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1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Entomology at Texas A&M University is to create and implement knowledge that improves lives. Faculty, students, and staff conduct discovery, transitional, and applied entomological research, which is delivered to Texans and the world, through educational outreach, classroom teaching, and distance education. 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 Entomology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among research, teaching, 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 (University Rule 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 Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Unit 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="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</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.

This document provides the guidelines for faculty evaluation in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Faculty ranks, areas of performance, evaluation criteria, review and promotion processes for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension Service are defined in the following guidelines:

- Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures - 12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review and 12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion
- Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty

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.
The ranks for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty are defined in Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, respectively.

**Tenured Professor.** A tenured Professor should lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national and international recognition and leadership through publication in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; maintain sustained external funding for research; provide leadership to interdisciplinary and interagency regional, state, national and international programs; and, when appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenured Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; through advisement and mentoring of students; and by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and by participating in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The tenured Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the tenured Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Tenured Associate Professor.** A tenured Associate Professor should lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national recognition and emerging leadership through publication in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; strive to maintain continuity of external funding for research; provide leadership to interdisciplinary and interagency regional, state, national and international programs; and, when appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenured Associate Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; through advisement and mentoring of students; and by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and by participating in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The tenured Associate Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the tenured Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Tenure-Track Assistant Professor.** The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology and related disciplines; achieve national recognition through publication in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; and develop research grant proposals and acquire external funding for research. The tenure-track Assistant Professor will, as appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and teach undergraduate and graduate courses in related areas of specialization, consistent with needs for the general departmental curriculum and the graduate program; contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through advisement and mentoring of students and by participating in graduate dissertation committees. Through these and related activities and by limited service on departmental service committees, the tenure-track Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Senior Lecturer.** The Senior Lecturer will participate in classroom teaching, primarily at the undergraduate level, in support of the educational goals of the Department for both departmental majors and non-majors in topics related to entomology, forensic sciences and related disciplines; supervise and train graduate teaching assistants; contribute to student mentorship through office hours and other outside-the-classroom teaching
opportunities as appropriate. Participate in occasional committee service both in the department and in the larger university community.

**Lecturer.** Present lecture and/or laboratory courses in entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines as appropriate. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations, and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning experiments, ordering supplies, presenting pre-laboratory lectures, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, grading lab notebooks and lab reports, and assigning final grades. Both lecture and lab courses involve training and supervision of teaching assistants.

**Instructional Professor.** The non-tenure-track Instructional Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national and international recognition and leadership through their scholarly work and, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and The Instructional Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The Instructional Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college or university programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the Instructional Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Instructional Associate Professor.** A non-tenure-track Instructional Associate Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national recognition and emerging leadership through their scholarly work and presentations at regional, national and international meetings. The Instructional Associate Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The Instructional Associate Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the Instructional Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The non-tenure-track Instructional Assistant Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; achieve national recognition through their scholarly work and presentations at regional and national meetings. The Instructional Assistant Professor will develop and teach undergraduate and graduate courses consistent with the needs of the general departmental curriculum and the graduate program; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. Through these and related activities and by service on departmental committees, the Instructional Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.** Historically, the Department has only utilized the Research Assistant Professor title but under appropriate situations would consider appointments at the Research Associate Professor and Research Professor levels. As a non-tenured member of the faculty, the Research Assistant Professor develops and executes a research programs in an agricultural/life science specialization relevant to the Department. The terms of appointment and promotion to Research Associate Professor are defined by AgriLife policy and may include acquisition of independent funding. Research Assistant Professors are expected to contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department through limited service on committees and related activities.
Two additional tracks of Texas A&M University faculty titles associated with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences are:

- **AgriLife Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor** – These Texas A&M University faculty titles are for faculty members employed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research who are hired to teach Texas A&M University courses and/or mentor students. These appointments are non-tenure track positions at Texas A&M University.

- **AgriLife Extension Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor** – These Texas A&M University faculty titles are for faculty members employed by Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service who are hired to teach Texas A&M University courses and/or mentor students. These appointments are non-tenure track positions at Texas A&M University.

3. **Faculty Mentoring**

Peer mentoring is intended to provide professional guidance for tenure- and non-tenure track assistant and associate professors on and off campus, as well as for instructional assistant and associate professors throughout the reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure (RPT) process. Guidance provided by the committee to the mentee is not a mandate.

Mentors play a key role in providing constructive critique and advice to mentees throughout the RPT process. Mentoring also provides guidance and assistance to assistant professors as they seek to integrate into the Department of Entomology and the Texas A&M University (TAMU) community.

In order to maximize the efficiency and value of the mentoring process, faculty acting as mentors will agree to play an advocate role. Although mentors are required to make their mentees aware of any perceived weaknesses in their programs, they should refrain from discussing confidential conversations in public. Mentors will have access to inside information that should be kept confidential to improve trust and prevent mentors from unwillingly and negatively biasing any of their mentees’ evaluations.

**Mentoring Committee’s Mission Statement:** To provide guidance and assistance to faculty in the Department of Entomology falling in the previously described categories as they seek to develop a nationally and/or internationally recognized, sustainable program, while integrating into the Department of Entomology and TAMU community, as well as to successfully navigate the RPT process.

3.1. **Selection of Committee Members**

Each mentoring committee will consist of three to five faculty members holding a rank higher than the rank of the mentee. Some considerations for selecting mentoring committee members include, but are not limited to:

- Faculty in the same discipline who can provide feedback on grant proposals, funding strategies, laboratory setup, manuscript submissions, and other research-related activities.
- Faculty with a similar mission and expectations with regards to research/teaching/Extension activities.
- Faculty from another department who can provide advice on challenges relating to sensitive issues encountered within the Department of Entomology.
- In all of the above cases, Faculty can be selected from another department or college at TAMU or another Tier I institution and can serve these roles as the candidate best sees fit, particularly when faculty within the department do not meet these criteria.
- The mentee is encouraged to seek the mentorship of faculty who come from diverse backgrounds so that the mentoring experience can be as productive and inclusive as possible.

