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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](http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf) of the University and the Department of Geology and Geophysics; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general College of Geosciences and Department of Geology and Geophysics 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.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</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. Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Academic Professional Track (APT) appointments are non-tenure track appointments that normally have a primary responsibility for a single area, but may also be expected to contribute in one or more of the other areas. Expected contributions shall be outlined in the annual appointment letter for each individual.

APT appointments include:

- **Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, Assistant Professor of the Practice**
  Within the University, these appointments are normally reserved for faculty members who continue to maintain primary employment in a profession outside of academia. In the Department of Geology and Geophysics, Assistant/Associate/Professors of Practice serve primarily to mentor graduate students in industry related research, and as such their primary responsibilities include advising graduate students, obtaining funding to support students and student research, and mentoring students towards publications in peer-reviewed journals. Teaching graduate classes, as appropriate to mentor students, is also expected.

- **Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor**
  Faculty in these appointments are required to make significant contributions to scholarly research; they may also teach graduate classes as appropriate to mentor students, or contribute to service in the area of research support.

- **Executive Professor**
  These appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, and in the area of service or administration.

- **Senior Professor**
  These appointments are non-tenure track appointment for faculty members who teach but who are not required to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or service. This title is typically reserved for retirees who have been rehired into a non-tenure track position. Expected contributions will vary for each individual.

- **Instructional Professor, Associate Instructional Professor, Assistant Instructional Professor**
  Faculty in these appointments focus on teaching; they may also contribute to research or to departmental service (primarily in the area of education). Expected contributions shall be outlined in the annual appointment letter for each individual. The teaching load for these faculty in the College of Geosciences is typically three courses per semester, but may vary depending on other duties assigned.

- **Lecture, Senior Lecturer**
  These appointments are for faculty who teach but who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or service. The level of effort for each appointment is based on the number of courses/sections taught per year and may vary depending on other duties assigned.

- **Visiting Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Lecturer**
  These appointments are limited term appoints that normally have focus on a mixture of teaching and research.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)
This section describes the expectations of College of Geosciences faculty for evaluation for tenure, promotion and merit compensation, common to all units across the College.

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). 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 and products 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 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 evaluations, classroom assessments by senior faculty and alumni surveys.

3.2. Research, scholarly activity or creative work
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 or peer-reviewed products (e.g., maps, databases, software programs). Publications in highly-ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight, presentations and publications in regional conferences rank lower. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work.

3.2 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. 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.

Service is evaluated in two separate parts: internal service to the department, college and university, and service
external to TAMU. The evaluation of these two service components are combined to form a single overall service evaluation.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Geology and Geophysics recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

4.1 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
- Documented effort at continued pedagogical development, such as participation in teaching workshops.
- Development and successful implementation of innovative pedagogy, new laboratory exercises or class assignments, including course content and pedagogies likely to be effective with and supportive of students with diverse backgrounds and learning styles.
- Timely attention to resolution of student complaints and disputes.
- Purposeful mentoring of under-represented groups in the Geosciences.
- Timely graduation of and/or achievement of appropriate progress to degree on the part of mentored graduate students.
- Appropriate mentorship of teaching assistants.
- Student satisfaction, as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation (controlling for course level and GPA).

4.2 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
- Outstanding mentoring of graduate research as indicated by performance (publications, presentations, awards, grants), placement and subsequent career advancement.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
- Demonstrated improvement in student learning due to revised curriculum/improved pedagogy.
- Receiving external grant support for curricular materials.
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions.
- Expanding or enhancing opportunities for international studies with substantive learning outcomes.

4.3 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but is not limited to:
- Consistent publications in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs, special papers, or other peer-reviewed products.
- Regularly successful pursuit of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
- Regularly successful pursuit of Indirect Costs (IDC) bearing external funding for research.
- Collaborative efforts across academic units that result in research products/funding.
- Patents and/or commercialization of research.
- Regular contributions to national and international scientific conferences, and invited presentations at meetings and other venues.
- Frequent citations of publications.

4.4 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but is not limited to:
- A high rate of peer-reviewed publication or publication in competitive high-impact journals (e.g. Science, Nature Geoscience).
• Dissemination of high-impact products (e.g., peer-reviewed software packages, database, datasets).
• Publication of peer-reviewed scholarly book(s) by established publisher(s).
• National-level recognition (e.g., medal; AGU fellow) for research.
• Leadership in obtaining major externally-funded research awards.
• Authorship of invited review articles
• Invited presentations at national and international meetings.

