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

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

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

--Dean of Faculties
1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) is to enhance equity in educational achievement and health outcomes with a focus on human development and well-being in educational and community contexts. The EPSY Shared Vision: To transform lives through leadership and innovation in education and human development. 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 Educational Psychology (EPSY) for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and EPSY; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general EPSY 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="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</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="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Faculty Categories of Performance in the College of Education and Human Development include the following:

**Tenure Track Faculty TT/T (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Full Professor)**
Tenure track and tenured faculty members make a unique contribution to the education, research, engagement, and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Tenure track and tenured faculty are full-time faculty engaged in teaching, research, clinical training, supervision, service activities, curricular development, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, TT/T faculty participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation supervision, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

The responsibilities in all three areas of faculty duty include:
- Teaching
- Research
- Service

The typical load for TT/T faculty in the CEHD is 40% Teaching; 40-50% research; 10-20% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the three categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program).

We also have a one course release for assistant professors on tenure track for the first 3 years to enable them to build their research program.

**Academic Professional Track**
Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. APT faculty are generally full-time faculty who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in clinical training, supervision, service activities, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, APT faculty can participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

**Clinical Faculty (Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Full Professors)**
The responsibilities in all three areas of clinical faculty duty include:
- Teaching
- Research
- Service

The typical load for clinical faculty in CEHD is 80% Teaching; 10% research; 10% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the three categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program).

**Instructional Faculty (Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Full Professor)**
The responsibilities in the two areas of instructional faculty duty include:
- Teaching
• Service
The typical load for instructional faculty in CEHD is 90% Teaching; 10% Service. Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment in any of the two categories. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable (e.g., a one course release for leading a program).

Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of Practice
The responsibilities are in one area:
• Teaching
The typical load for lecturers and professors of practice in CEHD is 100% Teaching; Faculty cannot go to 0% appointment. Department heads can negotiate workload adjustments if revenue neutral and deemed reasonable, and depending on the terms of appointment.

3. 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 (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; administration). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

Faculty Performance in the College of Education and Development is based on faculty categories including tenured and tenure track, and academic professional track as indicated below:

General Criteria for Performance Review
In the College of Education and Human Development, faculty annual performance reviews are the key mechanism for collecting data on the accomplishments and productivity of college faculty. Faculty annual performance reviews serve several additional and vital purposes, including faculty development, merit salary increases, periodic review, and optimal alignment of faculty resources with multiple departmental missions. For all of these reasons, faculty annual reviews are conducted with the utmost care and diligence based on faculty roles and responsibilities.

According to Texas A&M University Guidelines to faculty titles, (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/faculty_titles/guidelines_faculty_titles.pdf) the following faculty titles and the expected responsibilities and areas of performance are provided.

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty
Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

Instructor is a tenure-track appointment which is used for a person recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title will be changed to Assistant Professor. Instructors are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service.

Academic Professional Track (Clinical, Instructional, Research Scientist)
Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, as well as evidence of scholarly work and service, as appropriate to their respective title. Faculty with Research in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well. Adjunct and Visiting are normally used for appointments to faculty members whose long term primary employment commitment is not to TAMU. Visiting appointments should normally be used in cases where the faculty appointment is expected to cease after no more than three years (although the appointments are one-year or semester appointments, reappointment is possible), whereas Adjunct appointments will indicate an expectation that a longer term as a faculty member is expected.

Departments may use any of these non-tenure accruing appointments for faculty members who consistently and significantly contribute in all three areas, scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, if the unit and faculty member benefit from such a non-tenure-track appointment.

**Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Assistant Professor of the Practice**
These are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are normally for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia.

**Senior Lecturer and Lecturer**
These are non-tenure track appointments for faculty members who teach but who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in either scholarly research and creative work, or the area of service.

**Assistant Lecturer**
This is a non-tenure track appointment used for less than five years for either candidates for a TAMU doctoral degree, or people who are not expected to fill a permanent faculty position at TAMU. These appointments are focused on teaching, and they do not normally confer eligibility for faculty voting rights in shared governance processes on campus.

3.1 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 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.

3.2. 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 for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

**Evaluation of teaching in the College of Education and Human Development is based on qualitative and quantative indicators.**
Record of Courses taught during the year or over the period of evaluation
- Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching
- Strong and impactful teaching performance as evidenced by student satisfaction
• Effective and impactful teaching with technology or face-to-face

Course Syllabi
• High impact teaching and learning activities as stated in the course syllabi
• Student learning outcomes
• Teaching activities that engage students in active learning

Teaching Observations
• Peer evaluation feedback provided by colleagues in the department, college or CTE
• Evidence of very high quality of student engagement in learning activities
• Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses

Grading methods
• Nature of assignments
• Class projects, team projects
• Examinations

Professional Development Activities
• Evidence of participation in professional development activities
• Engagement in continuing education and lifelong learning
• Continuous course and teaching improvements

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
• Management of training grants to fund students and involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities,
• Competitive funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities

Teaching Awards Earned
• Evidence of teaching excellence by receiving internal/external teaching awards

Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students
• Impactful doctoral mentoring as evidenced by chairing/co-chairing doctoral committees,
• Student awards
• Faculty or leadership position of former doctoral students,

Professional Development Activities for Students
• Engagement in important non-credit instruction such as serving as a faculty advisor to a student professional organization]

3.3 Research, scholarly activity or creative work: Are defined as the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities (includes research, creative activities, and all other forms of scholarship -- creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and is communicated).

Research or Scholarship in CEHD can be demonstrated through a combination of ways:

Quality and Quantity of Publications and Creative Works
• Peer-reviewed research and scholarly writings
• Refereed articles in top tier journals in the field
• Books and bookchapters published by reputable publishers
• Apply and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU which is based on peer-reviewed research publications
• Authorship protocols within the discipline and authorship responsibility on joint publications

**Grants and Contracts**

• Funded grant and contract activities
• Submission of grant/contract proposals
• Type of funding agencies such as IES, NSF, NIH, state and private foundations
• Presentations at professional conferences, workshops
• Invited presentations or keynote
• Reviewer for professional publications and conferences

**Upward trajectory for research progress**

• *Research quality and contribution improves over time*
• *Scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding in the field*
• *Faculty reputation in the field over a period of time*

**Awards and Honors**

• Research excellence as evidenced by research awards
• Development of creative products such as patent or intellectual properties
• Performing and creative activities

**Recognition in the field based on expertise and impact on the field**

• Serve as a member of review panels as a judge
• Service as editor or associate editor of a top tier journal in the field
• Citation of published work by peers in the field

**Collaborative and multidisciplinary research**

• Participation on multidisciplinary research projects
• Joint publications with colleagues and graduate students

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

• Scholarship of teaching and learning which advances understanding in a primary discipline of study
• Scholarship of teaching and learning that act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience

3.4 **Service:**

**Formal Service Roles:**

• Membership in standing committees
• Leadership of standing committees
• Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force
• Liaison activities with donors or industry partners

**Informal Service Roles:**

• Mentoring or peer-review of colleagues
• Providing expertise for a department need
Examples of service activities in CEHD might include:

- Serving as a member of a diversity, equity and inclusion committee
- Active service on department, college and university committees and task forces
- Significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Serving as an advisor to student organizations
- Serving in an administrative role within the department or college
- Serving as a member of a curricular review committee or accreditation review panel
- Chair or membership on department, college, and university committees
- Leadership in professional organizations
- Member on editorial boards of journals in your discipline
- Planning and delivering workshops and other learning opportunities
- Involvement in creative works and performances
- Program/curriculum reviewer
- Membership on journal review boards
- Leading program-relevant programming for outreach to the community
- Securing and management of multi-year service grant
- Serving on federal grant review panels
- Recipient of service award
- Providing workshops and consultation.

3.5 Administration:

Tenure Track, Tenured, and APT Faculty in Administrative Roles in the College of Education and Human Development

In a few cases where assistant professors on tenure track are appointed to administrative roles such as program chairs, division chairs or program leaders or tenured associate professors being appointed as associate department heads, their contracts will be adjusted accordingly to reflect the service and administrative role. The annual evaluation will include their administrative roles and performance expectations toward promotion to the next rank in their appointment contracts. The same applies to academic professional track faculty such as clinical associate professors or instructional associate professors being appointed in administrative roles. Scholarship relevant to enhancing administrative role should be counted in the portfolio for promotion.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

Following CEHD guidelines, EPSY 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. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation of teaching,
- Student satisfaction, and student outcomes
Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials, developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
Significant advancement of teaching pedagogy in the related field
Chair/Co-chair of doctoral research committees
Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
Publications with teaching focus in leading refereed journals
Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic scholarly or professional positions
Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
Significant contributions to teaching through non-credit instruction.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
Peer evaluation of teaching
Student satisfaction and student outcomes
Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation
Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching as evidenced by self-evaluation
Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research, member of graduate student advisory committees
Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
Publications in leading refereed journals
Receiving major fellowship or research award
• Frequent citation of publications
• Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
• Awards for, or publication of peer reviewed creative activities
• Juried works in creative activities
• Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization and federal grants
• Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
• Keynote presentation at international/national meetings
• Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research,
• Mentoring of postdoctoral and other research staff (including assistant, associate, and research scientists)
• Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research)
• Evidence of creative professional practice).

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

• Publication of scholarly book(s) with reputable publishers
• Publication in refereed journals
• Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
• Editing a scholarly book
• Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
• Publication in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
• Continued public activity in performing or diverse arts
• Significant self-development activities such as a Faculty Development Leave that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness
• Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
• Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals.

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

• Serving as editor or associate editor of editorial board of a major journal
• Being a leader such as president or chair in a national or international professional organization
• Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
• Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
• Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
• Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
• Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
• Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
• Significant advocacy for policy and practice at the state or national level.