3.2. **Management of Committee**

- The department head (and/or associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) will work with each mentee to develop a mentoring committee within the first six months of initiation of employment.
- A committee will remain in place throughout the RPT process from assistant professor to full professor.
• The mentee will designate one individual on the committee as Chair.
• The mentee should meet with all mentors individually (and/or as a group) throughout each year on an as-needed basis, with more interactions recommended early in the mentee’s career (monthly or quarterly), compared with later years (semi-annually or annually).
• The entire committee will meet with the mentee formally at least once per year (in person or virtually through an online platform, such as Zoom or Skype).
• At this more formal meeting, the mentee will provide the mentor committee with outlines or drafts of his/her research/teaching/service statements, an updated CV, and goals for the next year, as well as the annual mentoring committee form.

3.3. Best Practices and Outcome of Committee Meetings:

The following details will be discussed and then written into a summary (Appendix 1. Example of Outline of Annual Mentoring Committee Meeting Summary) by the mentoring committee Chair.

• The chair is encouraged to complete the Faculty Mentoring Program: https://cte.tamu.edu/Communities,-Programs-and-Models/Mentoring/Faculty-Mentoring-Academy
• Committee approach leading to generation of a strong summary statement will include:
  o A discussion of resources available to the mentee including, but not limited to, 1) grants, 2) training in teaching/presentations, and 3) diversity and inclusion resources (see below).
  o Discussion that should focus primarily on providing guidance with regards to crafting a cohesive narrative about one’s appointment (e.g., teaching, research, Extension, and/or service) and associated program and articulating its impact. This will be accomplished primarily through continuous feedback on the mentee’s research/extension, teaching, and service statements (as appropriate to their appointment).
• Annual outcome will provide:
  o A summary of the mentee’s advancements as related to their appointment (e.g., teaching, research, Extension), service, mentee needs, and committee recommendations.
  o A brief synopsis regarding recommendations given to the mentee on how to improve any areas of their job performance to help ensure continuous success throughout the RPT process at TAMU.
  o A finalized version signed by the committee and mentee within one month of the annual meeting being held, and, for the given year, subsequently provided to the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) at the conclusion of each calendar year.
  o The report will remain confidential with the mentee, mentor committee, and department head.

3.4. Managing Composition of Committee

The mentee has the opportunity to work with the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) to reshape the mentoring committee member composition, as needed. If changes to the committee composition occur, the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) will submit a letter to the individual(s) being replaced.

4. Areas of Faculty Performance
(Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; teaching; and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance, as well as their evaluation, 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).
The areas of performance for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty are defined in Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.90.A0.03 Faculty Promotion and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, respectively.

4.1. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work

Research is critical to the mission of the College and a defining element of our University as a Research I institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. Tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to be respectively nationally and internationally recognized leaders in their areas of study with demonstrated impact that advances their field or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status in the case of tenure-track faculty members. Effectiveness and excellence in research significantly affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for faculty members with research appointments.

Evaluation of research should focus on: 1) how a faculty member has defined, developed and positioned their scholarship and field of study throughout their career to achieve impact and 2) evidence that their leadership and impact in their field of scholarship compares favorably to accomplishments and reputation typical of leaders in their discipline and field of study. This impact should be supported by demonstrated success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, state, private and corporate funders; number, quality and impact of research publications in the leading journals; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; number of citations and, where applicable, translational impacts. Leadership, impact, and reputation in the faculty member’s field should also be documented, for tenure/promotion, through peer evaluation letters from leaders in the same or closely related field from leading academic institutions. Leadership and impact should be demonstrated mainly from analysis of the content of the faculty member’s work and how it has influenced and advanced their field of study.

4.2. Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction as assigned 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.

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. The criteria to be considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to: knowledge of subject matter; skill, experience, and creativity with a range of appropriate pedagogies and technologies; understanding of and skill in using appropriate assessment practices; professional interactions with students within and beyond the classroom; mentoring of student research; and involvement with and contributions to one’s profession in enhancing teaching and learning.

In the Department of Entomology, most faculty members will have a job expectation consisting of 60% Research, 30% Teaching, and 10% Service. An analysis of the current fixed credit teaching in the department demonstrated that each faculty member’s teaching effort in fixed credit courses is between 6 and 9 credits of teaching effort per year. Please note that teaching effort is not equivalent to, and is often higher than, student credit hours. This analysis used the criteria for adjusting teaching effort of fixed credit courses as outlined in the Faculty Senate Workload Document (https://dars.tamu.edu/files/workload-policy) and available on the Department’s Intranet. The Department Head will review the current teaching effort of fixed credit courses for the year under review.
and their contribution to graduate education through advising graduate students. Each faculty member’s current teaching assignment of fixed credit courses and the planned classroom teaching in the next academic year and the number of graduate students they are advising are used to make adjustments to the faculty member’s position description. Those faculty who routinely have a teaching effort in excess of 10 credits will be advised to move to a 45/45/10 appointment (R/T/S). A few faculty who have a reduced teaching effort (<6 credits of effort per year) in fixed credit teaching may have their appointment adjusted to 75/15/10 (R/T/S) to account for increased research and scholarly output to be reflected in their job expectations. Evaluation will be based upon the assignment of the faculty member’s appointment.

4.3. Service

Service is essential to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to engage effectively in service to their academic unit and the institution, to their profession, and to society. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the academic unit, the institution, the profession, and society. Excellence in service should document how service activities contribute to national and international reputation and recognition for the faculty member and Texas A&M.

5. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Entomology recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their 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). All representative indicators listed may not apply to every faculty member and there may be other appropriate indicators.

The indicators of faculty excellence and effectiveness for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty are defined in Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, respectively.

