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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Oceanography is to: (1) advance discovery and understanding of the ocean sciences, technology and resources, and (2) to prepare the next generation of ocean scientists and citizens in general for the challenges facing a growing human population with limited resources. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Oceanography 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="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/</a> Promotion-and-Tenure</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. Teaching graduate and undergraduate classes, as appropriate, is 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)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (teaching, research and service). 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 Department, 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 Department’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: : Implement new pedagogical strategies; Publication of widely adopted teaching materials; Receiving consistently high teaching evaluations; Receipt of fellowship or award for teaching; Receipt of research awards by the faculty members’ student(s); etc.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work
Research is central to the mission of the Department, and the development of a vibrant research enterprise is required of all tenured/tenure-track faculty. All tenured/tenure-track faculty members are expected to: 1) Publish their research in peer-reviewed journals; 2) Obtain extramural funding; and 3) Support and mentor graduate students promoting and diversifying Department’s student body. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing research. Measures and sources of information considered are: 1) peer-reviewed publications; 2) grants and funding levels for extramural research; 3) other publications and presentations; and 4) other indicators as described in the narrative from the faculty member. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are: Publishing ground breaking research; Exhibiting leadership in obtaining funding for large-scale, interdisciplinary or multiple-investigator projects; Receipt of significant research funding; Frequent citations; Receipt of major fellowship or award; etc.

3.3 Service
Service is central to the mission of the Department, and a commitment to service to the department and scientific community is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) Serve on departmental, college and university committees as appropriate; 2) Serve the scientific community; and 3) Promote and diversify participation in the field of Oceanography. Effectiveness and excellence in service activities affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Measures/sources of information may include: 1) committees; and 2) other indicators as described in the narrative from the faculty member. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are: Being and officer in a national or international organization; Being elected to serve on a university organization like the Faculty Senate; Receiving requests to serve on high profile University, National or International committees; etc.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness
The Department of Oceanography 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.
4.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to: Implement new pedagogical strategies; Publication of widely adopted teaching materials; Receiving consistently high teaching evaluations; etc.

4.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to: Receipt of fellowship or award for teaching; Receipt of research awards by the faculty members’ student(s); etc.

4.3 Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include, but are not limited to: Publishing ground breaking research; Exhibiting leadership in obtaining funding for large-scale, interdisciplinary or multiple-investigator projects; etc.

4.4 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include, but are not limited to: Receipt of significant research funding; Frequent citations; Receipt of major fellowship or award; etc.

4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to: Being and officer in a national or international organization; Being elected to serve on a university organization like the Faculty Senate; etc.

4.6 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to: Receiving requests to serve on high profile University, National or International committees; etc.

5. **Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

5.1 **Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty**

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.

Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for are as follows:

5.1.1 **Assistant Professor:** Must possess substantial promise for scholarly achievement in one or more areas within Oceanography, as evidenced by prior research or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference. Must demonstrate substantial promise for high quality in teaching, as evidenced by prior teaching experiences or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference, which address this point. Must display a willingness to serve the university and the profession.

5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** Must have met all the requirements for appointment at the lower rank. Must have established a record and program of research and scholarly productivity as evidenced by publication of journal articles, books, chapters in books, or other relevant outlets. Must have a record of high quality in teaching as evidenced by syllabi, other course materials, student evaluations, teaching awards, and/or direct faculty observations, as appropriate. Must have a record of high quality in service to their department, university, and profession. Must show promise of continued growth likely to result (in due course) in promotion to the rank of full professor.

5.1.3 **Professor:** Must have met all the requirements for appointment at the lower ranks. Must have achieved a national or international reputation, readily evidenced, for example, by publications, citations, professional honors or awards, and evaluations by other nationally visible scholars. Must have demonstrated high quality in teaching since their appointment to the rank of associate professor. Must have displayed the ability and willingness to serve in the governance of the department, college, and university, in the governance and conduct of the profession, or in other ways to use one’s professional expertise to benefit student and public life.