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:

• Service as a reviewer or member of editorial board for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
• Being a board member or committee chair in national or international professional organization
• Serving as an executive officer in regional or state professional organization
• Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
• Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
• Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces
• Serving as consultant, being an advisor to student organizations
• Serving in administrative roles within the department
• Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
• Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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 EPSY follows CEHD guidelines as follows:

5.1.1. 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.

Annual Review. Each non-tenured tenure-track faculty member who is not undergoing a Tenure and Promotion or Midterm Review will receive written feedback regarding progress toward tenure and promotion from both the Department Head and Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. This evaluation occurs in spring for tenure-track faculty who are not yet tenured until the candidate has received a Midterm Review. Following the Midterm Review, Annual Reviews of progress toward tenure occur in September.

Each Candidate annually will submit a Candidate’s Statement of Teaching, Research, and Service (see below for information to be included in this statement) and CV, along with a table of courses taught, teaching evaluations, and student committees on which the Candidate serves as co-chair or committee member, and other documentation as required or requested. The written evaluation of progress toward Tenure and Promotion provided by the Committee must provide specific feedback regarding progress in research, teaching, and service. This feedback will include the Candidate’s strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement, as well as the votes on (a) whether the Candidate’s yearly appointment should be renewed, and (b) whether the Candidate is making acceptable progress toward tenure.

5.1.2. Associate Professor: [Evaluation criteria might include the following:
• An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field in the core areas of teaching, research and service
• Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University
• An area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on
the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority

- Evidence indicating a **commitment to maintaining** the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).
- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment in research for an associate professor is measured against the contributions of others in the field and the potential for impact over time; at least a rating of “effective” in the other two areas of teaching and service

**Excellence in Research**

- An area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority
- Originality of contributions to the field; innovative or outstanding publications
- Quality, significance, and impact of publications
- Quantity of publications
- Trajectory – Is this faculty member likely to become one of the leading figures in the discipline?
- Overall assessment of standing in relation to others in their peer group who are working in the same field
- See criteria above for examples of effective teaching and service sections 4.2 and 4.6
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).

- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University

**Note:** There are occasions when tenure and promotion to associate professor are separate for individuals when they are hired in CEHD. In those cases, a record exists equivalent to other associate professors in terms of quantity of publications, but may not equal our criteria in terms of quality, originality, or impact. It is never the case that promotion to associate professor is separated from tenure for those hired as assistant professors.

The individuals assigned to prepare the draft reports on research, teaching, and service will complete this task in August once the Candidate’s dossier has been finalized and is available for review. The draft reports will indicate who prepared each one and will be available for review and comment by Committee by the end of August. The Committee will meet in September to determine its recommendation on Tenure and Promotion and complete the reports of teaching, research, and service (and other areas, as needed).

Prior to the meeting, the Committee members will review material in the Candidate’s Portfolio, which will consist of all information to be included in the packet that goes forward to the college and university that is available at the time of the meeting and is stipulated in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. It also will include the draft reports on research, teaching, and service for discussion and revision. The evidence found there will be evaluated in light of the Departmental Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Tenure track faculty must go up for Tenure and Promotion two years prior to the end of their Probationary Period, which typically occurs during their fifth year of appointment. Candidates who have demonstrated exceptional merit may be considered early.

**5.1.3. Professor:** **[Evaluation criteria might include the following]**:

- An **exemplary** level of accomplishment in research for full professor is measured against the contributions of others in the field and the realized impact of the individual’s research on the field; at least a rating of “effective” in the other two areas of teaching and service

  **Excellence in Research**

- Originality of contributions to the field; innovative or outstanding publications
- Quality, significance, and impact of publications
- Quantity of publications
- Continuing accomplishment and some measure of national or international recognition or impact in research or another form of creative activity
• Evidence of academic leadership through provision of valuable professional service
• Scholarly or artistic work which is perceived as outstanding in the field
• A strong reputation in the candidate’s field of study
• See criteria above for examples of effective teaching and service sections 4.2 and 4.6
• Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).
• Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University

A similar process is followed for Promotion to Professor. At its September meeting, the Committee will review any Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor. Associate Professors may put themselves forward for consideration for promotion to Professor at any point consistent with College and University timelines and can elect to submit their materials to the Committee for an informal assessment prior to initiating the official process. Promotion to Professor requires continued productivity and accomplishments that exceed those expected of Associate Professors. Candidates will be expected to provide evidence of national or international recognition as leaders in their fields. Draft reports will be completed in the areas of research, teaching and service as with Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

5.2 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 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. Department guidelines define what each of these criteria mean relative to each discipline.

Clinical faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Clinical faculty are generally full-time faculty who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in clinical training, supervision, service activities, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, clinical faculty can participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. There is a 10% FTE expectation in research for clinical faculty.

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Clinical Assistant Professor
• Doctoral degree or terminal degree
• Minimum of 3 years of relevant professional experience (e.g., teaching experience, clinical practice, supervision)
• Evidence of effective post-secondary teaching experience
• Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of clinical expertise in the professional program area
• Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership activities.

Suggested Criteria for Promotion
The college and the departments will make available to each clinical faculty a copy of the college and departmental review and promotion guidelines. The guidelines will identify examples of meritorious performance under each of the areas of responsibilities.
Clinical faculty can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements. All faculty workload must include teaching and service and may include scholarship and other creative or performing activities, depending on the assignment. Professional development is an ongoing activity that cuts across teaching, service, and scholarship/creative/ performance activities. It is the expectation that clinical faculty will engage in professional development activities.

The categories below are the recommended requirements for promotion to the respective clinical faculty rank in CEHD. EPSY provides indicators for meritorious performance in each of these categories for the specific rank. Appendix I to University Rule 12.01.9.M: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion provides examples of indicators that may be applied in the evaluation of faculty.

Faculty must meet performance expectations in teaching and service. Performance expectations in scholarship/creative and performing activities apply to the extent to which participation and productivity in scholarly activities are in the individual faculty member’s job description as stated in the initial letter of appointment and subsequent annual renewal letters.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

- Candidates applying for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and at least effective in service and research expectations.
  - Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
    - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
    - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.).
    - Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses as needed for the program
    - Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes including the option of applying for or managing funding related to teaching or curricular improvement activities. This growth in trajectory is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer observations reveal areas of challenge
  - Demonstrated effective service evidenced by a combination of some of the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
    - Active service on department, college, or university committees and task forces
    - Significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision
    - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
    - Evidence of involvement in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)
  - Demonstrated effective scholarship of research as evidenced by both:
Dissemination and application of research to the field, practice and policy across more than one of the following categories (see section 4.4 for additional examples):

- Peer-reviewed research findings (may be published in practitioner, discipline or teaching-focused journals)
- Other scholarly writings, such as books and book chapters published by a reputable publisher or discipline-specific newsletters
- Professional presentations, such as conference presentations or delivery of research-based workshops
- Creative products

Measures of impact of scholarship, suggested examples include (Associate Professors should provide at least one):

- External grant funding related to scholarship of teaching
- Impact factors of journals or assessment of journals as high quality by external reviewers
- Number of subscribers/views of practitioner-based publication containing scholarly writing
- Application of writings/curriculum/training by those in the field as demonstrated
  - Number of individuals currently using materials
  - Number of trainings of practitioners based on scholarship/writing completed and evaluation of those trainings as effective
  - Implementation of curriculum in districts with evaluation of curriculum effectiveness
- Application of writings/curriculum/training into policy at district, state, or national level
- Downloads of creative products (ex. Open educational resources)

In addition, Clinical Assistant faculty members are expected to apply for and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU at the time of promotion to Clinical Associate (*which is based on one peer-reviewed research publication every 5 years).

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Full Professor

- Candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching and be rated at least effective in service and research.
  - Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
    - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
    - Key leadership of course, program, and curriculum development efforts at department level
    - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, professional development workshops for graduate students, etc)
- Receiving a department, college, university, professional or a national outstanding teacher award
- Leadership in offering high impact practice courses such as study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, etc.
- Actively applying for or receiving internal or external grant support related to teaching or applied disciplinary work (e.g., management of training contracts to fund students, involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities, receiving competitive internal or external funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities)

Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:

- Evidence of service/engagement/leadership within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., leadership/membership on department, college, and university committees)
- Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
- Evidence of leadership in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)
- Engagement in significant professional development activities that lead to provision of enhanced service

Demonstrated effective scholarship of research as evidenced by both:

- Dissemination and application of research to the field, practice and policy across more than one of the following categories (see section 4.4 for additional examples):
  - Peer-reviewed research findings (may be published in practitioner, discipline or teaching-focused journals)
  - Other scholarly writings, such as books and book chapters published by a reputable publisher or discipline-specific newsletters
  - Professional presentations, such as conference presentations or delivery of research-based workshops
  - Creative products
- Measures of impact of scholarship, suggested examples include (Full Professors should provide at least one):
  - External grant funding related to scholarship of teaching
  - Impact factors of journals or assessment of journals as high quality by external reviewers
  - Number of subscribers/views of practitioner-based publication containing scholarly writing
  - Application of writings/curriculum/training by those in the field as demonstrated
    - Number of individuals currently using materials
    - Number of trainings of practitioners based on scholarship/writing completed and evaluation of those trainings as effective
    - Implementation of curriculum in districts with evaluation of curriculum effectiveness
• Application of writings/curriculum/training into policy at district, state, or national level
• Downloads of creative products (ex. Open educational resources)

In addition, Clinical Associate faculty members are expected to apply for and maintain Graduate Faculty Status at TAMU at the time of promotion to Clinical Full (*which is based on one peer-reviewed research publication every 5 years).