5.1. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in leading refereed journals;
- Frequency of a faculty member’s publications being cited by others in their articles (impact factors of journals are becoming increasingly important);
- Receipt of significant external funding for research (when used as a quality indicator, the extent of peer review in the competitive process should be noted);
- Publication of scholarly books;
- Receipt of nationally approved patents;
- Receipt of major fellowship or other awards in recognition of research accomplishments;
- Member of a review panel for a national research organization;
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings;
- Editor or member of the editorial board of a major journal
5.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in refereed journals;
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations;
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
- Presentation of papers at national meetings of appropriate disciplines (and/or societies);
- Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
- Publications in non-refereed, but widely recognized journals or magazines;
- Significant self-development activities, such as Faculty Development Leave or the participation in other activities that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.

Additional indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work for Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension may include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of research in journals targeted for industry and user groups;
- Evidence of a well-planned and developed program of research that has contributed to the advancement of knowledge or has produced a tangible benefit to society (e.g. an insect-resistant crop variety, software utilization);
- Evidence of sustained accomplishment of research project objectives;
- Evidence of an effective relationship with research-user groups;
- Inclusion of graduate students in research efforts and serving as co-advisor, co-chair and/or member of their advisory committees;
- Participation in interdisciplinary research activities.

5.3. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Indicators of Excellence in Teaching (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:

- Selection for a University, College, or Professional Society outstanding teacher award;
- Evidence of courses being taught at a rigorous and challenging level;
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials;
- Outstanding teaching performance evaluations;
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials;
- Chair of doctoral graduate student research advisory committees;
- Publications in refereed education journals.

5.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:

- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses;
- Member of graduate student advisory committees;
- Evidence of high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments; Coordination of multi-section courses;
- Significant self-development (improvement) activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.

5.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

Indicators of Excellence in Service (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:
• Officer in a national or international professional organization;
• Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
• Program chair or similar chair at a national or international meeting.
• Committee chair of national professional organization;

Additional indicators of **Excellence in Service** for TAMU include:

• Administrative leadership role at TAMU;
• Officer in Faculty Senate;
• Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee.

5.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to:

• Officer in regional or state professional organization;
• Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting;
• Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations;
• Service on University, college, departmental, AgriLife Research, or AgriLife Extension committee and taskforces;
• Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies;
• Administrative roles within the department, AgriLife Research, or AgriLife Extension;
• Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
• Reviewer for international research organizations

Additional indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** for TAMU include:

• Service as a member of the Faculty Senate;
• Advisor to student organizations.

6. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

6.1. 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 (research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, 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 for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences are described in the sections below.

Evaluation criteria for promotion of AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty are described in Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, respectively.

6.1.1. For promotion to Assistant Professor

• Faculty members holding a tenure-accruing appointment with the rank of Instructor will be promoted to the rank of assistant professor upon the receipt of the terminal degree.

6.1.2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

• **Research**: Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.1) is an expectation of tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Tenure-track faculty are
expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research and be recognized as leaders in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Except in the discipline of education, scholarship of teaching and learning should be secondary to scholarship in the research discipline. Collaborative work is encouraged where each member of the group documents their major and independent contribution to the impact of the research. The applicants for promotion should have advanced their field nationally and internationally, demonstrated by specific examples.

- **The Department of Entomology has adopted** similar criteria for faculty appointed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research (non-tenure track), with additional indicators of effectiveness listed for AgriLife Research faculty (see indicators described in 5.2).

- **Teaching**: Effectiveness in teaching and a sustained trajectory toward teaching excellence (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) are expectations of all tenure-track faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member’s appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented.

- **Service**: Effectiveness in service and some evidence of excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenure-track faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally.

- **The Department of Entomology has adopted** similar criteria for faculty appointed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension (non-tenure track), with additional indicators of effectiveness listed for AgriLife Research faculty (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6). See section 6.3 for department criteria adopted for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty.

### 6.1.3. For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

- **Research**: Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.1) is an expectation of tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professors. They are expected to be recognized leaders nationally and for most fields internationally who demonstrate impact that has advanced their field. It is incumbent on applicants for promotion to clearly define their field of research/scholarship and its relevance, value and impact for the department, TAMU/TAMUS, the State of Texas, the nation, and the world. The applicants for promotion should provide specific examples of how they have advanced their field nationally and internationally; activity alone is not a sufficient measure of impact. Leadership and impact of research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member’s career.

- **The Department of Entomology has adopted** similar criteria for faculty appointed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research (non-tenure track), with additional indicators of effectiveness listed for AgriLife Research faculty (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2). See section 6.3 for department criteria adopted for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty.

- **Teaching**: Effectiveness in teaching and evidence of excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) are expectations of all tenured faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be
documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member’s appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented. Impact of teaching should grow throughout the faculty member’s career.

- The Department of Entomology has adopted criteria for faculty appointed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research (non-tenure track) that focuses on and typically is limited to mentoring of student research. See section 6.3 for department criteria adopted for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty.

- **Service**: Effectiveness in service and evidence of excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenured faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member’s career.

- The Department of Entomology has adopted similar criteria for faculty appointed by Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension (non-tenure track), with additional indicators of effectiveness listed for AgriLife Research faculty (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6). See section 6.3 for department criteria adopted for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty.

6.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (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. Faculty with Instructional or Practice in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

6.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- **Teaching**: Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 5.2 and 5.3.

6.2.2. For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor (or Assistant Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice)

- **Teaching**: Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.2 and 5.3.

- **Service**: Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the
department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these contributions can often have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching.

- **Research**: Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

### 6.2.3. For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Professor (or Professor of the Practice)

- **Teaching**: Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.2 and 5.3. Leadership and impact in teaching and scholarship of teaching should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member’s career.

- **Service**: Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these service contributions should have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member’s career.

- **Research**: Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. Leadership and impact in research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member’s career.