4.5 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** includes, but is not limited to:
• Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University.
• Serving as a referee or reviewer for funding agencies, professional journals, or book publishers.
• Membership on national advisory boards or institutional boards or review panels.
• Serving on editorial boards of journals or books.
• Diligent and conscientious service in departmentally-assigned committee work as assessed by the committee chair and department head.
• Regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as student and faculty recruitment
• Substantive contributions to college or university committees.
• Contributions to enhancing or expanding the diversity of faculty, students and staff.
• Effective outreach to K-12 community and general public through informal learning programs (including summer programs).
• Communication of research results to the general public.

4.6 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** includes, but is not limited to:
• Serving on a 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 of editorial board of a peer-reviewed scientific journal.
• Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization.
• Contributing support letters for tenure and promotion of colleagues at other institutions.
• Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
• Organizing national or international symposia or workshops.
• Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
• Shouldering a pivotal leadership service role without reduction in other responsibilities.
• Performance of service to the larger scientific community through leadership in professional societies.
• Leadership position on national advisory boards.

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 Promotion to Associate Professor
- Holds a Ph. D.;
- Has demonstrated excellence as measured against the contributions of others in the field at comparable career stages and institutions, where those accomplishments are evidenced by criteria listed above (e.g., outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, other peer-reviewed, high-impact products);
- 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.

5.1.2 Promotion to 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 (evidenced by criteria listed above);
- Has shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision, and
- Has achieved substantial international recognition in research or another form of creative 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. For example, 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 tenure and promotion in the College of Geosciences
The review process for tenure and promotion is described in the College of Geosciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

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.

Process: The Department Head conducts the annual review process in concert with the Executive Committee of the Department, and, for promotable faculty, with input from the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The evaluation is conducted during the Spring Semester of each year and encompasses the calendar year January – December of the previous year. The input from the Tenure and Promotion Committee for promotable faculty will also be provided directly to the faculty member.

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.

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.
- In consultation with the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, 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 and tenure-track faculty, the annual review evaluates yearly performance, and where relevant, serves as an assessment of 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 or academic year, but will also include a three year expanded window for review to ensure that activities are viewed within the context of ongoing work.

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 using five categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” “Outstanding.” In each performance area, ratings are supported by the Indicators of Effectiveness and Excellence for that area, as defined in Section 4.

- Unsatisfactory – absence of significant indicators of effectiveness
- Needs Improvement – minimal indicators of effectiveness
- Meets Expectations – appropriate indicators of effectiveness
- Exceeds Expectations – ample indicators of both effectiveness and excellence
Outstanding – strong indicators of excellence

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, 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, 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), 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 Sections 4 and 6.4). 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. 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 8) 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 8), 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 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.

6.9 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Faculty members in the academic professional track (non-tenure track) are evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. For example, 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. All new Professional track faculty members will be provided with an initial appointment letter stating the assigned areas of performance, initial terms, and conditions of employment. Subsequent modifications in regard to the appointment, which may be made on an annual basis, will be stated in the annual appointment letter. Reviews will include all requirements established in appointment letters.

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.

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 two 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, and
- The faculty candidate’s dossier does not proceed beyond the College.
- The Mid-Term Review may result in an independent evaluation of the faculty members’ 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 to not 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, and be completed with recommendation and feedback provided to the faculty member, anytime between March and December of that year. 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>

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) 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

Annual reviews are carried out through peer review by the Executive Committee of the Department. The annual review process will fulfill the requirements of a Periodic Peer Review. Three consecutive overall unsatisfactory departmental annual reviews will trigger a Professional Development Review (see section 8.4).

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- Current 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

---

1 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
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 (adloc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.\(^2\) 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 31\(^{st}\)**, 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 of the College of Geosciences, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. The ad hoc review committee will be composed of three

---

\(^2\) It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
tenured full professors and will include two members from the Department of Geology and Geophysics and one tenured full professor from another department at Texas A&M University and agreed upon by the department head and the faculty member.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements they 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 8.5) 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.

Contact Office

Department of Geology and Geophysics, e-mail Lisa Reichert (lreichert@geos.tamu.edu) or Cathy Bruton (bruton@geo.tamu.edu)