Instructional Faculty
Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Instructional Assistant Professor
• Appointment to this rank generally requires a terminal degree; however, in the College of Education and Human development, the minimum requirement is a master’s degree. Under extraordinary circumstances, other degrees, certifications, and other qualifications may be considered that demonstrate evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field that the individual will be teaching (For example, exceptional athletic experience with national prominence, renowned performing artist, nationally-renowned educator/teacher, etc.)
• Relevant professional experience
• Evidence of superior teaching experience
• Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of expertise in the professional program area
• Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership or scholarly activities

Suggested Criteria for Promotion
Instructional professors can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. The following are the recommended requirements for promotion to the respective instructional professor faculty rank:

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

To be promoted to instructional associate professor, the candidate must meet the requirements for instructional assistant professor, demonstrate excellence in teaching and at least receive a rating of effective in service.
• Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
  • Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
  • Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.)
  • Design and successful delivery of new courses or major revisions of existing courses as needed for the program
  • Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes including the option of applying for or managing funding related to teaching or curricular improvement activities. This growth in trajectory is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer
observations reveal areas of challenge

- Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
  - Active service on department, college, or university committees and task forces
  - Significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service provision
  - Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
  - Evidence of involvement in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)

(Successful teaching can be demonstrated by some of the following indicators: student satisfaction with teaching, evidence of positive student outcomes, peer review of teaching, innovative program development and supervision, impactful program leadership, using technology effectively to enhance teaching, internal/external grant funding to support teaching; invitation to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence, selection for a department, college, or university outstanding teacher award; placement of students in academic or professional positions, etc.)

Promotion to Instructional Professor

Must meet the requirements for instructional associate professor and demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching and receive a rating of at least effective in service

- Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
  - Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
  - Key leadership of course, program, and curriculum development efforts at department level
  - Demonstrate impact on student learning, examples might include impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes; or High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, professional development workshops for graduate students, etc)
  - Receiving a department, college, university, professional or a national outstanding teacher award
  - Leadership in offering high impact practice courses such as study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research, etc.).
  - Actively applying for or receiving internal or external grant support related to teaching or applied disciplinary work (e.g., management of training contracts to fund students, involvement in grants and contracts in support of teaching or scholarly activities, receiving competitive internal or external funding for teaching and curricular improvement activities)

- Demonstrated effective service as evidenced by the following activities; additional examples found in section 4.6:
• Evidence of service/engagement/leadership within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., leadership/membership on department, college, and university committees)
• Evidence of impactful community service (e.g., student organizations, community schools, community organizations)
• Evidence of leadership in commitment to continuous improvement (e.g., peer review and support of quality teaching, providing teaching workshops, leading continuous program improvement, serving as a reviewer for other programs)
• Engagement in significant professional development activities that lead to provision of enhanced service

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
• Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers do not follow the typical process outlined below. In consultation with the department head, lecturers may be reclassified to senior lecturers after 5 years in rank and consistent performance. Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:
  • Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching, see section 4.1 for examples of appropriate ways to demonstrate
  • Impactful teaching with technology if teaching online or integration of technology appropriate to support student learning outcomes
  • High impact teaching and learning activities such as leadership in study-abroad programs, service learning, offering honors courses, engaging undergraduate students in research etc.).
  • Trajectory – engagement in continuous professional development in areas related to teaching and learning outcomes; this is particularly important if initial teaching evaluations or peer observations reveal areas of challenge

5.3 Process

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the multiple missions of Texas A&M University, in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member. This is a critical role of tenured faculty in EPSY, CEHD and the University.

The department's faculty evaluation policies are designed to promote and recognize excellence in faculty research, teaching, and service activities. As such, faculty members are responsible for documenting the impact of their scholarship in research, teaching, and service. The following reviews are important components of the department's Tenure and Promotion process: Annual Review, Midterm (Third-Year) Review, Tenure and Promotion Review, and Review for Promotion to Professor. These policies and procedures pertain only to tenure-track faculty and conform to College and University rules and policies, which can be found at: https://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure and http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf

Criteria judging level of performance in each category

Although the current faculty activity in the department provides some guidance regarding the evaluation of faculty performance, professional judgment is the ultimate basis for making decisions pertaining to tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, or allocation of merit salary or professional development funds. Professional judgment rests on the principles of integrity of the process, careful analysis of the supporting data, and logically derived conclusions. The department adheres to the University Criteria set forth in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for 2019-2020, 4.4.1.1, 4.4.1.2, 4.4.1.3 with regard to expectations for rank as set forth in 4.4.3.1 (tenure accruing), 4.4.3.2 (Assistant
Relative Importance and Normal Level of Productivity

Teaching, scholarship, and service are considered the essential job functions. Appointment letters should specify responsibilities for teaching, advising, independent and/or collaborative research, patient care, committee assignments, external accrediting agency requirements, or essential functions for positions combining academic and administrative assignments. This appointment letter specifies tenure, tenure-accruing, or non-tenure accruing status.

**Procedures for providing faculty with a written statement of tenure conditions when employment is initiated.** In accordance with 3.31 of TAMU policy 12.01 faculty are provided with an appointment letter containing initial terms and conditions of employment. Any changes occur annually in writing with a copy to the faculty member.

Procedures for giving notices to faculty regarding tenure or non-reappointment decisions. In accordance with 12.01.4.2 notice of non-reappointment is provided in writing not later than March 1 of the first academic year of probationary service if the appointment expires that year. Three months in advance of termination is needed for positions terminating during an academic year. No later than December 15 of the second year of probationary service. If a two year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of termination.

**Termination of probationary appointment after two or more years with the system academic institution requires at least twelve months prior to expiration of appointment.** Policy 12.01.7 articulates the procedures for non-renewal and include the assertion that no reason for a decision to not reappoint is needed. Appeals may occur based on a) violation of academic freedom, retaliation, discrimination, or other illegal reason or, b) inadequate consideration of professional record of achievement. Appeals are required to be filed within 20 business days of the written notice.

**Tenure Track Faculty**

**Process for Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty and Tenured Faculty**

The EPSY review, tenure, and promotion process has two levels: 1) Department Committee, and 2) Department Head.

**Methods for appointing or electing required committees.** The EPSY Tenure and Promotion Committee for Annual, Midterm, and Tenure and Promotion reviews consists of all tenured faculty members. The EPSY Tenure and Promotion Committee for reviews of promotion to Professor, consists of all Professors; however, the Department Head does not serve on any committee. Further, EPSY faculty serving on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, although allowed to be present, do not vote on Midterm or Tenure and Promotion decisions at the Departmental level, although they may be present during the Departmental T&P deliberations. The Committee and the Head independently evaluate each Candidate’s record and forward their recommendations for consideration in the College and University reviews.

**Use of committees in the tenure evaluation process.** In order to vote in each review, members of the Committee must (a) document that they have reviewed the material in the Candidate’s Portfolio, and (b) participate in the meeting. The Committee’s deliberations are initiated by drafts of the reports on Research, Teaching, and Service. The dossier of each candidate is reviewed by the Department Head and Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to ensure that all needed materials are available. Draft reports are written by members of the EPSY T&P Committee and are based on the evaluation documents provided by the candidate, as well as the external letters (described below), with attention to the University criteria in that area, and emphasizing the impact of the faculty member in that area. Draft reports are available for review, along with the candidate’s dossier, in advance of the meeting to facilitate discussion and ensure accuracy of the reports. Each committee member involved in the discussion must vote yes or no; recusals are only allowed for 1) those with a conflict of interest (e.g., spouse, in which case they also not be present...
for the discussion nor vote on the candidate), or 2) those present but who will later vote as part of the College Committee. A final summary report is completed by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The process of organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates is systematic and uniform across candidates. All voting members are expected to be active participants. The deliberations of the Committee are strictly confidential and may not be shared with persons who are not members of the Committee. Confidentiality is essential to maintaining collegiality within the department.

TAMU Tenure and Promotion Packages Submission Guidelines indicate that the final summary reports should reflect the views of the voting committee’s members. In order to meet this charge, all Committee members are encouraged to state the reasons for their vote either orally or by written comments on the ballot recording their vote.

Drafting of summary evaluation reports will be assigned to an individual faculty member or a subset of the faculty. The author(s) of the summary reports should be clearly identified. Information should not be repeated. Format includes three or four individual reports to reflect teaching, research, service, or other activities if applicable. Reports provide a well-substantiated analysis of scope and impact of candidate performance in each area, including alignment with Department, College, or TAMU Mission. (see Guidelines for joint appointment, interdisciplinary activities, and impact of candidate performance on student success). A statement is added to each report that all voting members of the T&P Committee agree with the summary statement. All voting members of the T&P Committee must sign off on the final summary prepared by the Chair.

Candidates will receive copies of the recommendations of the department and college T&P Committees, the Department Head, and the Dean as specified in the TAMU review policy. Copies can be requested through open records after the P&T process is complete. In addition, the EPSY Department Head (or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs as appropriate), and no one else, will provide a verbal summary of the T&P committee’s deliberation to the candidate in a manner that does not link specific comments of evaluations to specific individuals.

1. Department Committee. Composition and operation of the Department Committee shall be determined by each department, consistent with University policies and rules, and shall be specified in departmental policies and procedures. The Department Committee is responsible for preparing the Department Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and Other Activities (these evaluations should not be prepared by the candidate or the Department Head) and the Department Committee Report and Recommendation. Authorship of these statements must be identified and individuals who have a close relationship with the candidate should not prepare the evaluation statements. For example, to void conflict of interest, the candidate’s former graduate advisor or a co-author/collaborator should not write the evaluation statements.