### 6.3. Evaluation Criteria for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Faculty

#### 6.3.1. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Faculty

**Educational program development, implementation, and assessment.** One of the core programming responsibilities of an extension specialist is to support statewide, district and county programs. By the end of the fifth year, the faculty member should have a record of use by other specialists and by county extension agents in support of field days, tours, and educational programs. Extension specialists should also demonstrate the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the local level. By the fifth year they should have developed effective programming at the district or regional levels, at a minimum and served as a statewide resource within the extension entomology project group. Examples of broader programming would include, but are not limited to, symposia, seminars, web-based programming, or workshops.

A second core responsibility of an extension specialist assigned to a district is agent training. Although a specialist’s face to face time with agents is often limited, by the fifth year a faculty member should show a record of providing information and training to agents in their assigned districts through formal training meetings and webinars, newsletters, email correspondence, and collaborations via demonstration efforts or other vehicles.

A third core responsibility is documenting impact of the faculty member’s extension program. The impact of at least one major program area should be formally evaluated to show adoption by clientele of new technology or change in behavior resulting from the program efforts. The evaluation should define the problem or educational need; document its importance to clientele, detail the educational and applied
research programs and/or demonstrations conducted to address the issue, and formally document the outcome and impact, including economic impact when appropriate.

Program Support. The acquisition of external support is an integral part of scholarly contributions. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts from various organizations (commodity, state agencies, regional and federal agencies, foundations, industry, etc.) along with donation of materials and volunteerism. A faculty member’s job in the first few years is to create the personal relationships with clientele, county extension agents, extension program specialists, IPM specialists, industry representatives, extension specialists in entomology and other discipline areas, and relevant colleagues in the local area, state, region, or nation, so that an effective extension program can be developed.

By the end of the fifth year, a record of obtaining external support and collaboration should be documented. Partnering or networking with other agencies, universities, campus-based faculty, and agribusinesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an extension specialist in terms of program support.

Scholarship through Publication. The expectation for extension specialists is that the record will show multiple extension publications or similar contributions written or revised each year. Examples of extension publications include numbered bulletins, fact sheets, videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, web pages, newsletters, blogs, other relevant social media, and computer software programs. It is expected that applied research will be submitted for publication in appropriate peer reviewed journals. A goal of publishing as senior or junior authors multiple refereed journal articles by the end of the fifth year is a good benchmark, but this level of output will not be the only criterion used to measure for scholarly writing. As such, other writing which may not be anonymously reviewed, but is peer-edited or reviewed should be included. Examples include symposium proceedings, published abstracts (e.g., Arthropod Management Tests), and writing for mass media (e.g., authored or co-authored articles in newspapers, magazines, trade publications, newsletters, web sites, blogs, or other relevant social media). All scholarly contributions will be taken into consideration.

An extension specialist applying for promotion to associate professor should have at least a local and state-wide recognition for their extension and academic excellence and show evidence of progress toward a regional (multi-state) reputation. An extension specialist should have demonstrated considerable diversity of topic area expertise; however, there should be some evidence in the publication record that a coherent extension program has been developed by the end of the fifth year as the state-wide expert in the faculty member’s major area of expertise.

Professional Service. Such service refers to accepting a variety of opportunities to serve a larger organization such as a department, agency, professional society, and other such venues with the concept of meeting the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of professional service would include, but are not limited to: (a) service on department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving on external agency boards, grant review panels, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and (e) serving as adjunct faculty for other universities.

Reputation/Professionalism. A local to statewide reputation with evidence of progress toward building a regional (multi-state) reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to associate professor. This is likely to be exemplified by serving in leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or teach at professional meetings or conferences, organizing and participating in symposia, guest lecturing and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

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

6.3.2. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Professor for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Faculty

Educational program development, implementation, and assessment. An extension specialist applying for promotion to professor should exhibit a proven track record supporting state, district, and county programs. This support may be in the form of educational programs (field days, tours, workshops, seminars, etc.) as well as support of their programming planning activities. Extension specialists should also exhibit the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the local level. When applying for promotion to professor, an extension specialist should have developed effective programming at the district, regional, and state level with evidence of an emerging national or international reputation.

Examples of broader programming would include, but not be limited to, named programs, organizing, or being invited to participate in symposia, seminars, web-based programming, or workshops.

A second core teaching responsibility of extension specialists assigned to a district is ongoing agent training. Although a specialist’s face to face time with agents can be limited, a faculty member applying for the rank of professor should show a proven record of providing information and training to agents at the state, district, regional, and county level through formal training meetings and webinars, newsletters, email correspondence and collaborations via demonstration efforts or other vehicles.

A third core responsibility is documenting impact of the faculty member’s extension programs since last promotion. The impact of at least one major program area should be formally evaluated to show adoption of new technology by clientele or a change in behavior resulting from the program efforts. The evaluation should define the problem or educational need; document its importance to clientele, detail the educational and applied research programs and/or demonstrations conducted to address the issue, and formally document the outcome and impact, including economic impact when appropriate.

Program Support. The acquisition of external support is an integral part of an individual’s scholarly contribution. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts to various organizations (commodity, state agencies, regional and federal agencies, foundations, industry etc.) along with donation of materials and volunteerism. A faculty member’s expectations are to create the personal relationships with clientele, county agents, extension program specialists, IPM specialists and industry representatives, extension specialists in entomology and other discipline areas, and relevant colleagues in the region or nation, so that an effective extension program can be developed.

It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some subject matter fields as compared to others, thus discrete guidelines are not defined. Partnering or networking with other agencies, universities, campus-based faculty, and agribusinesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an extension specialist in terms of program support.

Scholarship through Publication. Extension specialists applying for promotion to professor should have a significant body of scholarly extension-focused publications. Extension publications are defined, but not limited to, numbered bulletins, fact sheets, videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, newsletters, websites, blogs and other relevant social media and computer software programs. Similarly, applied research reports and books or book chapters in edited volumes should be considered as peer reviewed or peer edited contributions.

