1. Introduction
This document describes the guidelines and procedures for annual review, mid-tenure review, promotion of faculty with and without tenure, and post-tenure review at the Texas A&M University College of Dentistry (TAMCOD). This document should always be used in conjunction with the TAMU documents (dof.tamu.edu) listed below. These guidelines and procedures are intended to supplement the TAMU documents and provide specific information for the College of Dentistry as outlined and required in the TAMU documents.

1.1. 12.01.99.M2 University Rule: University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
1.2. 12.06.99.M0.01 Standard Administrative Procedure: Post Tenure Review
1.3. Dean of Faculties document: Promotion and Tenure Packages, Submission Guidelines (updated yearly)

2. Expectations and Responsibilities
2.1. TAMCOD has a diverse faculty with a wide range of duties and responsibilities extending from those who focus primarily on research to those with a focus on clinical and/or didactic instruction or some combination of research and teaching. All faculty strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty are expected to make contributions in all areas including research, teaching, and service. Academic professional track (non-tenure track) faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in two of these three areas, but are not excluded from making contributions in all areas. The goal of this document is to describe the unique aspects of TAMCOD regarding the various assessments required to gauge faculty performance.

2.2. Texas A&M University allows variation in faculty assessment that takes into account the unique aspects of each college. Some colleges consist of a number of large departments where each department generates its own guidelines and procedures for faculty assessment. Other colleges, like TAMCOD, consist of smaller departments and are better served by producing a single college document. Also in some of the colleges, all assessment and associated paperwork is handled through the department administration. At TAMCOD, because of the smaller department sizes, all aspects of assessment and associated documentation are handled through the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). This document describes the recommended procedures for each of the various faculty assessments and the responsibilities of the faculty, department heads,
and college administration in carrying out these assessments, submitting, and storing the resulting documentation.

3. **Faculty Annual Performance Reviews**

All faculty members, whether tenure track, tenured, or academic professional track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads (or immediate supervisors if administrators) are responsible. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 2.4.5, explains the purpose, basis, and requirements for the faculty annual review process. Section 2.4.4 specifically addresses annual reviews for faculty who hold joint appointments. For faculty holding budgeted joint appointments, “... there should be one department where more than 50% of the appointment is located; the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation.”

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads to assess faculty performance when determining merit payments and/or merit salary 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.” At TAMCOD, annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, and the review process must be completed by **March 1** of each year.

3.1. **Required Documentation:** In January of each year, department heads must request that all faculty submit an **Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation Report**. The current version of this report will be made available to the department heads by the OAA. The report may consist of either an online form or a Word or other type of digital document that can be filled in and submitted electronically.

3.2. **Process:** During January and February, Faculty Self-Evaluations are produced by the faculty and reviewed by the department head or immediate supervisor, in case of administrators. The department head meets with individual faculty to discuss their progress and to provide and receive verbal feedback. The discussion should specifically address the following areas: (1) classroom and clinical instruction, and student advising; (2) research, scholarly publications, and related scholarly activities; (3) institutional and professional service; (4) plans for the coming year; and (5) the department head’s summary and recommendations. In evaluating teaching, research, and service, contributions made to support interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs, and contributions made to enhancing diversity should be recognized.

Ratings for faculty given by department heads should include the following categories:

- Unsatisfactory: Performance does not meet requirements for the position.
- Needs improvement: Performance would be improved by minor adjustments.
Satisfactory: Performance meets requirements for the position.
Excellent: Performance goes beyond requirements for the position.

After meeting with the faculty member, a written evaluation of the faculty member’s progress/performance is submitted by the department head encompassing the areas listed above using an electronic form, the Annual Evaluation Review Report, the current form of which will be provided by OAA. No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all mandatory university training programs. 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. Likewise, the faculty member must certify their attentiveness to safety and compliance. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be signed and dated by each faculty member on their Annual Evaluation Review Report:

1. I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory university training programs.
2. I will, on a continuing and timely basis, address any safety deficiencies, report any and all safety concerns to the department head, and demonstrate compliance with safety standards as defined by the Environmental Health & Safety Department.