If committee members differ in terms of their evaluation, that should be noted in the evaluation statement, and the department statement should clearly communicate the areas of difference and explain their rationale. All negative comments from external reviewers should be addressed by the departmental committee and/or the department head. Members of the Department Review Committee should have the opportunity to review the candidate’s Evaluations of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other Activities prior to submission to the Department Head. The Department Committee Report and Recommendation should contain a record of the vote and should address the reasons for any negative votes or abstentions among committee members.

Following the latest CEHD guidelines, the departmental representative to the College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee can attend and vote for the annual reviews at the department level meeting but should not attend and vote for the midterm reviews and tenure/promotion reviews at the department level meeting since the representative attends the College meeting and votes at College level.
The report of the midterm review or tenure/promotion review should reflect that the tenured faculty member did not attend the departmental meeting due to the service on the college-level committee. Members are reminded that deliberations at the departmental committee review meeting must remain confidential and must not be shared with the candidate or with anyone outside of those eligible for membership on the committee.

2. Department Head. The Department Head is responsible for preparing the Department Head’s Recommendation. The Department Head’s recommendation should provide a composite evaluation of the candidate’s record and include sufficient information to support judgments regarding teaching, research, and service. Negative comments from reviewers and/or the Department Committee and negative votes or abstentions from the Department Committee should be addressed in the Department Head’s recommendation, even if these comments are factually wrong or misguided.

Candidate’s Portfolio (Tenure Track/Tenured Faculty)

The Candidate’s portfolio to be used in departmental Midterm, Tenure and Promotion, and Promotion to Professor reviews will include all information specified in the TAMU Tenure and Promotion Packages Submission Guidelines. It is the responsibility of the Department Head and the Chair of the T&P to ensure that it is complete. If additional information is deemed necessary, the Candidate should be requested and given the opportunity to provide same. In addition, Draft Evaluations Reports of Teaching, Research, and Service will be available for review by the Committee prior to the meeting per CEHD Policy III.B.1.

External Letters

The purpose of external review letters is to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Accordingly, external reviewers should be nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline who are therefore qualified to speak with authority about the candidate’s accomplishments, future potential and impact to the field. Texas A&M University requires that external reviewers be from peer* (AAU public institutions from Vision 2020 or aspiring institutions (see TAMU policy, p. 16). For tenure and promotion decisions, a minimum of five (5) arm-length (see TAMU policy) reviewers is required, although seven (7) is preferred. If a reviewer is to be from a non-AAU, the request and rationale must be approved by the Dean and documented in the dossier. External letters must be from Full Professors. As with non-AAU preferred list, if an Associate Professor is to be a reviewer, rationale and approval must be documented in the dossier.

Evaluation Reports

The Evaluation Reports are consensual documents representing the evaluation of the Candidate’s record in each area by faculty in the Candidate’s division/department who serve on the Committee involved in the deliberations. Preparation of the Draft Evaluation will be the responsibility of individuals assigned to complete the task, generally not those who have mentored the Candidate or who potentially be otherwise biased. The drafts of the documents will be available in advance of the T&P meeting. The individual(s) assigned for each area will present their report for discussion and amend based on the input received. In effect, they will be revised as needed based on the discussion at the meeting until they reflect the consensual view of the Committee. The revised documents, along with the report of the Committee’s recommendation, will be available for review by Committee members who attended the meeting prior to submission to the Department Head. Final versions of the documents are required for each candidate’s TAMU Package to go forward.

The Report on the Evaluation of Teaching must include: peer evaluation of syllabi, assignments, exams, and grading methods, student ratings, peer evaluation of other teaching contributions. This category includes, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students. It further includes classroom instruction, academic advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and student mentoring.
The evaluation of teaching will be conducted within the framework set out by the CTE/TAMU Framework of Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation. Data sources for these components should primarily be the responsibility of the candidate and may include the candidate’s statement, student evaluation numbers, response rate, and rating, syllabi, attendance at CTE workshops, lists of student committees, list of advisees, and reports of teaching observations.

Examples from the TAMU Policy Appendix I include, but are not limited to: Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated; Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award; Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence; Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials; Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum; Chair of doctoral research committees; Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects; Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence; Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students; Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions; Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program); Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

Reports of and documentation of these indicators should be described to the T&P Committee in relationship to impact as part of the candidate statement and incorporated into the Evaluation Report on the Candidate’s Teaching as part of the T&P packet.

The Report on the Evaluation of Research and/or other scholarly, creative activities must include: description of authorship protocols within discipline, a review of selected works, relative candidate contribution in publication and grants, impact of the work on the discipline (not just numbers), clear connections to specific departmental expectations and criteria. Per 4.4.1.2, the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities: For most disciplines, this category consists of scholarship or research and its publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activity.

Examples from TAMU Policy, Appendix I include but are not limited to: Publications in leading refereed journals; Receiving major fellowship or research award; Frequent citation of publications; Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s); Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities; Juried works in creative activities; Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization; Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings; Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research; Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research); Publications with teaching focus in leading refereed journals; Evidence of creative professional practice.

In addition to examples, the report and description in relation to impact must be included in the report.

The Report on the Evaluation of Service must include indicators of service to the institution, to students, colleagues, department, college, and the University--as well as service beyond the campus (4.4.1.3). Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.: Examples include but are not limited to: Serving as editor, associate editor, or member of editorial board of a major journal; Being an officer in a national or international professional organization; Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board; Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University; Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting; Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate; Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee; Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service; receipt of recognition or award for service.

More than a restating/listing of the service activities, the report should provide a description of involvement, contribution, and impact of service with clear connections to specific departmental, college, and TAMU expectations and criteria.
The Discussion Report and Recommendations convey the essence of the discussion, reflect adequate consideration across areas, ensure recommendations based on guidelines and correlate with the tabulation of votes. The report is not a summary or synopsis of documents found elsewhere; instead, the document is a summary of issues explaining voting outcomes. The Report also should reflect the committee’s acceptance of the conclusions of the individual evaluation reports in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In the case of significant dissent, the discussion should convey a sense of the major relevant points and arguments as represented in the voting outcomes. The Discussion Report and Recommendations will be completed and available for review within one (1) week of the meeting in order to be finalized and signed off on by all members who participated in each evaluation process.

External Letters (CEHD Guidelines).

1. Number. The department must aim to receive 6-7 letters from external reviewers although the minimum number required is 5. All letters that have been requested and received must be included.

2. Authors. Review letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and one nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals “tainted” by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors). Letters should not be sought from among the names on the “do not contact” list provided by the candidates.

3. Institutions. Letters should come from “peer institutions or better” (i.e., top-tier, Research Extensive universities) but letters from notable leaders in the field who are not within a peer institution are also acceptable. In such a case, a rationale must be provided as to why the letter was solicited in the Description of the Qualifications of the External Reviewers. For assistant to associate professors, letter writers should hold the rank of full professor, except for some rare cases where the associate professor appointed as an external reviewer has an exceptional record of scholarship and is in the process of being promoted to full professor at his/her institution.

4. Letter Samples. A sample of the letters or emails used to solicit external reviews should be included in the candidate’s file. It is not recommended that the solicitation letter asks if the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion at their institution. Instead the reviewer should be asked to evaluate the candidate’s work and its current and potential national and/or international prominence (or progress toward them in the case of mid-term reviews). The solicitation must contain the following statement: “Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state and your review could be requested and relinquished.” Examples of letters are available from the office of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

5. Letter Availability to Candidates. Under Texas law, external letters are available to the candidate upon request to their department head in writing. These can be made available upon written request after the review process is complete.

6. Dean’s Review and Decision
The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request for promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he/she will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have been properly enclosed with the dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion,
she/he shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval. If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean notifies the department head and the candidate of the decision.

7. Provost Approval  
The candidate’s portfolio is forwarded to the Provost’s and President’s offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties, unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

8. Informing Faculty Members  
A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department Head at each level of review in a timely manner.

9. The Appeal Process  
In the case of not granting tenure or non-renewal of the contract, the faculty member has the right to appeal and the process is stated in sections 5.2, 5.3, and 9.0 of the University rule 12.01.99.32 (https://rulesadmin.tamu.edu/rules/download/12.01.99.M2).

Academic Professional Track

Process for Promotion for Clinical Faculty  
Clinical faculty promotion review will be an independent process from the tenure-track faculty review process and will be conducted during the fall semester.

Candidate’s Dossier

The candidate’s dossier includes the following:

1. A concise statement (not to exceed three pages) which allows the candidate to explain the QUALITY, productivity overtime, and IMPACT of their teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments. Each of the three areas, as applicable, should be individually addressed. This statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across all the areas that apply. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. The statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good ideas and teaching and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.

2. A current curriculum vitae, and

3. Evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility including, but not limited to teaching; service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities. The evaluation must be based on written criteria. The candidate’s dossier must be organized to reflect the accomplishments in the department, college and university criteria.

The departmental Clinical Faculty Review Committee (CFRC) should communicate to the candidate prior to the evaluation the information that it deems necessary for its evaluation of the candidate’s performance.

External Reviews

The Department Head will select a minimum of two reviewers external to the department, college or university. One reviewer is to be selected from a list of potential reviewers given by the faculty member; the other is to be selected from a list developed by the CFRC committee and/or department head in
consultation with departmental faculty within the candidates’ area of expertise. These external reviewers should be selected based on the clinical faculty candidate’s assignment and responsibilities. For example, appropriate reviews might include a teaching evaluation (by a faculty member outside the candidate’s department with expertise in this area), an evaluation by a school-based professional who has interacted with the faculty member (e.g. principal); clinical practitioners (e.g. licensed psychologists or licensed exercise physiologists); or faculty with similar responsibilities at other institutions. Care should be taken in selecting outside reviewers to ensure that they are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge – that is, not co-authors, personal friends, former students, or former mentors unless more than the minimum of two reviews are requested. The external reviews shall be considered as one piece of information needed to make a determination for promotion. Candidate’s dossier and job description will be submitted to the external reviewers. External reviewers should be asked to provide a written assessment of the candidate’s areas of responsibility and performance expectations. (Responsibilities include teaching and service/engagement, and may or may not include scholarship and/or creative and performing activities).

Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee (Promotion)
The CFRC will review the candidate’s dossier of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities, credentials, and letters from external reviewers. The CFRC will vote on promotions and produce separate reports to address each of the areas of performance, as well as an overall report that integrates or summarizes the committee deliberations and explains the outcome of the vote. This vote and associated CFRC reports will be forwarded to the department head. The CFRC reports should be based on the individual’s job description and appropriate performance expectations.

Departmental Approval
Upon review of the recommendation for promotion by the CFRC, the department head will make an independent evaluation and recommendation to the dean. The department head’s letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. The dossier must be forwarded to the dean’s level and beyond unless the candidate withdraws in writing from the promotion process.

After department review, the CFRC and department head forward recommendations to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the Academic Professional Track Advisory Committee (APTAC) and subsequent review and recommendation by the dean.

College Approval (CEHD Guidelines)
The dean will review all applications for promotion forwarded by department heads and the APTAC. The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of the dean’s vote for or against promotion. When the dean does not concur with the department head’s positive recommendation for promotion, the dean will give the department head the opportunity to present new arguments or new data not presented before. The dean must notify the department head and the faculty member, in writing, of his or her final decision.

Provost’s Approval
The candidate’s dossier is forwarded to the Provost’s and President’s offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties, unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

Informing Faculty Members
A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department
Head at each level of review in a timely manner.

Process for Promotion Review for Instructional Faculty
Instructional professors make a unique contribution to the educational and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Instructional professors are generally full-time faculty who are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching but are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. As part of the teaching functions, they are often engaged in supervision, program/curriculum development, and/or other academic activities. In addition, instructional professors can participate in grant activities and serve on various committees and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. They will also be required to demonstrate evidence of continuing professional development.

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Adjunct Instructional Professor
For purposes of promotion, adjunct instructional professors are considered part time and are not involved in the promotion process.
- Appointment to this rank generally requires a terminal degree; however, in the College of Education and Human Development, the minimum requirement is a master’s degree. Under extraordinary circumstances, other degrees, certifications, and other qualifications may be considered that demonstrate evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field that the individual will be teaching (For example, exceptional athletic experience with national prominence, renowned performing artist, nationally-renowned educator/teacher, etc.)
- Relevant professional experience (e.g., teaching experience, program/curriculum development, practical experience, supervision)
- Evidence of effective teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of expertise in the professional program area

Procedures for Promotion
The general requirement for time in rank before promotion consideration is five years. Under unusual circumstances, a request can be made to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development to consider time in an equivalent faculty rank. For example, a senior lecturer who has served the required number of years and met or exceeded performance expectations may meet the requirement for instructional associate professor.

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor should include the following elements:
Instructional professor review for promotion within the College requires a review by the Departmental APT (or Instructional) Professor Review Committee, the Department Head, the College APT Advisory Committee, and the Dean. This review will begin in the fall semester with the submission of the candidate’s dossier promotion. Please see section 8.3 for full details on dossier preparation.

Department APT or Instructional Professor Review Committee (IPRC)
Academic professional track faculty in each department will elect a committee of 6 members consisting of APT faculty members at associate professor rank or higher for review of instructional assistant to instructional associate and instructional professor rank or higher for review of instructional associate to instructional professor. If the department has insufficient instructional professor faculty at the appropriate ranks, members of the following faculty groups from either the department or another
department within the college with the appropriate rank can be used: clinical faculty group, tenured faculty group, providing that members have knowledge of the instructional faculty role. The department head in consultation with the dean selects these committee members. In EPSY, the review of instructional and clinical faculty occurs within the same committee.

For promotion, two additional members can be added to the committee. The first is a faculty member selected by the candidate. The second is one faculty member, instructional, clinical, or tenured, that represents the candidate’s area of expertise (program). This member will be elected by APT faculty. Therefore, for promotion only, the committee may consist from 6-8 members.

The IPRC will review the candidate’s dossier of teaching, leadership, service and professional activities. The IPRC will vote on promotions. This vote and the committee’s recommendations will be forwarded to the department head. The committee’s recommendation should be based on the individual’s job description and appropriate performance expectations. The departmental review committee is responsible for providing a written evaluation of the candidate’s job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility. This written evaluation provides the basis for the committee’s decision regarding promotion.

**Department Head Review and Decision**

Upon review of the candidate’s portfolio and the recommendation by the IPRC, the department head will make a recommendation to the dean’s office whether to deny or recommend the promotion. The department head’s letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. At any point in the process, candidates for promotion may elect, by written request, to withdraw their names from further consideration.

After departmental review, the department head forwards the departmental committee’s vote and recommendation together with his/her recommendation to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the College APT Advisory Committee (APTAC) and ultimately a review and decision by the dean.

**Dean’s Review and Decision**

The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request for promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he/she will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have been properly enclosed with the dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion, she/he shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval. If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean notifies the department head and the candidate of the decision.

**Provost Review and Decision**

The candidate’s portfolio is forwarded to the Provost’s and President’s offices through the Office of the Dean of Faculties, unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

**Informing Faculty Members**

A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion by the Department Head at each level of review in a timely manner.
6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or 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.

The Annual Review Process

- All faculty (tenure track, clinical, instructional, professor of practice, lecturers, senior lecturers, assistant lecturers, distinguished professors) complete an A-1 (see Appendix A) and undergo an annual review.
- While each department may develop its own annual evaluation form referred to as A-1 form, each faculty A-1 must contain the information specified in the “CEHD Standard Information for Inclusion in Faculty A-1s shown in sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of this form.”

The A-1 form is aligned with tenure and promotion expectations and provides data that may be used in the tenure and promotion process. Along with the A-1 is the A-2 that provides an annual review of the candidate’s progress towards tenure and promotion. Successful annual reviews contribute to the overall assessment for the tenure and promotion process.

Peer Review Process at the Department Level

In addition, all academic professional track, and tenure-track faculty will have an annual review by a departmental review committee who serves in an “advisory” capacity to the Department Head. This feedback will be considered by the department head in writing the A-2 report. Moreover, the candidate statement in the A-1 document must clearly identify specific research, teaching, and service goals which must be supported with evidence in the A-1 document.

Overall, alignment of the annual review to tenure and promotion would encompass the following:

1. An A-1 report that documents annual productivity in research, teaching, and service.
2. A candidate statement in the A-1 outlining specific research, teaching, and service goals which are supported with evidence in the A-1 document.
3. Two separate departmental committees review for academic professional faculty, and tenur-
track/tenured faculty, respectively. The A-1 committee for tenure-track/tenured faculty composed of one tenured-faculty member from each EPSY division will meet annually every spring to review the performance of all tenure-track/tenured faculty. This committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Department Head (DH) for A-1 evaluations. Committee members are selected by the faculty, serve 5-year terms, and rotate off of the committee in staggered fashion to ensure continuity and ease of training. The A-1 committee selects its chair from among those who have served 2 or more years on the committee. The individual appointed as chair will serve in that role for three years. (For example, if an individual is elected as chair after two years of service, she/he will serve three more years as chair for a total of 5 years of service.) The A-1 committee for APT faculty consists of 3 members appointed by the DH and chair is elected. All members of the APT A-1 committee should hold the rank of [Clinical/Instructional] Associate or Full Professor. Committee members should not submit self-evaluations (i.e., assign shares to themselves). If a member does submit ratings (i.e., shares) for him/herself, those should not be used and should not be recorded on the table of scores that is projected to the group. Each A-1 Review Committee Member should excuse him/herself during the committee’s deliberations and score adjustment process for his/her performance.

4. Department head will consider the feedback from the department review committees in the A-2 report to the faculty.

We follow the College's suggested values statements below to guide expectations for EPSY annual evaluation and tenure and promotion reviews. Examples of ‘meritorious’ activities for each of the performance categories are outlined in Section 3 (pp.4-8). In addition, we also follow the EPSY Clinical Faculty Role Expectation Guidelines (see Appendix B) to guide our annual evaluation.

**Research**

We value:
- Engaging in significant research activities
- Generating external funds to support research
- Collaboration among faculty to secure research funds
- Supporting graduate students with research assistantships
- Involving graduate and undergraduate students in research activities
- Publications from research initiatives
- Publications in high quality and high impact journals
- Publications and presentations with graduate students

**Teaching**

We value:
- Generating external funds to support teaching
- Scholarship related to teaching and learning
- Teaching both graduate and undergraduate students
- High quality teaching
- Peer review of teaching
- Student feedback related to teaching
- Evidence of student success in their receptive professionals
- Professional development related to teaching
- Innovation in teaching
- Bringing diversity into the curriculum
- Organizing and conducting study abroad programs using technology to enhance teaching
- Innovative program and course development
- Mentoring graduate and undergraduate students
• Mentoring doctoral students through the dissertation
• Developing doctoral students for the professoriate and other professional careers

Service
We value:
• Participation in events at the department, college and university level Providing service to the university
• Providing service to professional organizations
• Providing service to scholarship such as journal editorship and editorial board membership
• Providing service to the community
• Leadership in professional organizations
• The recruitment of diverse students
• Generating external funding to support recruitment of diverse students The traditions and values of Texas A&M University
• Serving as experts in communication with the media on teaching, research, and service

6.1 Purpose
• Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
• Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations for the Department Head to consider.