There should be a consistent record of multiple refereed journal articles since last promotion with some of those articles having extension specialist or their graduate students as senior author. Additional scholarly writing is expected, such as symposium proceedings, published abstracts (e.g., Arthropod Management Tests), and articles for mass media, e.g., authored or co-authored articles in newspapers, magazines, trade publications, newsletters, websites, blogs, and other relevant social media. All scholarly contributions will be taken into consideration.
An extension specialist applying for promotion to professor should be able to demonstrate an emerging national or international reputation in Extension programming and academic excellence, and have a documented, coherent long-term successes in extension programming, recognizing that specialists will be required to address a diversity of topics. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (i.e. interactive video or web design, blogs or relevant social media) and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches, new technology or technology transfer in the base program areas.

**Professional Service.** Such service refers to accepting a variety of opportunities to serve a larger organization such as a department, agency, professional society, and other such venue with the concept of meeting the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of professional service would include, but are not be limited to: (a) service on department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving on external agency boards, grant review panels, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and, (e) serving in adjunct positions for other universities. It does not include service to the community as a citizen, rather than a professional role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

**Reputation/Professionalism.** A strong local, district, regional and statewide reputation, with evidence of an emerging national or international reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to professor. This is likely to be exemplified by taking on leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or teach at professional meetings or conferences, organizing and participating in symposia, and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

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

7. **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 non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are 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 units 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. 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.

Guidelines for annual reviews of AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension faculty are in Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, respectively.

7.1. Purpose

- 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.
  - See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and 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.

7.2. 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 and professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). The Faculty Annual Performance Review will take into account the faculty member’s assigned job expectations outlined in their position description.

7.3. Time Period of Review

The evaluation will be based primarily upon data and metrics pertaining to the previous calendar year, but trends extending into the previous two years and/or into the current year may be considered.

7.4. 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 five categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” “Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations,” and “Superior” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance. In the Workday system where faculty annual evaluations are loaded, the five ratings are equivalent at “Does Not Meet Expectations,” “Partially Meets Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” and “Significantly Exceeds Expectations,” respectively.
7.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity based on the indicators described in 5.2.

- **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, funding, manuscripts, citations, presentations, book chapters, or other indicators described in 5.2.

- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, or other indicators described in 5.2.

- **Exceeds Expectations** – 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 quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations and other indicators described in 5.1.

- **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 5.1. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

7.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching based on indicators described in 5.4.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of students, didactic/laboratory teaching, or other indicators described in 5.4.

- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees, and other indicators described in 5.4.

- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments and other indicators described in 5.3. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

- **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 5.3. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and/or solicited involvement in professional organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

7.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6.
● **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

● **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.

● **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service based on indicators described in 5.5. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations (e.g., officer or chair) would be typical.

● **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators described in 5.5. These faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and/or solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

### 7.5. Required Components

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

#### 7.5.1. Faculty member’s report of previous activities.

Faculty will complete a standardized annual activity report in Interfolio Faculty180. The Department Head also requires each faculty member to submit an updated CV, their Annual Plan of Work, and a 1-page self-assessment document. The self-assessment document will be a standard form that will contain three components: Teaching, Research, and Service. All documents are needed to complete the Faculty Annual Performance Review. Failure to provide these documents in a timely fashion will result in an overall “Unsatisfactory” rating.

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar 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 research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service as appropriate.
- 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)

#### 7.5.2. 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 a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service. Job expectations are adjusted annually at the annual performance review and written into a new position description to account for faculty members who plan to take on an administrative duty, who will be on approved leave during the reporting period, when a new faculty member is hired and will not be teaching classes immediately, or in other circumstances where, on a temporary basis, their job expectations may be 0% in one or more
categories. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review should 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. Once the Faculty Annual Performance Review document is completed, the Department Head and the faculty member sign the evaluation to indicate the review session and feedback occurred. 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. The Department Head can modify the summary document using the written input from the faculty member’s response and returns the revised version to the faculty member for their signature. In cases where the overall performance rating assigned by the Department Head is “Unsatisfactory”, and the faculty member’s written input does not result in a change in rating by the Department Head, the faculty member may request a review of the Faculty Annual Performance Review by the TAMU subcommittee of the elected Promotion and Tenure Committee. The subcommittee provides a written report to the Department Head. The Department Head will use this additional evaluation to consider changing the “Unsatisfactory” rating.

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 unit personnel file and loaded into the Workday system. A copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review is provided to the faculty member. No merit increase can be given without a signed copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review and position description on file.

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.

7.5.3. Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member

A meeting needs to be scheduled between the Department Head and the faculty member to discuss their performance during the previous reporting period with particular attention to his or her overall rating in Teaching, Research, and Service. The department head, director, or supervisor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. Any missing data or errors in reporting can be brought up for inclusion into the assessment. Areas of superior performance along with areas where improvement is needed will be indicated and specific goals will be agreed to if overall performance was rated below Satisfactory. These goals, if met, are designed to elevate the overall performance rating to Satisfactory or above in the next evaluation period. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

7.5.4. Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service 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.

7.6. 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:
7.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, service, and 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 unit 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, 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 9.2.) of the faculty member. 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).

7.6.2. 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 9), 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/creative work), 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.

7.7. 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.”

7.8. 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, or in their absence those published by the college, 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.

8. 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.
The mid-term review process for Assistant Professors in Texas A&M AgriLife Research follows that for tenure-track faculty. Mid-term reviews for Assistant Professors and Extension Specialists follow the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty.

8.1. 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; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a mid-term (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action to not renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

8.2. Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2019</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This review is conducted by the elected Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T committee (8.2.2) with a summary statement provided to all members of the P&T committee following a special called P&T committee meeting; typically, in April or May of the candidate’s 3rd year. The dossier is forwarded to the College by the published deadline for review by the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee, and the Dean and Directors. The midterm review does not go beyond the College and Agencies.