Faculty members are also required to acknowledge receipt of the written evaluation by returning a signed copy of the document to the department head. A signed copy is to be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. At that time, the faculty member may add a response to the written evaluation so that it may also be included in their personnel file.

On or before March 1 of each year signed copies of reviews for faculty should be forwarded to the OAA. Department heads must also provide a memo, which certifies that all faculty (tenured, tenure track, academic professional track) have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed a copy of their written review. In this memo the department heads should specifically indicate any tenure track faculty member who is not progressing satisfactorily toward an affirmative tenure decision. Likewise, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for any faculty member must also be reported. The department head in collaboration with the individual must prepare a written plan for near-term improvement, which will be submitted to the OAA by an April 1 deadline. If the faculty member is tenured and an unsatisfactory performance evaluation is received, a written plan for near-term improvement must be submitted unless three consecutive unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations have been received, in which case a professional development review will be initiated (see Section 8).

Annual reviews must be completed before merit payments or raises may be recommended, and no later than March 1.

4. Mid-term Review of Tenure Track Faculty Members

Mid-term review ensures that tenure track faculty members have a clear understanding of
their current status and progress toward tenure and promotion. The University requires that all tenure track faculty members are hired with a probationary period and have a mid-term review. The University requires that both department and college-level appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) committees, the department head, and the dean review and provide input into the formal mid-term review process.

Mandatory mid-term review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. All items and acknowledgements mentioned in the annual review must be incorporated into the mid-term review unless already stated in a separate annual review.

4.1 Required Documentation
Department heads should meet with mid-term review candidates in the early part of the calendar year to discuss the mid-term review process. The OAA will provide each department with a list of mandatory mid-term review candidates. To conduct the review, the following items must be provided by the candidate to the OAA in the spring semester (exact date will be provided during the review year):

- A cumulative three-page statement (maximum) on the faculty member’s accomplishments, goals, and philosophies in teaching, research, and service
- A course evaluation summary (form available through the OAA)
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV)
- Copies of two of the faculty member’s most significant papers published while at Texas A&M University

4.2 Process
Following submission of the materials to the OAA by the candidate, the department APT committee will review each case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department head. Separate evaluation of each area (research, teaching, and service) as well as an overall assessment must be provided. The committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate but rather they must provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and indicate the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate’s accomplishments. The committee must also discuss what the candidate can do to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period. Regarding scholarly activity, the committee must specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the circumstances of each candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual assignments in teaching, research, and service. The due date for the committee report will be determined by the OAA. The department head must then submit the following items to the OAA (the deadline will be provided by the OAA each year):

One original copy in single-sided, unstapled format (folders are not needed), and one electronic copy, both in the following order:

- The department head’s written preliminary report regarding the candidate’s performance in all areas of review. This report must include arguments as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and what the candidate can do to
improve performance during the remainder of the tenure period. The department head must specifically describe the scholarly expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. This report must be signed by the department head.

- The department APT committee’s written evaluation/recommendation addressing teaching and student advising, research and scholarship, and institutional and professional service.
- Documents submitted by the faculty candidate as required by the University (in the order stated under 12.01.99.M2 University Statement 4.1).

The College of Dentistry APT Committee will then review the dossier and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the OAA. Separate evaluation of each area (research, teaching, and service) as well as an overall assessment must be provided. The committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate but rather they must provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not on track for tenure and indicate the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate’s accomplishments. The committee must also discuss what the candidate can do to improve performance during the remainder of the tenure period. Regarding scholarly activity, the committee must specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the circumstances of each candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual assignments in teaching, research, and service.

The ADAA and the department head will meet with the candidate to discuss all recommendations and the overall outcome of the mid-tenure review. Department heads with the input of the ADAA will then prepare a report/memo for the candidate, which will receive final review and approval from the Dean of the College, before dissemination to the candidate. Candidates will acknowledge receipt of their evaluation by signing the document. The signed copy is sent to the OAA, and will be retained in the faculty member’s faculty file.