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For academic 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).

6.3 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. The two EPSY A-1 committees provide recommendation on faculty’s performance based on the A-1 (Appendix A) in three categories of “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” to the DH and the DH evaluates faculty’s performance based on the five categories of “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious”. The current scoring system in EPSY includes a scale from 0-4 in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service, with 0 corresponding to “Satisfactory”, and 4 corresponding to “Most Meritorious.”

6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:
• Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching. Based on indicators described in sections 4.1 and 4.2.
● **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of *effectiveness* in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching or other indicators described in section 4.2.

● **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of *effectiveness* in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees or other indicators described in section 4.2.

● **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both *effectiveness* and *excellence* in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments or other indicators described in 4.1. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

● **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators described in 4.1. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in teaching for tenured and tenure track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- A significant number of Variable Credit Courses, Chair/Co-Chair Doctoral Committees, Chair/Co-Chair Masters Thesis Committees, Doctoral Committee Memberships, and/or Masters Committee Thesis Memberships
- Course Development and Use of Innovative Teaching Methods
- Student Involvement in Teaching
- Teaching Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period
- Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Management of Multiyear Funded Teaching Grant
- Peer-reviewed Recognition for Teaching Excellence
- Internal (e.g., university, college, department) Recognition or Award for Students Chaired/Co-Chaired
- Peer-reviewed External Recognition for Students' Accomplishments
- Delivery of Workshops/Training/Continuing Education Units
- Participation in Professional Development Activities to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness
- Other Student Mentoring/Supervision Activities
- Students Chaired Within the Past 3 Years Placed in Tenure-Track Positions

**APT:**

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

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of *effectiveness* in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in peer review, student evaluations, reflective practices and course development activities, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.

- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of *effectiveness* in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, reflective practices and course development activities.

- **Exemplary** – 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...
innovative teaching methods. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

- **Most Meritorious**– those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational 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.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in teaching for academic and professional track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- A significant number of Variable Credit Courses, Co-Chair Doctoral Committees, Chair/Co-Chair Masters Thesis Committees, Doctoral Committee Memberships, and/or Masters Committee Thesis Memberships
- Course Development and Use of Innovative Teaching Methods
- Student Involvement in Teaching
- Teaching Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period
- Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Management of Multiyear Funded Teaching Grant
- Peer-reviewed Recognition for Teaching Excellence
- Internal (e.g., university, college, department) Recognition or Award for Students Chaired/Co-Chaired
- Peer-reviewed External Recognition for Students' Accomplishments
- Delivery of Workshops/Training/Continuing Education Units
- Participation in Professional Development Activities to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness
- Other Student Mentoring/Supervision Activities

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Based on indicators described in 4.4.

- **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, prominent presentations, book chapters, or other indicators described in 4.4.

- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other indicators described in 4.4.

- **Exemplary** – 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, grant funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline or other indicators described in 4.3.

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.3. 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.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity for tenured and tenure track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- Refereed Journal Publications from This Year
- Other Refereed Publications from this Year
- Other Non-Refereed Publications from This Year
- Refereed Presentations
- Other Presentations
- Research Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period
- Research Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Research Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Management of Multiyear Funded Research Grant
- Provides Guidance and Leadership to Students and Lower Rank Faculty
- Non-grant related Awards
- Technical Reports and Monographs
- Development of Creative Products
- Other Meritorious Indicators

**APT:**

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in scholarly activity.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in conference presentations, participation in research projects, and unpaid consultation.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in scholarly activity. Effectiveness can be supported by conference presentations, participation in research projects, and unpaid consultation.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by development of creative products, peer-reviewed publication, and teaching grants.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholars through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in scholarly organizations.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity for academic and professional track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- Refereed Journal Publications from This Year
6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.6.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.6. 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 4.6. 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.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service based on indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6. 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 would be typical.

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.5. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in service activity for tenured and tenure track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- Service on Program and/or Departmental Committees
- Participation on College or University Standing or Ad Hoc Committees
- Service Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period
- Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Management of Multiyear Funded Service Grant
- Leadership Role in Professional Organization
- Serves as Field/Ad Hoc Reviewer for Journals
- Provides Workshops/Inservices/Consultation
- Serves as Grant Reviewer
- Serves on Editorial Boards
- Journal Service as Editor-in-Chief or Associate Editor
- Work with Student Groups
- Significant Administrative Responsibility
- Professional Honors
- Professional Unpaid Consultation
- Service Awards
- Significant Community Service Based on Disciplinary/Professional Knowledge

**APT:**

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in division, department, college, or university service, **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment**.
- **Satisfactory** - appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in division, department, college, or university service, **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment**.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in significant administrative service, faculty mentorship, leadership role in professional organizations, and in impactful local service activities.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized for their service through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in service.

Examples of evidence for effectiveness and excellence in service activity for academic and professional track faculty in EPSY include a combination of the following activities:

- Service on Program and/or Departmental Committees
- Participation on College or University Standing or Ad Hoc Committees
- Service Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period List
- Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period
- Management of Multiyear Funded Service Grant
- Leadership Role in Professional Organization
- Serves as Field/Ad Hoc Reviewer for Journals
- Provides Workshops/Inservices/Consultation
- Work with Student Groups
- Significant Administrative Responsibility
- Professional Honors
- Professional Unpaid Consultation
- Service Awards
- Significant Community Service Based on Disciplinary/Professional Knowledge
6.5 Required Components  
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities.  
The exact form of the faculty member’s report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit’s practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should submit impact statements for research, teaching and service

Examples of possible content for the report are:
- EPSY uses their A-1 template as the basis for the report (see Appendix A)

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

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head’s, program director’s, or supervisor’s evaluation and expectations.  
The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. 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.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.  
The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.
6.5.4 **Performance Assessment.**
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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.

6.6 **Assessment outcomes that require action**
As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

6.6.1 **Unsatisfactory Performance**
An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), 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). 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” 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 shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 **Needs Improvement Performance**
If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 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 predetermined milestones are met.

6.7 **Time-Line**
The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”
6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department
published annual review guidelines, 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

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic
Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review
for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by
December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

Pre-Tenure Track Faculty
In the College of Education and Human Development, formal mid-term reviews for tenure track faculty
members shall occur during the spring of their third year. CEHD mid-term reviews follow the same
procedures as promotion and tenure reviews up through the level of the Dean. In the case that a mid-term
review does not have a positive outcome, the Dean may recommend an additional review be conducted
the following year. Otherwise, the faculty member on tenure track will be given a one-year notice of
termination of employment.

Academic Professional Track
Mid-term reviews for Clinical Assistant Professors take place in the spring of the initial third year of
employment. For purpose of review, adjunct clinical professors are considered part-time/short term and
will not be evaluated in the third-year or for promotion.

Recommendations for Non-Reappointment and Termination of Employment
Termination of Employment: Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint a faculty
member, shall be given in writing in accord with the following standards:

Clinical Assistant Professor/Instructional Assistant Professor who have held any faculty appointment other
than Assistant Lecturer for the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full-time service within a 7-year
period shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University's intent not to renew the appointment.
Notice of intent not to renew Clinical Assistant Professors who have not held an appointment 5 or more
academic years of full-time service within a 7 year period shall be given within a reasonable time from
when the department has decided not to renew the appointment.

Faculty member promoted to or hired at the rank of Clinical/Instructional Associate Professor or
Clinical/Instructional Professor shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University's intent not to
renew the appointment.

Midterm Review (Third-Year) of Tenure Track Faculty
Each tenure track Candidate's accomplishments will be evaluated by the Committee in February at the
midpoint of the Candidate’s probationary period, typically during the third year of employment. The
Midterm review serves as a summative evaluation of the Candidate’s performance and achievements. The review also serves as a benchmark source of feedback to the Candidate regarding perceived progress toward promotion and tenure. Draft reports on research, teaching and service will be completed in mid-January for review by all committee members prior to the meeting. The Committee votes on a recommendation regarding the Candidate's continued employment, and as to whether the Candidate is making acceptable progress toward tenure. EPSY policy includes the incorporation of external letters in the Midterm Review process.

Third-Year Review of Academic Professional Track Faculty
Each academic professional track Candidate's accomplishments will be evaluated by the Committee in February, during the third year of employment. This review may serve as a formative evaluation of the Candidate’s performance and achievements. The review also serves as a benchmark source of feedback to the Candidate regarding perceived progress toward promotion. Draft reports on research, teaching and service will be completed in mid-January for review by all committee members prior to the meeting. The Committee votes on a recommendation as to whether the Candidate is making acceptable progress toward promotion. In lieu of the third-year review, APT faculty may choose to submit their dossier for promotion to the next rank.

7.1 Purpose
- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; 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 teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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 midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process
The mid-term review should be conducted 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>

**Candidate’s Portfolio**

Candidates for mid-term review submit a portfolio of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities. The portfolio will contain, but not be limited to the following:

(a) a concise statement (not to exceed three pages) which allows the candidate to explain the QUALITY, productivity overtime, and IMPACT of their teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments. Each of the three areas, as applicable, should be individually addressed. This statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across all the areas that apply. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. The statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good ideas and teaching and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise;

(b) curriculum vitae; and

(c) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility as applicable within the general headings of: (i) teaching, which must include a table of courses taught (face-to-face and online), student evaluations for each course and departmental average of student evaluations for equivalent courses; (ii) service/engagement/ professional activities provided within the institution and to professional organizations and/or (iii) scholarship and/or performing and creative activities; (iv) sample course syllabi (3-4); (V) sample of publications (3-4)

- A job description provided by the department head.
- A-1 form for the current year.
- A-2 forms for the previous two years.