8.3. 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 (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.
8.4. Mid-term review for Academic and Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professors

To provide a formative review of Instructional Assistant Professors and Assistant Professors of Practice near the mid-point of the period toward promotion, a similar mid-term review process will be conducted for APT Assistant Professors in the third calendar year in the rank.

9. Promotion and Tenure Review

9.1. Purpose

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated and continued leadership and impact in a research field nationally and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. Promotion to Professor is granted for continued international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership and impact in teaching and service can be the basis for promotion from associate to full professor (see University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

9.2. Process

9.2.1. Guidelines for the Promotion/Tenure Review Process

The promotion/tenure review process (including the timelines and dossier requirements) for all college faculty follows the University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The department-level promotion/tenure review process follows the approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines in accordance with the university rules and guidelines.

Texas A&M AgriLife Research Faculty should refer to the agency’s Procedures 12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review, for policies and procedures unique to Texas A&M AgriLife Research.

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service faculty should refer to the agency’s guidelines Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty, for policies and procedures unique to Texas A&M AgriLife Extension.

Candidates should order the CV so that the primary area upon which they are being evaluated is listed first. Tenure track and AgriLife Research faculty should put research/scholarly activity/creative work as the first section, Academic and Professional Track (APT) faculty (except for those with Research in their title) should put teaching as the first section, and AgriLife Extension faculty should put extension as the first section.

The departmental P&T committee is expected to provide guidance and feedback to the candidates on preparation of the dossier prior to its submission.

Faculty members having budgeted joint appointments in two or more departments are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by each department/unit, in accordance with the guidelines from each department/unit and as specified in the memorandum of understanding executed for the budgeted joint appointment. If the budgeted joint appointment involves other colleges, each dean (and each college level P&T committees) provide recommendations to the provost. The college in which the faculty is administratively located has the responsibility for completing and forwarding the dossier to the Office of the Dean of Faculties. For candidates who are involved with Interdisciplinary Programs, a letter must be requested from the program chair/director at the same time as when external reviewers’ letters are requested so they may become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental P&T committee.

9.2.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee

To be eligible as a member of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, a “faculty member” is defined as any person holding the title of Associate Professor or Professor. Those holding a named
professorship or endowed chair are also eligible to participate and vote because they also hold a faculty rank. However, faculty with the modifiers Emeritus, Senior, Visiting, or Adjunct are not eligible to vote on any promotion dossier. TAMU faculty with modifiers Research, Clinical and Instructional, etc. are “Academic Professional Track” faculty. These faculty are promoted using the same process. They can be members of the Departmental P&T committee if they hold the appropriate rank, but they can only vote for non-tenured faculty. There are four categories of faculty in the Department of Entomology. TAMU faculty are those who are administratively located at Texas A&M University; they are in tenured or tenure-track appointments or they hold a non-tenured appointment as an Academic Professional Track faculty. The other two categories are for those faculty whose primary appointment is with one of the state Agencies – Texas A&M AgriLife Research or Texas A&M AgriLife Extension; generally, these faculty do not hold tenure-track positions.

The P&T Committee consists of all Associate Professors and Professors and Senior Lecturers. P&T Committee members who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will vote on all Assistant Professors and Lecturers (Lecturer and Senior Lecturer) and other Academic Professional Track faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor and seeking promotion. In addition to all faculty listed above, Senior Lecturers can vote for Lecturers seeking promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Only those who have achieved the rank of Professor are eligible to discuss or vote on promotion of an Associate Professor to the rank of Professor.

9.2.3. Duties of the Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T Committee

(1) Of the two individuals elected as Chair and Co-Chair, one will be on-campus (TAMU appointment) and the other will be off-campus (either AgriLife Research or AgriLife Extension appointments). This keeps the committee balanced with respect to administrative affiliation.

(2) Election will occur each year in January with duties beginning immediately.

(3) The Chair and Co-Chair stand for election with staggered 2-year terms. Once elected the individual cannot stand for re-election for a period of 4 years (two, 2-year terms).

(4) The Chair and Co-Chair must hold the rank of Professor.

(5) Each elected individual must attend training sessions for chairs of P&T committees if available. These are typically held by the DOF or by the College.

(6) The Co-Chair rotates to become the Chair in the 2nd year, and a new Co-Chair is elected.

(7) All faculty subject to evaluation by the P&T committee vote for the Co-Chair.

(8) The duties of the Chair and the Co-Chair are to:

a. Compile the written comments submitted by P&T committee members following their review of the dossiers of each candidate seeking promotion into draft reports required by the College, Agencies, and DOF. The Chair/co-Chair may lead writing the draft reports or request members of the P&T committee of appropriate rank and appointment to write selected draft reports. The draft reports will be distributed to the full committee at least 7 days prior to the P&T meeting where the reports will be discussed and revised. The preparers of the draft reports will be identified in the document, The Chair/Co-Chair will prepare the committee discussion report.

If the candidate is either tenured or seeking tenure, the tenured member of the leadership team must be the individual that facilitates discussion at the P&T Committee meeting, finalizes revision of individual draft reports, and compiles the final summary report. The Chair or Co-Chair facilitates discussion of all other candidates. Dossiers will be posted in Interfolio and available to the P&T Committee for comment approximately 30 days prior to the meeting of the P&T committee. Committee members will submit their written comments to the Chair and Co-Chair at least 14 days before the annual meeting of
the P&T Committee, and draft reports will be made available to committee members at least 7 days before the annual meeting. The annual meeting typically will be held in late August to early September, depending upon the calendar set by the Dean of Faculties as to when documents are due.

b. Facilitate the discussion of each candidate’s dossier along with the submitted written comments of the entire P&T Committee during the annual P&T Committee meeting.

c. Prepare a final summary document that includes points arising during the P&T Committee meeting to be reviewed by the P&T Committee prior to casting a ballot. The Chair and Co-Chair are expected to cast a vote for each candidate.

d. Maintain a record of committee member participation in the three steps of the evaluation process (1. written comments, 2. P&T committee meeting, and 3. final report approval).

e. Coordinate with department staff to send and receive ballots from members of the P&T committee and to verify final results.

f. Forward the final summary statement before the deadline, with vote totals to the Department Head for inclusion in the dossier.

g. Work with department staff to secure signatures on the final summary statement of every member of the P&T committee who voted.

h. For the Department Head to attend the discussion of the P&T Committee, the Head must receive a written invitation from the Chair and Co-Chair. In general, the Department Head is not a participant in the P&T Committee discussion. The Department Head is not eligible to cast a vote because of their supervisory role.