5. Review of Faculty for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Criteria and Performance Measures for Appointment and Promotion
Tenure-track faculty must be evaluated for tenure and promotion based on accomplishments in each of the three major categories of performance (teaching and student advising, research and scholarly activity, and professional and institutional service), but with primary emphasis on teaching and academic advising, and the creation and dissemination of new knowledge and other creative activities, including but not limited to basic, translational, educational, and clinical research. University mandates also require awarding appropriate credit to faculty who actively work toward achieving the University’s goals in three major areas: (1) supporting multidisciplinary collaboration; (2) enhancing diversity and the climate of internationalization and related experiences at the department, college, and/or university levels; and (3) requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

Imperatives for tenure and promotion in the College of Dentistry are: effective classroom
instruction including creative development of teaching materials and methods, the
successful advising of undergraduate, dental, and/or graduate students, the ability to
develop and sustain an independent research program, scholarly contributions primarily
but not exclusively through peer reviewed publications, and evidence of high quality
service/engagement at an institutional and professional level.

Although some quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in
performance is of primary importance; that is, the quality, significance, and impact of
accomplishments are of greatest importance. All tenure track faculty will have variable
amounts of teaching, research, and service as designated in their yearly appointment
letters. Review for promotion must consider these relative proportions so that the weight
of the evaluations of each area matches the proportion of activity in that area. For tenure
and promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for
continued excellence is required.

Exceptions: Section 4.4.1.4 of the University’s Statement on Academic Freedom,
Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 - Section 4.4)
dresses exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion.

“Exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion may
sometimes be warranted. Examples would include (a) gifted and
productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have
not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b)
exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely
acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the
University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and
research are only acceptable. Few faculty will possess qualities such as
these, but those who do deserve recognition and advancement.”

5.2 Outside Professional Experience
It is important that dental faculty be aware of the current state of professional practice
and research. Continuing interaction with the private practice community and the
academic and research community nationally and internationally is essential to a faculty
member’s maintaining professional currency. Mechanisms for accomplishing this
continuing development may include: limited private practice opportunities; CE courses;
faculty development leaves at institutes other universities, within industry, or
government laboratories; consulting activities, and activities in professional societies and
accreditation agencies.

5.3 Time of Service within Rank
There is no firm minimum period of service required for advancement in the College of
Dentistry. Rather, advancement will be based on accomplishments, which merit tenure
and/or promotion. Determining the year of mandatory consideration for tenure track
faculty is calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Tenure Consideration Year

Normally, one academic year is required for preparation and processing of cases for
promotion and/or tenure. Successful recommendations will result in the advancement becoming effective at the beginning of the following academic year (i.e., September 1).

5.4 Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration
The department head and/or the department APT committee should identify candidates for tenure and/or promotion by the end of January of each calendar year. Candidates themselves may also propose going up for promotion following consultation with the department head. The OAA will send a memo to all faculty below the level of Professor to ask them if they would like to be considered for promotion. Tenure track assistant professors will also be informed if they are up for mandatory tenure review. Once candidates are identified, department heads will inform the OAA, who will provide each potential candidate with a copy of the current tenure and promotion procedures and guidelines of the College of Dentistry and of the University (also available from the Dean of Faculties’ website: dof.tamu.edu).

5.5 Required Documentation
Department heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the process. The OAA will provide each candidate with documentation describing how to prepare and submit the required items to the OAA. Yearly deadlines will also be provided. The process and the required documents are described in detail in the yearly edition of the Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines available from the TAMU Dean of Faculties website: dof.tamu.edu.

The department head should make it clear to the candidate that these materials may be updated by documentation in a memo at any stage of the process, prior to final submission to the Office of the Dean of Faculties, and that updates should be signed and dated by the candidate.

5.6 Solicitation of External Reviewers
To better facilitate the solicitation of input from external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases, the process should begin as early as possible. Department heads are required to review all potential external reviewers to ensure they are from recognized peer institutions/programs or better and are clear leaders in the field. In addition, individuals with whom the candidate has had a close working relationship, such as the candidate’s faculty advisor, post-doctoral advisor, or frequent co-author must not be used as reviewers. Letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation. The candidate may also include a do-not-contact list. Contact with individuals requesting their service as a reviewer will be in the form of a personal letter from the OAA. The department head may make telephone or email inquiries to potential reviewers prior to the letter request. This letter, along with selected materials for review, will be sent to external reviewers as early as possible in the review cycle, thus it is imperative that the candidate does not delay in the preparation of these materials.

