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
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1. Introduction

The mission of the College of Geosciences at Texas A&M University is to be a destination-of-choice organization for innovative education and research. 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 College of Geosciences for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

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

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

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit. In particular, Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Executive Professor, Visiting Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Senior Professor, Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor, Lecturer, and Visiting Lecturer are non-tenure track or Academic Professional Track (APT) appointments. The level of effort for each APT appointment is based on the number of courses/sections taught in any given semester. This effort may vary from semester to semester.

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, particularly their contributions to the research, teaching and service missions of Texas A&M University. The standard level of effort for a tenure-track or tenured faculty member is 40% research, 40% teaching and 20% service (unless unique terms have been established by the department head in the annual appointment letter). The standard level of effort for instructional faculty (including “practice”) is 80% (or more) teaching and 20% (or less) either service or research. The standard distribution of effort for lecturer positions is 100% teaching. While the absolute balance of time and effort may evolve over the course of a career, the College of Geosciences expects sustained excellence in each of the three dimensions. Sustained excellence in scholarly impact is based on the standards of impact valued within the specific discipline. Regardless of discipline, the College of Geosciences expects tenure-track and tenured faculty member to consistently seek external funding and advance the discipline through peer-reviewed publications at every career stage. Sustained excellence in teaching includes consistent revision of course materials and instructional methods/assessments based on the evolving nature of the discipline and standards of pedagogical excellence. Sustained excellence in service at a minimum consists of conscientious contributions to Department, College and University efforts as assigned or requested, as well as external service to the discipline. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and 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.

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: (i) coverage of appropriate material in a
rigorous manner, (ii) effective classroom presentation, and (iii) reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Items (i) and (iii) are generally handled by peer evaluation of appropriate materials, such as class syllabi, notes, and examinations. Some information on these two items may also be obtained from student evaluation. Item (ii) may be evaluated by student course evaluations, classroom assessments by peer faculty and alumni surveys.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:
Tenured or tenure-track faculty are expected to conduct funded research, produce impactful research outcomes, and contribute to education through integrating research into education and mentoring students. Scholarship indicates discovery of new knowledge, development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses, and integration of knowledge leading to new understanding. Active production of scholarly work is expected and necessary for promotion and tenure. In addition, scholarly work should be appropriate in the context of supporting the mission of the Department. Pursuit of scholarship can be accomplished in teaching, research, or professional activities. A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated work. Scholarly activities are those that result in publications. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. Publications in proceedings of international or national conferences (refereed) rank second, and presentations and publications in regional conferences rank last. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work.

3.3 Service
Service includes service to the Department, the University, and the profession, and must be appropriate in the context of the mission of the Department. Serving as chair of major committees represents a leadership role and contributes to the stature of the Department and College. Mentoring or guiding early-career faculty is regarded as a valuable service activity. Leadership roles in external service activities, such as Significant role in commission, task force, board, etc., are highly valued. Typical service activities may include organizing national or international symposia or workshops; serving as a member of boards of international or national symposia, an officer in professional societies, referee or reviewer for funding agencies, professional journals, or textbook publishers; and participating in editorial boards of journals or textbooks and grant review panels.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness
The Unit 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 include, but are not limited to:
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Outstanding mentoring of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement, and subsequent development of graduate students.
- 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.
• Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.

4.2 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:
  • Reflective response to peer review.
  • Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course materials and delivery.
  • Analysis of student achievement of course objectives.
  • Statement of goals for improvement.
  • Participation in teaching workshops or other development activities.
  • Evidence of student growth over the semester.
  • Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses.
  • Employer reports of student performance.

4.3 **Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include, but are not limited to:
  • Publications in leading refereed journals.
  • Receiving major external fellowship or externally funded research award.
  • Frequent citation of publications.
  • Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s); in particular, formally published book(s) that is (are) positively reviewed by peers.
  • Patents and/or commercialization of research.
  • Awards for peer reviewed scholarly or creative activities.

4.4 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include, but are not limited to:
  • 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.
  • Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings.
  • Publications in refereed journals

4.5 **Indicators of Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:
  • 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 editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
  • Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization;
  • Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large;
  • Evidence of innovation or excellence while chairing a departmental committee or exercising similar function below the Department Head role

4.6 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:
  • Serving as an officer in a national or international professional organization;
  • Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee;
  • Organizing national or international symposia or workshops;
  • Serving as a referee or reviewer for funding agencies, highly ranked professional journals, or textbook publishers, and
  • Serving on editorial boards of journals or textbooks and grant review panels.
  • Diligent and conscientious service in departmentally assigned committee work as assessed by the committee chair and department head
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 are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year so that they know, to the maximum extent possible, their level of progress toward tenure. Input material for such evaluations may be faculty members’ curricula vitae, annual performance reports, and other sources of information. While it is recognized that College and Department priorities and faculty performance criteria will likely change over time, faculty members will be kept informed of current expectations and their evaluations conducted in a consistent manner.