(9) If neither the Chair nor Co-Chair is available to conduct the annual P&T meeting, the Associate Department Heads may substitute and assume all duties of the Chair and the Co-Chair of the P&T Committee. However, because Associate Department Heads provide input to the annual performance review of faculty, they cannot cast a vote for promotion and/or tenure. Associate Department Heads are expected to attend the P&T committee meeting and will take the training available through the DOF office for chairs of P&T committees as well.

9.2.4. Promotion/Tenure Review Process

Review of the cases for TAMU faculty will follow the University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Review of the cases for Agrilife Research and Agrilife Extension faculty will follow the guidelines of Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension (12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review and Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty), respectively. The committee will ensure equitable review and evaluation of on- and off-campus promotion candidates, based on the guidelines and the position description for each candidate.

In order to cast a vote on promotion and tenure candidates in a given evaluation cycle, a P&T Committee member must fully participate in the evaluation process. ‘Full participation’ shall be defined as contributing to the following three opportunities for committee members to provide evaluative input into the content of the final summary report: (1) Provide written comments on the candidates’ dossiers prior to the annual P&T committee meeting (mandatory – no exceptions); (2) Participate in the annual P&T meeting (mandatory – with exceptions for legitimate scheduling conflicts such as planned travel, family emergencies, etc.), and (3) Review and approval of the final summary document arising from the annual P&T committee meeting prior to the vote (mandatory – no exceptions).

There is typically one annual meeting of the P&T Committee where candidates’ dossiers are discussed. All P&T Committee members must individually review the candidates’ written dossiers and submit written comments prior to the annual P&T Committee meeting. Confidential written comments will be submitted through the University’s secure Qualtrics Survey application or similar
online system, and record of their submission will serve as the record of participation. The compiled comments will be anonymously presented for discussion at the annual P&T Committee meeting and used to develop a written summary for each candidate to be prepared by the Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T Committee along with additional items arising from discussion of the candidates’ dossiers during the P&T committee meeting. Roll will be taken at the annual P&T Committee meeting as a record of participation. A final summary document will be sent to the P&T committee for review and approval within a specified deadline. All P&T committee members must approve the final summary document signifying that they agree that it adequately reflects outcome of the evaluation process to be eligible to vote. Note that approval of the report is independent of a committee member’s yes/no vote on a candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. As soon as the summary report review period has passed, an electronic vote with a specified deadline will be initiated by sending an electronic ballot to all eligible committee members who have fully participated in the three steps of the evaluation process as described above. Votes not cast by the deadline will be recorded as Absent.

All members of the P&T Committee are expected to cast a vote for candidates they are eligible to review. For the final report that is placed in the dossier, votes need to be segregated into tenured and non-tenured votes. The votes of the committee members of the College, AgriLife Research, and AgriLife Extension will be recorded separately. Academic Professional Track faculty are eligible to vote on non-tenure track Assistant Professors and all Lecturers if they hold the rank of Instructional (or other modifiers) Associate Professor or Professor. For cases of tenure-track and tenured candidates, the vote of the tenured faculty is the vote of record and must be recorded separately. For cases of Academic Professional Track faculty, the vote of the College faculty is the vote of record.

The Department of Entomology faculty have adopted a Code of Conduct (see Appendix) that in part states, “Faculty members accept personal responsibility to evaluate people based solely on their performance.” This statement is interpreted to mean that each faculty member is to vote individually based on how well a candidate has met or exceeded the Indicators of Effectiveness and Indicators of Excellence when evaluating a candidate for promotion. Organized block voting would constitute a violation of the Code of Conduct. Faculty members have a responsibility to avoid any such activity or appearance of such activities.

The only source of information for making a decision is the candidate’s dossier, which includes: 1) CV, signed and attested; 2) external letters of evaluation; 3) candidate’s statements on Teaching (or Extension Programs or Outreach activities), Research, and Service; 4) if the candidate has a teaching appointment, a peer evaluation of teaching completed by the departmental Education Committee is required, 5) all tables and charts required by the Dean of Faculties, and 6) any addenda added by the faculty member. The complete dossier with external letters is to be available for review approximately 30 days prior to the annual meeting of the P&T Committee.

All eligible faculty of the P&T Committee are expected to minimize Absent votes in order for the committee’s recommendation to carry maximum influence as the dossier moves forward. Recused votes should only be used for valid reasons. The Chair and Co-Chair will make a determination if an individual is using a valid reason to recuse themselves from voting. In all instances one who is recused cannot be present for any discussion of that candidate. All “No” votes cast require the inclusion of a statement as to which concern(s) raised in the P&T Committee discussion of the candidate dossier were the reason for the “No” vote.

Once a faculty member attains the appropriate rank, their membership on the Departmental P&T Committee is permanent, but contingent on participation as follows:

1. If a P&T committee member fails to participate fully in the annual evaluation process (as defined above) or does not cast a ballot for all candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion
1. If a faculty member is recused from voting for two consecutive academic years, they will be removed from the P&T Committee. A valid recusal from voting is considered a participatory action. The Chair and Co-Chair will validate the vote and maintain a record of P&T Committee member participation.