This portfolio will be submitted to the department head no later than the first day of the spring semester.

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm 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. 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 6.) 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 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

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

Department of Educational Psychology
Post-Tenure Review Process and Performance Expectations
Adopted 1-11-2017; Revisions Approved 10-8-2018

The Department of Educational Psychology’s (EPSY) post-tenure review guidelines align with the most recent updates to University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review (revised October 6, 2016). EPSY’s guidelines have also been prepared in accordance with The College of Education and Human Development’s (CEHD) Post Tenure Review Guidelines (approved December 6, 2016); some of the language was taken verbatim from the University’s and/or CEHD’s most recently updated documents as well as guidelines from CEHD’s Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development.

EXPECTATIONS AND PREMISE OF POST-TENURE REVIEW

1. Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily in (a) teaching; (b) research, scholarship or creative work; (c) service; and (d) any other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration) throughout their career.

2. Modifications to assignments may change as one’s career progresses, but tenured faculty appointments should reflect some percentage of effort (i.e., more than 0%) allocated in each of the categories of research, teaching, and service. Changes in level of expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase/decrease in load expectations in another category. Note that volume of work does not equate to quality.

3. Faculty are to be reviewed based on the assigned duties of their position. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean.

4. Faculty with 100% administrative appointments (e.g., associate deans and department heads) will be reviewed by their immediate supervisor (in this case, the dean).

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. The primary purpose of EPSY’s Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process is to foster the continued development of tenured faculty members’ teaching, research, and service productivity. Emphasis is placed on early identification and developmental support for faculty evidencing performance deficiencies in one or more areas. EPSY’s PTR policies and procedures highlight the importance of peer input and are similar to departmental procedures associated with initial tenure and promotion decisions. Specifically, they provide multiple opportunities for evaluative administrator and peer input as well as faculty development support for faculty evidencing performance deficiencies prior to the required implementation of a formal Professional Development Review (per SAP 12.06.99.M0.01). Post-tenure reviews (PTR) are conducted every spring during the same timeframe as the required annual reviews of faculty performance (University Rule 12.01.99.M2). These two review processes are parallel but may be conducted by separate committees. While the post-tenure reviews yield designations of
satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory for each of a faculty member’s assigned area of service, the annual review may also yield share values (1 – 4) for meritorious productivity in each of those areas, and an overall rating.

Post-tenure review comprises:

- Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

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

8.3 Peer Review Committee

- A PTR committee composed of one tenured-faculty member from each EPSY division will meet annually every spring to review the performance of all tenured faculty. This committee serves in an advisory capacity to the department head for post-tenure evaluations. PTR committee members are selected by the faculty, serve 3-year terms, and rotate off of the committee in staggered fashion to ensure continuity and ease of training. The PTR committee selects its chair from among those who have served 2 or more years on the committee. The individual appointed as chair will serve in that role for three years. (For example, if an individual is elected as chair after two years of service, she/he will serve three more years as chair for a total of 5 years of service.)
- The PTR committee reviews 2-3 tenured faculty member’s (on a rolling basis) most recently submitted curriculum vitae in conjunction with the three most recent A1 submissions to access the pertinent information to evaluate the areas of teaching, research, and service. Using the department’s performance expectations for these areas, the committee will render an evaluation of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of these assigned areas.
- The committee will submit its review for each selected tenured faculty member to the department head prior to the annual spring submission date for A2 reports to the college, with sufficient time for the Head to incorporate the findings into the A2 evaluation of each faculty member with respect to post-tenure review status.

EPSY Performance Expectations for Post-Tenure Review

From 2020 and beyond, three year rolling averages will be used. The 3-year rolling average refers to the year when the review is due, and the two preceding years. Faculty’s performance in these three years will be taken into consideration during the PTR.

Performance Expectations for Research

Based on a 3-year rolling average:

1. Publishes 2 or more written products per year in refereed journals, non-refereed professional outlets, relevant book chapters, or books.
- At least 1 required product per year must be a peer-reviewed journal article.
- A newly funded external grant/contract (for which the faculty member served as the PI) can replace one required product in a given year.
2. Presents/co-presents 1 or more refereed presentation(s) per year at national / international / regional / state professional conferences.

3. Writes and submits (as PI, Co-PI, or other major role) one or more proposals for funding from external sources in one of the following areas: research, teaching, program development, and/or service. Minimum expectation is 1 or more proposal within the previous three years. (**Exception allowed if the faculty member is already managing an active extramural project during the time period.)

**Satisfactory:** Meets all 3 performance expectations  
**Needs Improvement:** Fails to meet 1 performance expectation  
**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to meet 2 or more performance expectations

**Performance Expectations for Teaching**

1. Completes two courses (i.e., 6 credit hours of teaching or equivalent supervision load) each semester of full employment. *Load reductions require approved course buyouts or approved administrative releases.* Expectations for teaching FTE greater/less than 40% will be adjusted proportionally.)
2. Mentors doctoral students in research and/or teaching activities. Minimum expectation is a 9 variable credit hours per year or alternative evidence of comparable mentorship.
3. Co-authors with graduate students on professional presentations and/or publications. Minimum expectation is 1 or more products with graduate student(s) per year using a 3-year rolling average.
4. Develops course/practicum syllabi that meet TAMU’s minimum syllabus requirements and are (a) reflective of current knowledge in the discipline, (b) distributed by the first day of class to students, (c) posted on Howdy (as required), and (d) submitted to the department.
5. Students provide positive feedback for courses/practica and mentorship. Indicators to the contrary include: A pattern of average student ratings lower than 3.5 (for both face-to-face and online courses) for the *Professor treated students with respect* indicator on 3 or more courses within a three-year period.
   • A pattern of average student ratings lower than 3.5 (face-to-face) or 3.3 (online) for the *professor taught the course effectively* indicator on 3 or more courses within a three-year period.
   • A repeated pattern of formal student complaints/grievances documented across time.
6. Advises/chairs equitable share of graduate students based on program needs and enrollments. *Each division/program provides minimum numerical threshold for advising loads based on the program’s overall graduate enrollments and competing needs.*
7. Provides doctoral students with annual evaluative feedback and completes online doctoral evaluations by the last day of May for all students chaired/co-chaired.

**Satisfactory:** Meets all teaching performance expectations  
**Needs Improvement:** Fails to meet 1 or 2 performance expectations  
**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to meet 3 or more performance expectations or a pattern of formal student complaints/grievances regarding egregious conduct.

**Performance Expectations for Service**

*Based on a 3-year rolling average:*

**Internal**

• Participates in some aspect of division/program- or department- level service activity during each academic year. *(Some examples: coordinating a degree program, chairing a division, serving on a search committee, serving as member of special task force, participating in accreditation/review preparation, coordinating WEAVE online entry, engaging in special recruitment activities etc.)*

• Serves on 2 or more ad-hoc or standing department, college, or university-level service activities within a 3-year period *(Some examples: climate committee, Council of Principal Investigators, Institutional Review Board, Graduate Instructional Council, Faculty Advisory Council, post-tenure review committee, A-1 reviews, Faculty Senate, search committees for other programs, technology council, etc.)*
External
• Active, visible external service as (a) reviewer/editor for refereed publications, books/book chapters, (b) elected office/board/task force/advisory council for professional organization, or (c) panel member/reviewer for national grant agency Minimum expectation: Evidence of 1 or more external service activities per year.

Satisfactory: Meets all 3 performance expectations
Needs Improvement: Fails to meet 1 performance expectation
Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet 2 or more performance expectations

EPSY POST-TENURE REVIEW EVALUATION OUTCOMES
1. Annual post-tenure reviews yield a designation of satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory in each of the core areas of research, teaching, and service. Criteria for these designations directly align with the department’s annual evaluation process for awarding merit. (Regarding merit, eligible faculty may be awarded between 1 and 4 merit shares for meritorious performance in each of their assigned areas of research, teaching, and service. Final merit shares are determined by the DH in consultation with the A-1 Review Committee recommendations and in accordance with EPSY’s approved Faculty Role Expectations.)

• Rating of Needs Improvement in One Area: When a tenured faculty member’s annual performance in a core area is deemed “needs improvement,” that individual will be invited to collaborate with the department head to develop professional development plan. For teaching, this plan should typically take 1 year or less to successfully complete. In other areas (e.g. research), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can remain a following year as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory.”

Note: Atypical work load assignments may influence final evaluations and subsequent decisions of whether a faculty member warrants a professional development plan. For instance, a faculty member with a 40% teaching load would be expected to meet all departmental benchmarks for teaching. However, if a faculty has a 10% distribution of work load in teaching, some performance expectation levels (e.g., numbers of courses taught, number of advisees) may need to be adjusted accordingly. Given the numerous potential combinations of work load distributions and benchmarks, the final determination of whether a faculty member with an atypical workload distribution meets the annual performance expectations will be made by the Department Head.

• Ratings of Unsatisfactory in one or more area or Needs Improvement in two areas: Once the PTR committee’s submits their annual review, the department head will review and determine whether there are any faculty who require further consideration for a department-level professional development plan due to ratings of unsatisfactory, or two or more needs improvement ratings.

2. If a faculty member does not agree with the designations of Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement, or if the faculty member and the Department Head cannot come to agreement on a department-level professional development plan due to ratings of unsatisfactory, or two or more needs improvement ratings.

3. The faculty member will be invited to meet with the T&P Subcommittee to present her or his case. After hearing the faculty member the committee will, in collaboration with the Head, make the final decision on the issue at hand. The Head will communicate that decision to the faculty member and append a written summary of the decision to the faculty member’s A-2 evaluation that will be submitted to the Dean of the College.