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, Instruction or Research. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. Faculty with Instructional in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their Teaching/Mentoring activities. 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. Primary emphasis is placed on the **quality, significance, and**
impact of their work. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria are as follows:

5.2.1 Assistant (Instructional or Research) Professor:

5.2.1.1 Research - Must possess substantial promise for scholarly achievement in one or more areas within Oceanography, as evidenced by prior research or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference. Must display a willingness to serve the university and the profession.

5.2.1.2 Instructional - Must demonstrate substantial promise for high quality in teaching, as evidenced by prior teaching experiences or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference, which address this point. Must display a willingness to serve the university and the profession.

5.2.2 Associate (Instructional or Research) Professor: Must have met all the requirements for appointment at the lower rank.

5.2.2.1 Research - Must have established a record and program of research and scholarly productivity as evidenced by publication of journal articles, books, chapters in books, or other relevant outlets. Must have a record of high quality in service to their department, university, and profession. Must show promise of continued growth likely to result (in due course) in promotion to the rank of full professor.

5.2.2.2 Instructional - Must have a record of high quality in teaching as evidenced by syllabi, other course materials, student evaluations, teaching awards, and/or direct faculty observations, as appropriate. Must have a record of high quality in service to their department, university, and profession. Must show promise of continued growth likely to result (in due course) in promotion to the rank of full professor.

5.2.3 Professor: Must have met all the requirements for appointment at the lower ranks.

5.2.3.1 Research - Must have achieved a national or international reputation, readily evidenced, for example, by publications, citations, professional honors or awards, and evaluations by other nationally visible scholars. Must have displayed the ability and willingness to serve in the governance of the department, college, and university, in the governance and conduct of the profession, or in other ways to use one’s professional expertise to benefit student and public life.

5.2.3.2 Instructional - Must have demonstrated high quality in teaching since their appointment to the rank of associate professor. Must have displayed the ability and willingness to serve in the governance of the department, college, and university, in the governance and conduct of the profession, or in other ways to use one’s professional expertise to benefit student and public life.

5.3 Process
Early in the year, before February 15, the Department Head meets with the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to set the calendar for the committee to receive documents related to mid-term reviews, tenure and promotion cases for both Tenure/Tenure Track faculty and Academic Professional Track faculty. Only tenured Department of Oceanography Faculty may stand on the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

- All Department of Oceanography tenured faculty will vote on tenure decisions and promotion of assistant professors to associate after a meeting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and review of the dossier(s).
- All Department of Oceanography Associate and Full Professors, tenured and non-tenured, will vote on the promotion of Academic Professional Track assistant professors to associate professor after a meeting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and review of the dossier(s).
- All Department of Oceanography tenured full professors will vote on promotions for tenured associate professors to full professor after a meeting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and review of the dossier(s).
• All Department of Oceanography full professors, tenured and non-tenured, will vote on promotions for Academic Professional Track associate professors to full professor after a meeting with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and review of the dossier(s).

• Official votes will be conducted by electronic ballot (Qualtrics) to record the votes.

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.

  o 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, and may also include the previous three years, for the review period.

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 the following categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Need Improvement”, “Meets expectations”, “Exceeds Expectations”, and “Exemplary” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) persistent negative student evaluations; (2) regular and unresolved student complaints; (3) indifference to teaching; (4) presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information; (5) disorganized presentation of course materials and poor communication of course requirements; (6) persistent lack of progress to degree on the part of students being mentored; (7) unwillingness to mentor students; (8) persistent inattention to university requirements including timely posting of current course syllabi, curricula vitae and student grades; (9) routine refusal to teach courses central to the departmental mission; (10) excessive cancellation of class.

- **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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) a few repeated negative student evaluations; (2) inattention to university requirements including timely posting of current course syllabi, curricula vitae and student grades; (3) presentation of some out-of-date or incorrect information; (4) unresolved student complaints.

- **Meets Expectations** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) the presentation of accurate, up-to-date, well organized information and concepts; (2) demonstrating interest in the course subject and the process of teaching; (3) receiving acceptable teaching evaluations; (4) satisfactory resolution of student complaints; (5) timely graduation of and/or achievement of appropriate progress to degree on the part of mentored students; (6) use of technology and active learning methods in the classroom; (7) efforts to implement pedagogy and course content likely to be effective with and supportive of students with diverse backgrounds and learning styles; (8) mentoring of students from groups under-represented in the Geosciences.