2. Two years after removal, the faculty member will regain eligibility, but they can only be re-appointed to the P&T Committee by petition in writing to the P&T Committee Chair and Co-Chair. The faculty member remains ineligible to participate and vote until a petition requesting a re-appointment is accepted.

10. 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 reviews (see Section 7) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 10.2).

10.1. 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.

10.2. Peer Review Committee

The Periodic Peer Review Committee will consist of all tenured TAMU Entomology faculty holding the rank of Professor and this committee will conduct Periodic Peer Reviews. The Periodic Peer Review Committee will select one member to serve as Chair (typically the Chair or co-Chair of the P&T Committee, though this is not required).

10.3. Process

Each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by the Periodic Peer Review Committee at least once every 6 years. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a Periodic Peer Review of the faculty member.

Consistent with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review "A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or a Professional Development Review (section 4), by making a request to the department head”.

In each instance the Periodic Peer Review is conducted by the Periodic Peer Review Committee.

**Timeline for the Periodic Peer Review and Post-Tenure Review.**

1. Tenured faculty members requiring Periodic Peer Review are identified each fall, and by the date specified by the Dean’s office, the Periodic Peer Review Committee will make a final report to the Department Head.

2. All tenured faculty members requiring a Periodic Peer Review will submit the following documentation upon the request of the Post-Tenure Review Committee:
   a. A current C.V.
b. The last 5 years of the faculty members Annual Performance Review Data provided by the faculty member as part of their annual review.

c. An optional 1-page narrative statement, providing any additional information that the faculty member wishes to provide the subcommittee on Teaching, Research, and Service activities, or any other information that they wish to have considered in the review.

3. For a Periodic Peer Review, each member of the Peer Review Committee will evaluate the submitted materials and provide to the Committee Chair a written statement regarding the faculty member’s overall performance since their last peer review using the criteria outlined in Section 5 for Research, Teaching, and Service.

4. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will prepare a summary statement and communicate the statement and the vote results to the faculty member. The faculty member will have the opportunity to meet with the Peer Review Committee to discuss the review, if desired, before the statement is forwarded to the Department Head.

The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations. The Committee will consider the faculty member’s position description when evaluating the faculty member’s performance.

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 three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

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

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

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

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

By no later than May 31st, each unit 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 last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

10.4. 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” Periodic Peer Review (see Section 10.3) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 10.7). The

¹ It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

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

- On behalf of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will solicit a list of names of potential committee members from the faculty member and a list of individuals that should not be contacted. The Department Head will give feedback on the submitted names and have the opportunity to provide additional names. The Dean will appoint the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee based on the input from the faculty member and the Department Head.

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.

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.

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

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

- Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4,
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 10.5) acceptable to the dean.

10.5. 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)

10.6. 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).

10.7. 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).

11. 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.

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.
Contact Office

Department of Entomology, Office of the Department Head, e-mail t-gold@tamu.edu.
Appendix 1: Outline of Annual Mentoring Committee Meeting Summary

**Purpose:** The mentoring committee will provide guidance/suggestions on how to improve research/Extension, teaching, and service statements for the mentee to develop a concise and effective program. The following categories listed in each emphasis area are criteria that can be used to develop committee feedback to the mentee. *This document is not to serve as a summary of an individual’s annual production but rather provide suggestions on developing a strategy to optimize their program.*

Mentee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mentorship Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. **Recommendations Concerning Scope of Research** (e.g., Grant Support, Publications, Collaborations, Meetings, Awards, Presentations):

II. **Recommendations Concerning Teaching Portfolio** (e.g., Formal Courses, Graduate Students, Undergraduate Students, Visiting Scholars):

III. **Recommendations Concerning Extension Outreach Programming, Relevance, and Impact** (e.g., Presentations, Publications, Agent Training, Justification of Purpose, Impact Documentation):

IV. **Recommendations Concerning Service Involvement** (Department, University, Professional, Community):

V. **Unmet Mentee Needs** (Space, equipment, administrative):

VI. **Other Committee Recommendations:**
Appendix 2: Code of Conduct Statement, Department of Entomology

The faculty of Texas A&M University Department of Entomology are dedicated to upholding a set of core values as we carry out our academic mission of learning and scholarship with the overarching goal of serving society through our research, teaching, extension education, and public service missions.

To achieve this excellence, the community of scholars and educators that comprise the Department of Entomology is committed to the highest ethical standards of conduct and integrity as outlined in our Code of Conduct Statement. This statement does not create any additional rules or different rights than are supported through current University and Agency policies, procedures and workplace rules. As a community of scientists we are simply stating that our department strives to be:

**Diverse:** We respect individual and intellectual diversity in all its forms. For example,

- Faculty members individually evaluate others based on their achievements and contributions irrespective of personal beliefs, gender, race, sexual orientation, ethnic, national origin, or religion.
- Faculty members promote understanding, tolerance, respect, and participation from all individuals.

**Accountable:** We are responsible for the reputation and success of the department and we expect all to adhere to the highest standards of personal and professional conduct. For example,

- Faculty members accept personal responsibility to evaluate people based solely on their performance.
- Faculty members accept a fair share of responsibility for participating in departmental governance by attending meetings, seminars, and volunteering to serve on committees.

**Respectful:** We treat others in a civil and respectful fashion. For example,

- Faculty members avoid all forms of harassment, illegal discrimination, threats, and abuse of power. We never use, or tolerate others that use, derogatory language about another person.
- Faculty members acknowledge professional indebtedness to colleagues and other scholars by proper citation.

**Ethical:** We act according to the highest ethical and professional standards and model ethical conduct to all members of the community. For example,

- Faculty members are personally accountable for individual actions and we affirm that we will abide by this code of conduct.
- We fulfill our obligations to manage resources responsibly, prevent waste and abuse, and promote a culture of principled behavior.

**DARE** to be Excellent!