The College expects a minimum of five letters, with a roughly equivalent number of letters received from reviewers selected by the department head and letters received from reviewers selected by the candidate (2 to 3 or 3 to 2). The OAA should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally half from the candidate’s selections and half
from the department selections. The letters will be collected and made available to the
department APT committee and the department head by the OAA.

The solicitation letter must use the template developed by the Office of the Dean of
Faculties and available on the website (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-
DOF/Forms/DOF-Tenure%20and%20Promotion/External-Reviewer-Solicitation-Letter-

**At no time is the candidate to inquire about the status of the reviewers he or she
nominates or to contact them.**

5.7 **Process**

All external review letters received by the deadline, along with the other items submitted
by the candidate to the OAA, will be made available to the department APT committee for
review. Confidentiality of hard copy and electronic files should be maintained throughout
the process. Signed and dated memos to the ADAA with updates by the candidate (see
Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines) will be distributed immediately
to the committee members, and will be incorporated into the candidate’s original dossier by
the OAA.

The department APT committee should meet to discuss and vote on each candidate. This
committee also prepares teaching, research, and service peer evaluations as required for
the dossier addressed to the department head. The committee should not merely list the
accomplishments of the candidate but rather they should provide an argument as to why
the candidate is or is not acceptable for promotion and/or tenure and indicate the quality,
significance, and impact of the candidate’s accomplishments. Regarding scholarly activity, the
committee must specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness
and significance of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the
circumstances of each candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual
assignments in teaching, research, and service.

The department head prepares a separate recommendation addressed to the Dean evaluating
the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. This document must also:

- Provide a general basis for strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.
- Describe the expertise of the candidate and the quality, significance, and impact of
  their contributions in all areas.
- Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
- Explain special considerations (i.e., early promotion/tenure, special hiring
  circumstances).
- Explain any mixed or negative votes if not explained in the committee’s report.
- Explain the department head’s vote. If contrary to the department committee’s
  recommendation, detailed arguments should be provided explaining this
  difference.

Other considerations itemized in section 7.3 should also be addressed. The OAA will then
pass the completed dossier to the College of Dentistry APT Committee for their
evaluation and recommendation as described in the committee bylaws appended to this
document. The committee should not merely list the accomplishments of the candidate
but rather they should provide an argument as to why the candidate is or is not
acceptable for promotion and/or tenure and indicate the quality, significance, and impact
of the candidate’s accomplishments. Regarding scholarly activity, the committee must
specifically describe the expertise of the candidate and the uniqueness and significance
of their scholarly contribution. The committee must consider the circumstances of each
candidate regarding the nature and proportion of their individual assignments in
teaching, research, and service.

Following review by the college committee, the dossier including the college committee’s
report will be submitted by the OAA to the Dean of the College of Dentistry for his
recommendation prior to submission to the Dean of Faculties office at TAMU as
described in the University documents listed at the beginning of this document.

The department head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every
level, including the department committee’s recommendation, the department head’s
recommendation, the College of Dentistry’s APT Committee’s recommendation, the
dean’s recommendation, the provost recommendation, the president’s recommendation
for tenure and promotion, and ultimately the Board of Regents decision for tenure. The
OAA will notify the department heads of decisions at the college, university, and system
level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

5.8 Academic Professional Track Promotion
Promotions among the academic professional track faculty should be initiated in the
same timeframe and manner as stated for tenure track faculty. An academic professional track
faculty member may engage in one or more academic activities, but in general they are
evaluated in one of the two main areas of teaching or research. All candidates are also
evaluated in service. For non-tenure track faculty primarily engaged in clinical or teaching
activities, research and/or other scholarly activates may be considered as part of their
evaluation in teaching, especially if the scholarly activity is pertinent to maintaining
excellence in their area of instruction or is of value to the overall academic excellence of
the College. The number of external reviewer letters can be reduced to a minimum of
three (3) for academic professional track faculty, but should strongly address the
performance and impact of the candidate’s academic activities.