- **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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) effective implementation of a new exercise or technique in the classroom; (2) contributing to textbooks or other instructional materials; (3) receiving better
than acceptable teaching evaluations; (4) effective use of technology and active learning methods in the classroom.

- **Exemplary** – 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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) design and successful institution of new courses; (2) extensive implementation of new laboratory exercises; (3) receipt of external grant support for teaching/learning projects; (4) excellent student evaluations or other indications of excellent instruction; (5) authoring textbooks or other instructional materials; (6) expanding or enhancing opportunities for international studies; (7) selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award; (8) placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic scholarly or professional positions; (9) purposeful mentoring of students from groups under-represented in the Geosciences; (10) successful implementation of innovative pedagogy including course content likely to be effective with and supportive of students with diverse backgrounds and learning styles.

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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) Lack of publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs or special papers; (2) inability and/or unwillingness to obtain extramural research support; (3) the absence of other forms of scholarly activity.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) limited publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs or special papers; (2) few proposals for extramural research support; (3) limited other scholarly activity such as attendance at scientific meetings, authorship of review articles or electronic publications.

- **Meets Expectations** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) regular publication in peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs or special papers; (2) successful pursuit of extramural research support; (3) the regular performance of other scholarly activities such as attendance at scientific meetings, authorship of review articles or electronic publications.

- **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 include but are not limited to: (1) regular publication in high profile peer reviewed journals, chapters in books, edited volumes, monographs or special papers; (2) successful pursuit of extramural research support for larger interdisciplinary projects; (3) the performance of other higher profile scholarly activities such as invited presentations at scientific meetings.

- **Exemplary** – 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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) publication of ground-breaking research; (2) leadership in obtaining funding for large-scale, interdisciplinary or multiple-
investigator projects; (3) receipt of major fellowship or research award; (4) frequent citation of publications.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) failure to attend faculty meetings regularly; (2) refusal to serve on departmental, college or university committees; (3) lack of contributions to departmental, college or university committees on which the faculty member is serving; (4) persistent insensitive or discriminatory comments and/or actions toward individuals or groups based on individual identity.

- **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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) minimal contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees; (2) limited participation in professional societies; (3) irregular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as those for student and faculty recruitment.

- **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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in other faculty activities such as those for student and faculty recruitment; (2) contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees; (3) performance of substantive service to the larger scientific community such as through manuscript and grant reviews; (4) active participation in professional societies; (5) academic program enhancement that improves graduate or undergraduate education experience; (6) serving in an administrative role at Texas A&M University; (7) contributions to enhancing or expanding diversity of faculty, students and staff.

- **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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) performance of larger service to the greater scientific community such as through panel reviews; (2) substantive contributions to departmental, college and/or university committees; (3) communication of applied research results to the general public.

- **Exemplary** – 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. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) shouldering a large or pivotal service role; (2) performance of service to the larger scientific community through leadership in professional societies; (3) editing journals or membership on advisory boards; (4) serving on major governmental commission, task force or board; (5) leadership in enhancing or expanding the diversity of faculty, students and staff; (6) effective outreach to K-12 community and general public through informal learning and summer programs.

6.4.4 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Patient Care (if applicable) are: N/A

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.
Annual activity is reported via the approved college Faculty Activity Report for Geosciences (FARG), updated curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations and any additional materials provided by the faculty member:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and allows a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report incorporates teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- A report of assigned courses, enrollment and student evaluations
- A list of activities, accomplishments, and awards
- A statement from the faculty member indicating any special accomplishments or special circumstances

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 predetermined milestones are met.

6.7 Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.
There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.

7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a mid-term (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review
Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The Peer Review Committee is the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- 6 most recent annual activity reports via the approved college Faculty Activity Report for Geosciences (FARG),
- updated curriculum vitae
- teaching evaluations
- a statement of purpose addressing recent Research, Teaching and Service and any additional materials provided by the faculty member for the relevant six year period

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 (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 8.2.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). 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.

---

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

Contact Office

Department of Oceanography, email Debbie Odstrcil (dodstrcil@tamu.edu)
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