5.1.2 Associate Professor: For tenured Associate Professors, the Annual Review should identify progress toward promotion to Full Professor. Specific criteria are as follows:
- Demonstrate an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field, where those accomplishments are evidenced by outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, the development of patents and the commercialization of research;
- Display professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;
- Expertise in one or more areas germane to the programs of the College of Geosciences;
- Show evidence of successful graduate student or post-doctoral fellow supervision; and
- Demonstrated a commitment to maintaining the level of excellence in teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

5.1.3 Professor: in general, full professors are evaluated from the following three perspectives:
- Demonstrate continued excellence in at least one of three domains - teaching, scholarship, or service - and sustained accomplishment in the other two;
- Show evidence of successful graduate student supervision, and
- Achieve substantial international recognition in research or another form of scholarly activity.

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. All new Professional Track faculty members will be provided with an appointment letter stating the initial terms and conditions of employment. Any subsequent modifications or special understandings in regard to the appointment, which may be made on an annual basis, will be stated in writing and a copy given to the faculty member. All Professional Track academic faculty will be reviewed on an annual basis by their department head or supervisor. Such review will include all requirements established in the initial letter of appointment and any additional requirements added during annual reviews. Professional Track faculty members whose appointment has not expired may be dismissed for cause on the same basis that tenured faculty may be dismissed.
dismissed for cause under System Policy 12.01. Professional Track faculty members may be placed on administrative leave pending investigation as described in System Policy 12.01. Professional Track faculty are subject to the provisions of System Policy 12.01 relating to financial exigency or termination or reduction of existing programs and may be dismissed subject to this policy. For detailed policy, refer to the rule 12.07 which pertains specifically to fixed term (APT) faculty (https://policies.tamus.edu/12-07.pdf). 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.

5.3 Process for the tenure and promotion in the College of Geosciences

The process of review begins when a prospective faculty member is being considered for employment. At that time, faculty seeking tenure and promotion should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements. This document should be provided to new faculty members upon arrival.

5.3.1 Goals and Expectations

To warrant recommendation for promotion, candidates must have shown excellence in one aspect of teaching, scholarship or service and a high level of ability in the other two. Persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement.

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor differ in degree and emphasis as described in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. The criteria for the College of Geosciences are as articulated below.

5.3.1 a Associate Professor

- Holds a Ph.D. degree;
- Has demonstrated an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field, where those accomplishments are evidenced by outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, the development of patents and the commercialization of research;
- Has displayed professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;
- Has expertise in one or more areas germane to the programs of the College of Geosciences;
- Has shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision; and
- Has demonstrated a commitment to maintaining the level of excellence in teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

5.3.1 b Professor

- Has demonstrated continued excellence in at least one of three domains - teaching, scholarship, or service - and an appropriately high level of accomplishment in the other two;
- Has shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision, and
- Has achieved substantial international recognition in research or another form of creative activity.
5.3.2 Procedures

5.3.2a Types of Reviews and General Guidelines

Tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually, in the mid-term of appointment (typically in the sixth or seventh semester) and finally in the penultimate year of the probationary period when the decision for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is made. Such reviews may be made earlier and are in fact encouraged whenever it appears appropriate. Associate Professors are reviewed during the year in which they are put forward for promotion to Full Professor. These reviews are in addition to other procedures that departments may undertake to assess suitability for salary increases and other University requirements.

In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If requested by the faculty member, a statement of reasons will be provided by the Department Head (or Dean).

A candidate will only be evaluated by tenured faculty of equal or greater rank to that sought by the candidate.

5.3.2b Committees

The committees discussed in this document are defined below.

Departmental Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee

The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee is a standing committee of tenured associate and full professors appointed by the Department Head. Terms of appointment are determined by the Department, with rotations within the committee to preserve the continuity and high standards of the committee. Alternatively, the committee may consist of all faculty members of appropriate rank within the Department. Associate Professors can be T&P Committee members, but only for evaluation of Assistant Professors.