6. College Appointment, Tenure, & Promotion (APT) Committee
University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 4.6.3 states, “In conducting tenure and/or promotion
reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide tenure and
promotion committee.” At the College of Dentistry, this committee is the APT Committee.
The structure and procedures of the College APT Committee are described in the bylaws of
the Committee, which are attached to this document as an appendix and are available on the
College’s website.

7. Department Appointment, Tenure, & Promotion (APT) Committees

7.1 Selection and Structure
Department APT committees shall consist of five faculty members of the College of Dentistry, who have already achieved at least the rank of the candidate up for promotion. Tenured faculty may serve on committees for faculty on academic professional track lines, but not vice versa. Three academic professional track committee members and two tenured committee members must be included in the department committee for non-tenure track faculty promotions. Faculty on department committees may be from other departments in the COD if faculty, who meet the above requirements, are not available in the candidate’s department. In all cases, committees will be appointed by the department head. The department head shall also appoint the chair of the committee. In some cases, two committees may be appointed by a department head within a single cycle if required to review candidates in both the tenure and academic professional tracks. In the case of budgeted joint appointments, both departments must conduct a full review. In cases where faculty are paid by administrative units within the College but have significant teaching, research, and/or service commitments, promotion is possible but will be conducted through the faculty member’s ad loc’ed academic department.

7.2 Operation of the Department APT Committee
The department APT committee shall perform (1) mid-term reviews for tenure-track faculty members, and (2) all other reviews related to promotion and/or tenure for tenure-track and academic professional-track department faculty. Prospective faculty members who are being hired with tenure on arrival must also be reviewed by this committee. If, as a result of an annual performance review, a tenure-track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior to their mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review must be submitted through the department head to the ADAA with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

For the tenure and promotion processes, the department APT committee is charged with:

- Review and evaluation of the candidate’s dossier.
- Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate’s teaching, research, and service. The authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated, and all authors should sign.
- Preparing a complete overall report and recommendation explaining the committee’s vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and in the case of mid-term tenure review, an overview of the candidate’s progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual tenure and/or promotion. For further details, see sections 4.2 and 5.7 of this document. This document is to be signed by all committee members.

No individuals other than the committee members shall be present during the committee's final deliberations, nor shall they be present during voting. Since the committee is viewed as advisory to both the department head and the dean, its vote should be independent of any action by the department head. Hence, the department head should not be present during committee discussions or voting.

A secret ballot should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to the department head and the OAA. The votes should be counted and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members
should be present although absentee ballots may be used at the discretion of the committee chair. Committee members may not abstain from voting.

7.3 Department APT Committee Report – Further Considerations

- The department APT committee report should address the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member’s contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, technology commercialization, and enhancing diversity and the climate of internationalization and related experiences at the department, university, and/or college levels. The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the department head, college administration, and university administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities, and the committee’s concerns. For further details, see sections 4.2 and 5.7 of this document.

Other considerations for the department committee report are:

- Authorship of the final report is to be made clear and the report is to be signed by all committee members.
- University guidelines recommend that this statement: “The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the APT committee,” appear at the end of each report.
- Authorship protocol must be addressed by the department committee or by the department head, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.
- Quality and impact. Department committees and department heads should be mindful of the multiple audiences who review the APT files and need to address “quality and impact” factors within their specific disciplines. Assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field. Some example areas: the importance of an award or citation; service and/or election to a professional organization; why published conference papers may be more significant than journal publications.
- Acronyms should be defined at first use, i.e., International Association for Dental Research (IADR). Again, assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field.
- Identification of Courses. If reference is made to a course, use the complete title of the course and its number in the initial reference.

8. Post-tenure Review

The College of Dentistry conducts post-tenure review of tenured faculty members in accordance with University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01.