4. The department will follow the CEHD Post-Tenure Review guidelines and University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 in implementing academic professional development for any faculty member who has fallen below the performance benchmarks for the department.

EPSY Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
5. In keeping with TAMU rules on post-tenure, a tenured faculty member also may voluntarily request a departmental promotion and tenure review by either the Department Head or the Tenure and Promotion Committee or both to evaluate his or her performance. Documentation of the results of such a review is not to be used in any other university evaluation except by explicit consent of the faculty member. This review may result in a development plan agreed to by the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

8.4 Process

8.4.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- EPSY uses their A-1 template materials as the basis for the review (see Appendix A)

8.4.2 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.

8.4.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

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

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

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

8.3.7 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. 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.

8.3.8 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.

8.4 Professional Development Review

EPSY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

---

1 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
If a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive years of unsatisfactory performance reviews in any given area, the Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review per TAMU’s policies regarding post-tenure review. Note: University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 section 4.1 states that a professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (section 2) or an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member the nature and procedures of the review.

A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process. All tenured faculty are advised to familiarize themselves with TAMU Standard Administrative Procedure see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review) and the CEHD Post-Tenure Review Guidelines approved by Dean’s Council on December 6, 2016.

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

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

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4. 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

University Rule 31.08.01.M2 states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered. 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.

The criteria for granting faculty emeritus status in Educational Psychology (EPSY) involves a nomination from the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee typically prepares a brief description outlining the contributions of the candidate under the classical Research, Teaching and Service domains including years of work in the EPSY department. The
brief description is shared with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and ballots are distributed and tenured faculty (associate and full) write their final recommendation. Once the votes are counted, that information is communicated to the Department Head, and then follows the process to the Dean and then to the Provost. Final approval is made by the Board of Regents.
Appendix A: A-1 Performance Report Department of Educational Psychology

Name: Rank: Year:
Vita: Not available.

Weighted Scholarship Distribution: % Teaching % Research % Service

I. RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty Member's Statement on Impact of Her/His Research Productivity.

*no impact statement provided*

Refereed Journal Publications from This Year (Count = 0)
Other Refereed Publications from this Year (Count = 0)
Other Non-Refereed Publications from This Year (Count = 0)
Refereed Presentations (Count = 0)
Other Presentations (Count = 0)
Research Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period (Count = 0)
Research Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period (Count = 0)
Research Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period (Count = 0)
Management of Multiyear Funded Research Grant (Count = 0)
Provides Guidance and Leadership to Students and Lower Rank Faculty (Count = 0)
Non-grant related Awards (Count = 0)
Technical Reports and Monographs (Count = 0)
Development of Creative Products (Count = 0)
Other Meritorious Indicators (Count = 0)

II. SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING

Courses Taught =

If you taught less than the required course load for your position, specify the number of courses waived for any of the following: Course buy-out for external grant/contract activity: course(s)
Approved course reduction for new/assistant professors: course(s)
Approved course release for administrative assignment: course(s)
Approved course release for Faculty Development Leave: course(s)
Other:
Faculty Member's Statement on Impact of Her/His Teaching Productivity.
Regular Courses
Variable Credit Courses
Chair/Co-Chair Doctoral Committee (Count = 0)
List each doctoral student you chaired/co-chaired this year as a separate entry. Include the student's name, area of emphasis, and specify whether you served as chair versus co-chair. The student must have an approved degree plan and have been enrolled for at least one semester or summer session during the year.

Chair/Co-Chair Masters Committee (Count = 0)
The EPSY graduate advising office will provide faculty with a list of master's students that were chaired/co-chaired during the current evaluation period.
Doctoral Committee Memberships (Count = 0)
The EPSY graduate advising office will provide a full list of each faculty member's doctoral committee memberships for students in the department. For student committees outside of EPSY (in other colleges/departments), faculty should list those students below (as separate entries).

**Masters Committee Memberships** (Count = 0)
Faculty are not required to list every master's committee membership. However, those who would like to report this information (e.g., professional track faculty) are welcome to. Upon request, the EPSY graduate advising office can provide a list of your master's committee memberships for students in the department. For student committees outside of EPSY (in other colleges/departments), you will need to recall and list those students.

**Course Development and Use of Innovative Teaching Methods** (Count = 0)

**Student Involvement in Teaching** (Count = 0)

**Teaching Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period** (Count = 0)

**Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period** (Count = 0)

**Teaching Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period** (Count = 0)

**Management of Multiyear Funded Teaching Grant** (Count = 0)

**Peer-reviewed Recognition for Teaching Excellence** (Count = 0)

**Internal (e.g., university, college, department) Recognition or Award for Students Chaired/Co-Chaired** (Count = 0)

**Peer-reviewed External Recognition for Students' Accomplishments** (Count = 0)

**Delivery of Workshops/Training/Continuing Education Units** (Count = 0)

**Participation in Professional Development Activities to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness** (Count = 0)

**Other Student Mentoring/Supervision Activities** (Count = 0)

**Students Chaired Within the Past 3 Years Placed in Tenure-Track Positions** (Count = 0)

**III. SCHOLARSHIP OF SERVICE**

Faculty members statement on impact of her/his external service contributions.

Faculty member’s statement on impact of her/his internal service contributions.

**Service on Program and/or Departmental Committees** (Count = 0)

**Participation on College or University Standing or Ad Hoc Committees** (Count = 0)

**Service Grant/Contract Awards Newly Funded During Current Evaluation Period** List each service grant/contract proposal as a separate entry. Do not include grants a (Count = 0)

**Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Under Review) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period** (Count = 0)

**Service Grant/Contract Proposals (Not Funded) Submitted During Current Evaluation Period** (Count = 0)

**Management of Multiyear Funded Service Grant** (Count = 0)

**Leadership Role in Professional Organization** (Count = 0)

**Serves as Field/Ad Hoc Reviewer for Journals** (Count = 0)

**Provides Workshops/Inservices/Consultation** (Count = 0)

**Serves as Grant Reviewer** (Count = 0)

**Serves on Editorial Boards** (Count = 0)
Summary of EPSY Clinical Faculty Role Expectation Guidelines for TEACHING (80%FTE) by Rank

Clinical Assistant Professor
- Completes 12 credit hours of teaching or training each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses / seminars / supervision). One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other instructional activities - i.e. EPSY 682, 683, 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.
- Receives consistently positive evaluations across all courses and practica.
- Demonstrates evidence of continuous efforts to update and improve courses and instructional formats.
- Course syllabi demonstrate attendance to culture/diversity issues, as applicable.
- Receives positive evaluations from student teachers, practicum students, cooperating teachers, or other professional collaborators in field-based experiences, as applicable.
- Attends to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by the department.
- Serves as a member on master’s or doctoral committees as needed.
- Attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Clinical Associate Professor
- Completes 12 credit hours of teaching or training each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses / seminars / supervision. One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other instructional activities - i.e. EPSY 682, 683, 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.
- Receives consistently positive evaluations across all courses and practica.
- Demonstrates evidence of continuous efforts to update and improve courses and instructional formats.
- Course syllabi demonstrate attendance to culture/diversity issues, as applicable.
- Receives positive evaluations from student teachers, practicum students, cooperating teachers, or other professional collaborators in field-based experiences, as applicable.
- Attends to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by the department.
- Serves as co-chair or member on master’s or doctoral committees as needed.
- Serves as program advisor to students as required by program.
- Assists in the development of grants for training or teaching activities from local, state, or national agencies.
- Attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Clinical Professor
- Completes 12 credit hours of teaching or training each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses / seminars / supervision. One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other
instructional activities -i.e. EPSY 682, 683, 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.

- Receives consistently positive evaluations across all courses and practica
- Demonstrates evidence of continuous efforts to update and improve courses and instructional formats.
- Course syllabi demonstrate attendance to culture/diversity issues, as applicable.
- Receives positive evaluations from student teachers, practicum students, cooperating teachers, or other professional collaborators in field-based experiences, as applicable.
- Attends to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by the department.
- Serves as chair, co-chair, or member on master’s or doctoral committees as needed.
- Serves as program advisor to students as required by program.
- Assists in the development of grants for training or teaching activities from local, state, or national agencies.
- Appropriately Attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Summary of EPSY Clinical Faculty Role Expectation Guidelines for SERVICE (10%FTE) by Rank

Clinical Assistant Professor

- Updates vita at least annually and provides copy to the department.
- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Clinical Associate Professor

- Updates vita at least annually and provides copy to the department.
- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Serves on ad-hoc or standing program committees.
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Clinical Professor

- Updates vita at least annually and provides copy to the department.
- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Serves on ad-hoc or standing program committees.
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

Summary of EPSY Clinical Faculty Role Expectation Guidelines for RESEARCH (10%FTE) by Rank

Clinical Assistant Professor

- Makes presentation related to teaching or program activities at local / state / regional / national conference.
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

**Clinical Associate Professor**
- Makes presentation related to teaching or program activities at local / state / regional / national conference.
- Participates in research project and/or other scholarly endeavor (e.g., publication).
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

**Clinical Professor**
- Makes presentation related to teaching or program activities at local / state / regional / national conference.
- Publishes one scholarly work over a three year period.
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research, teaching and service.

* When faculty are assigned other role responsibilities, the percentage of effort will be specified in a job description and the expectations (and corresponding FTE) adjusted in accordance with the description of other responsibilities.

---

**Contact Office**

Department of Educational Psychology; Harrington Education Center Office Tower, 4225 TAMU, 540 Ross Street, College Station, TX 77843; (979) 845-1831; fuhuitong@tamu.edu