The committee’s function is to conduct annual reviews of all faculty members below the rank of Full Professor to assess progress towards the next rank, to conduct Mid-term and Tenure reviews, and to evaluate faculty members seeking promotion to the next rank.

The following apply to the T&P Committee:

- It is strongly suggested that the Department Head seek advice from the faculty as a whole when considering appointments to the T&P Committee;
- It is the responsibility of the T&P Committee to coordinate the preparation of the candidate's dossier independent of the Department Head. This includes soliciting external review letters, collecting relevant documentation concerning teaching, and checking the dossier for completeness. Further details are explained below under each type of review. It is in the candidate's interest to consult early either with the Chair or the full Committee;
- The arguments for and against promotion developed by the T&P Committee are presented to all eligible faculty in the Department for discussion, providing those faculty the opportunity to express their opinions prior to the vote of the T&P Committee;
• Committee and faculty deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence;
• T&P committee votes are reported directly to the Department Head, who then informs the candidate of the results of the vote; and
• Committee procedures are based on this document, as reviewed, and updated periodically.

College T&P Committee
The Dean of the College of Geosciences, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College T&P Committee, consisting of two full professors from each academic department, of whom at least one shall be a member of their Departmental T&P Committee. Each member shall be appointed by the Dean for a two-year term unless a shorter term is required to maintain staggered terms for representatives of each Department. This committee will elect its own Chair who will report its recommendations in writing directly and solely to the Dean. Committee procedures are based on this document, as reviewed, and updated periodically, and Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence. The College T&P Committee reviews dossiers and Departmental recommendations for all faculty members undergoing mid-term review and promotion and/or tenure considerations.

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.

6.1 Purpose
• Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
● Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.

● Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant. See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

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

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (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 or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets expectations/Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations.” A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

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.

● 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.

● Meets Expectations – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
● **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

● **Outstanding** – 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.

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.

- **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, and so forth.

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

- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**

- **Outstanding** – 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 scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

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

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

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. 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.

- **Meets Expectations** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service *appropriate for their career stage and*
time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.

- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. 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.

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

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 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, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members must articulate their short- and long-term goals and reflect on their progress toward last year’s goals.

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 unit 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 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

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 pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 Timeline
The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & 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.

6.9 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)
Faculty members in the academic professional track (non-tenure track) are 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.

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.

7.1 Purpose
The goal of the Mid-Term Review of Assistant Professors is to assess the faculty member’s mid-term progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. To accomplish this goal, faculty candidates compile a dossier that is nearly identical to the tenure and promotion dossier in terms of content (see Section 2.5). The exceptions are:

- Departmental review committees do not solicit letters from external referees. Instead, committees are strongly encouraged to obtain one or more letters of recommendation from within the University,
• The Mid-Term Review would take the place of the annual review, although it is recommended that an annual review still be done even in the year when a faculty member undergoes a mid-term review.
• The faculty candidate’s dossier does not proceed beyond the College.
• The Mid-Term Review may result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments in order to provide guidance as the faculty member continues through the probationary period. If the tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual might 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>

The mid-term review dossier, when completed, should include the faculty's curriculum vitae, personal statement on teaching, research, and service, the Departmental T&P Committee and Department head reports, The College T&P Committee report, and the Dean’s evaluation and recommendation.

7.3 Feedback from midterm review
The Departmental T&P Committee and Department head should produce written reports that mimic those that are required for tenure and promotion dossiers. Prior to the Committee vote, it is desirable that the dossier be discussed by the Department’s tenured faculty so that opinions regarding progress toward tenure be shared with the Committee. The Committee’s vote consists of a yes/no vote on whether the voter feels that the faculty member is making adequate progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

The College T&P Committee reviews the dossier and prepares its own report and vote. The report results and vote are added to the dossier and forwarded to the Dean, who in turn provides a written evaluation and recommendation. At this point, the contents of the dossier are returned to the Department Head for discussion with the faculty member (with the exception of the letter(s) of support from within the University).

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 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
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.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The peer Review Committee should consist of no less than three faculty members at rank of tenured professor. The department head appoints the committee members.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- Updated CV
- The Faculty Activity Report for Geosciences form
- Other materials if relevant and appropriate

8.3.2 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.

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

8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the 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**

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

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.

---

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
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:

8.4.5a 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,

8.4.5b 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.

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

Contact Office

College of Geosciences, e-mail: corie.smith@exchange.tamu.edu; Tel: 979-845-3651.