8.1 Frequency and Incorporation with the Annual Review Process: The periodic peer evaluation portion of post-tenure review of performance occurs no less frequently than once every six years. As described in the TAMU document, annual reviews leading to ratings of unsatisfactory require written short-term plans to improve performance, which must be submitted to the Dean through the OAA. In addition, a professional development review must be initiated following three consecutive overall unsatisfactory annual
evaluations or three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews in either teaching, research, or service by the department head. In such cases, the department head will provide a list of reasons why the annual evaluations resulted in "unsatisfactory" determinations. Full time administrative appointees who step down from their positions (e.g. Deans, Associate Deans, Department Heads, etc.) and return to their respective home departments will be subject to periodic peer evaluation following a period of six years to allow time for re-adjustment to full academic duties and responsibilities, unless there are unsatisfactory annual evaluations after which a written short-term plan (one unsatisfactory annual review) or a professional development review (three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews) should be initiated. Yearly timelines for post-tenure review will follow the overall collage APT calendar; specific dates will be provided each year by the OAA.

8.2 **Materials for submission:** Faculty members being reviewed will provide the OAA with past six years of annual self-evaluations, an up-to-date CV, and a summary statement on the accomplishments and goals related to teaching and advisement, research and scholarship, and institutional and professional service. This statement should not exceed three single-spaced pages. All faculty members must submit appropriate documentation of effectiveness and excellence in teaching consistent with the portion of their effort dedicated to teaching. Evidence of quality of research should also be provided. This information may be contained in the annual self-evaluations but the faculty member may provide additional information at their discretion.

8.3 **Procedures:** The OAA will administer the post-tenure review process, which will consist of a college APT committee review. Review committees must contain members at or higher than the rank of each individual under review. Overall rules for the college committee are the same as listed in Section 7. The APT committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s activities for the Department Head, providing an evaluation in the categories of teaching, research, service, and an overall evaluation. The standards for the reviews follow the criteria described in Sections 5 and 7 of this document.

8.4 If evaluations in all areas are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to periodic peer review again in six years or following three unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head. If deficiencies are identified with a resulting unsatisfactory review in any area, the, the College committee will elaborate the deficiencies in writing and submit the report to the faculty member, the department head, the dean and the Dean of Faculties. The dean will then appoint a Professional Review Committee as described in University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01. A Professional Review as described in Part 3.1. will be conducted. The review will result in one of three outcomes: “no deficiencies identified”; “some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic;” or “substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified.” If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the Professional Review Committee will elaborate the deficiencies in writing, and a copy will be provided to the faculty member, the department head, the dean, and the Dean of Faculties. The faculty member, the Professional Review Committee, and the department head shall then work together to draw up a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean. The outcome of the
plan will be monitored and assessed as described in University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01. During the course of the plan, a progress report must be submitted by the faculty member to the department head for discussion every six months. Progress reports due in the early part of the calendar year when annual reports are due may be integrated into the annual report. The progress reports will be forwarded from the department head to the Professional Review Committee and the dean. At the College of Dentistry, the length of Professional Development Plans will normally be two years but can extend to three years in select cases if recommended by the Professional Review Committee and/or the department head. Final evaluation will be conducted as described in University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.0.
A. Teaching

Teaching comprises a large part of the central mission of the College of Dentistry. It is related to and supported by scholarly activity and service. The criteria for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluation are teaching qualities, educational innovation, impact upon students, and degree of teaching responsibility. Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered in the assessment of teaching. Appropriate input from students, graduates, peers, department/division heads and other sources help maximize the validity of the value judgment.

1. Teaching qualities

The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including the spectrum of current literature in one’s discipline. Essential components of teaching are: the use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; clarity of written, oral, and visual presentations; rapport with students of all abilities; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving; modeling professionalism; mentoring students; using appropriate methods of evaluation; and providing adequate feedback to students. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

2. Educational innovation

Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Innovations in teaching must accomplish more than mere change. Rather, new methods should demonstrate measurable advantage over those previously used. Examples of innovations in teaching are taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, courses, programs, or curricula; developing unique methods to evaluate student learning, skills, and professionalism; and developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curricula.

3. Impact upon students

A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. The ultimate outcome of effective teaching is students achieving competency that leads to proficiency and finally mastery of their chosen profession.

4. Degree of teaching responsibility

The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which the faculty member’s responsibilities contribute to the teaching programs of the College must
be a consideration. More weight should be given to directing a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than merely presenting lectures in a course or serving as a laboratory or clinical instructor. It is expected that faculty members will assume more responsibility for teaching as they gain academic experience.

5. Scholarship and teaching

Academic professional track faculty are encouraged to participate in scholarly activities that improve their teaching skills and contribute to the knowledge base in their content area. These activities may include involvement in research related to the content or method of instruction, and the publication or dissemination by other means of new and innovative teaching materials and content.

B. Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity comprises the other essential part of the central mission of the College of Dentistry and has two forms: (1) the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge, and (2) the generation of new knowledge through original research and publication of the findings. All faculty in the tenure track must engage in scholarly activity, and faculty in academic professional track should participate in scholarly activity to enhance their teaching. To be granted tenure a faculty person must engage in the generation of knowledge through original research and publication of the findings. The other forms of scholarly activity are of significant importance and lend substantial support to a candidate’s application for tenure. It should be understood that a record of manuscript publication and dissemination of knowledge in refereed journals or books or other formats is necessary. Prehiring publications will be considered, however, the major emphasis will be on publications since hiring or last promotion. As per TAMU guidelines, patents will be given equal weight to publications. In all instances, the quality of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure.

1. Compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge

All scholarly activity supports teaching and professional service. The compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is one aspect of this activity that contributes to and advances scholarship. Such scholarly work may take many forms. Activities that support teaching and/or service may include: the publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, case reports, technical and clinical procedures, and instructional materials, videos, teaching manuals and syllabi; the development of new continuing education courses; the editorship of professional journals; integration and synthesis of translational and clinical approaches to particular dental problems; compilation and comparison of teaching materials or curricula; marketing of new methods and techniques in education, instrumentation, and technology; and collaborative projects with other units within the University, and other institutions. Academic professional track faculty are encouraged to participate in scholarly activity that improves their teaching skills and contributes to the knowledge base in their contact area.
2. Research and publication

Research is the generation of new knowledge through use of the scientific method. Such research may be basic, behavioral, translational, and/or clinical. It is most frequently expressed as manuscript publication in refereed scientific journals or books, and the acquisition of extramural funding for research support. Patents will be counted as publications during review.

A reasonable and consistent level of research productivity is required; however, it is the quality of the investigative activity that is of primary importance in evaluation. The quality of research can be most readily measured through two peer review mechanisms: publications in refereed journals and books and the acquisition of grant funds from sources that evaluate proposals using a quality peer review system. It is recognized that quality research can be conducted without the support of peer reviewed grant awards, and that publications/grants may be co-authored.

Additional demonstrations of the research record, which also show the faculty member’s recognition in their discipline, may include: invitations to present one’s research at other universities or major scientific meetings; appointment as a section or symposium chairperson; receipt of awards or other special recognition for outstanding research; appointment to grant review committees such as NIH study sections; participation in faculty leaves.

C. Service

Service is related to those activities that pertain to one’s role as a professional and as a College of Dentistry/University faculty member. Faculty effort in this area of evaluation may include programs and services, professional activities, and patient care.

1. Institutional programs and services

All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving programs and services.

Examples of activities that relate to institutional programs and services are: membership on committees or other assignments within the University and College; leadership roles in curriculum reform, development, and implementation; contribution to faculty governance; participation in institutional, departmental/division, or program strategic planning; participation in student recruitment activities; development of or participation in diversity programs; participation in faculty recruitment; conducting faculty development programs; providing in-service seminars, continuing education, and training; participation in quality control; participation in assessment programs; and setting up educational displays in and outside of the College.

2. Professional activities
Faculty should contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. The state, the profession, and the general public depend on the TAMCOD for help in maintaining state-of-the-art health care delivery in this area of. Continuing education is both an instructional and public service activity that the College is uniquely positioned to provide. Finally, the faculty are encouraged to serve the community at large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature of the College of Dentistry.

Examples of professional activities are: membership in and contribution to professional organizations (includes offices held); organization of symposia; consultant to professional journals as a manuscript reviewer, etc.; consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards; membership on boards and committees in the community-at-large in a professional capacity; presentation of continuing education programs; and invited presentations at academic and professional groups.

3. Patient care

Faculty members (DDS/DMD) are expected to provide exemplary patient care that is respected by patients and peers both within the College of Dentistry and in the professional community.

Examples of activities relating to patient care include: certification by specialty board; awards or certification that recognizes clinical expertise; referral of patients from within and outside the College of Dentistry; expression of confidence and respect from patients and clinical staff; consultation as requested by other faculty members; application of current methods in patient care; membership on specialty examining boards; service as a consultant on patient care (third party groups, courts, health organizations); development and participation in health care service to community programs.

General Guidelines

Examples of types of activities which are consistent with the general guidelines follow for the three academic activities essential to the mission of the TAMCOD. Fulfillment of all items in an academic category is not a requirement for appointment, promotion, or tenure. It is also important to understand that interpretation of these guidelines must pay due regard to the difficulties inherent in quantifying academic performance. Evidence must also be presented to indicate a commitment to maintain the level of competence in teaching and/or research.

A. Teaching (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Is effective as a teacher and mentor as evidenced by mastery of both content and method and documented by student and faculty evaluation.
2. Is responsible for design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course, or a series of lectures, and/or for curricular improvements.

3. Is recognized as an exemplary scientist or clinician whose teaching activities can be documented as providing a positive role model for students.

4. Is effective as a supervising professor for post-doctoral/advanced education students.

5. Demonstrates innovation in teaching methods and production of texts, educational “software”, etc. and the production of new knowledge through research in the teaching content area.

6. Participates in student guidance and counseling.

7. Responsible for the development of continuing education or other professional programs, or is an invited speaker.

Scholarly Activity (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Demonstrates initiative, independence, and sustained scholarly activity in research.

2. Publishes research findings and scholarly papers in refereed professional journals or books. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.) Obtains patents.

3. Presents research and scholarly findings at professional meetings.

4. Obtains funding for research or other scholarly activities.

5. Serves on thesis or dissertation committees or other research review boards.

Service (Assistant to Associate Professor)

1. Provides administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or teaching for which peer recognition can be documented.

2. Chairs or serves on committees within the department, College, University, and/or affiliated institutions.
3. Provides consultation to other departments or schools within the University and to local, state, regional, or national organizations of institutions that seek to benefit from the candidate’s experience.

4. Conducts ad hoc review of manuscripts and grants; serves on extramural grant review committees or editorial boards of scientific or professional journals.

5. Performs a key administrative role in patient care, research, or teaching activities within a department or division.

6. Provides service as a health educator for the community.

7. Maintains active membership and participates in key organizations of the individual’s discipline.

B. Teaching (Associate to Professor)

1. Sustained and outstanding performance of the examples cited for the Associate Professor level.

2. Leadership through design, organization, coordination, and evaluation of a course or courses (undergraduate, graduate, or continuing education); administrative responsibility at the school or department/division level for curriculum; supervision of staff teaching within a course, department/division, or school.

3. Invitations as visiting professor at other institutions.

4. Responsibility for student mentoring, guidance, and counseling as well as consultation to student organizations and groups within and outside the TAMCOD.

5. Sustained recognition as an exemplary scientist, teacher, mentor, or clinician whose activities can be documented as providing an positive role model for students.

6. Publication of educational works and new content area knowledge in relevant journals or books.

Scholarly Activity (Associate to Professor)

1. Is senior or responsible author of papers published in refereed professional journals or other media. (It is recognized that publications/grants may be co-authored.)

2. Published research forms an important body of work that is nationally or internationally recognized.
3. Receives funding as a principal investigator for research and/or serves an essential role as a coinvestigator in collaborative research.

4. Invitations to participate at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

5. Invitations to preside over sessions at national or international professional or scientific meetings.

6. Recognition for excellence in research by professional or scientific institutions or organizations.

7. Serves as chair of thesis or dissertation committees.

Service (Associate to Professor)

1. Appointment to responsible positions within the institution or its affiliates. (chairs a committee, department, or division; membership on major decision-making College/University committees)

2. Recognition as an authority by other schools and departments within the University and by local, state, regional, or national organizations or institutions.

3. Senior administrative responsibility for a service or specific area of patient care or clinical teaching.

4. Consultant to, or serves on, government review committees, study sections, or other national review panels.

5. Serves as an officer or committee chair in professional or scientific organizations.

6. Serves on editorial boards of professional scientific journals.

7. Election to responsible positions on civic boards or organizations concerned with health care issues at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels.