1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Communication is to provide research, teaching, and service to the campus, community, state, university, and discipline. 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 Communication 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.M1, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
</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 12.01.9.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit.

Responsibilities in the Tenure Track (tenure-track and tenured) are Research (50%), Teaching (30%), and Service (20%). The ranks are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The ranks in the non-tenure Academic Professional Track are: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Professor of the Practice. Responsibilities in the Lecturer ranks are teaching (100%). Responsibilities for Instructional ranks are Teaching (70%) and Service (30%). Responsibilities for Professor of the Practice ranks are Teaching (70%) and Service (30%).

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, 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 including teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; 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 College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: (1) contribute to instruction and student development; (2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and (3) promote and diversify the development of the College’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: (1) self-evaluation; (2) peer-evaluation; (3) student feedback; and (4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: (1) classroom instruction, (2) course development, and (3) student mentoring.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research is central to the mission of the college, and effectiveness in scholarship is required of all tenured or tenure-track faculty as well as other faculty tracks where research is required as part of annual assessment and promotion. Faculty members should be actively engaged in creating an ongoing program of research that influences
academic and/or nonacademic communities. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research lends itself to multiple sources of information and methods. While normative expectations for scholarship may vary by communication sub-discipline, all scholarship should be of high quality and rigor, undergo peer review, and have impact. For example, for faculty members in areas that emphasize journal publication, one indicator of the quality of work is placement into top-tier academic journals which typically possess one or more of the following qualities such as a high impact factor for journal, publication by national or international professional association, rigorous peer review, and a distinguished editor or editorial board. Similarly, when demonstrating the impact of one’s research, faculty members may draw on a variety of indicators to provide evidence of its influence on academic audiences (e.g., H-indexes, citation counts, keynote addresses or invited presentations to prestigious venues) as well as its use by nonacademic audiences (e.g., policy formation, development of training models, social change, circulation in public venues such as newspapers). Evaluation of research effectiveness and excellence does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered when evaluating research performance are: (1) research productivity, (2) research sustainability, and (3) research impact.

3.3 Service

Service is central to the mission of the college, and effectiveness in scholarship and is required of all tenured or tenure-track faculty, instructional professors, and professors of the practice as well as other faculty in the Academic Professional Track, where service is required as part of annual assessment and promotion. Faculty members should be actively engaged in service activities that make meaningful contributions to the life of the department, university, discipline, and community. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing service including, but not limited to: (1) participation in service activities such as committee work and editorial boards, (2) creation and leadership of service initiatives, (3) documentation by service partners regarding the faculty member’s participation and impact, and (4) peer performance ratings of service activities such as those provided by PUBLONS. The criteria for effectiveness and excellence that shall be considered when evaluating service performance are: (1) departmental citizenship, (2) impact of service activities, and (3) departmental, university, and/or disciplinary leadership.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

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

- Evidence of high-quality student mentoring.
- Excellent student performance as evidenced by indicators such as student research success (e.g., conference presentation, publications, research awards) or job and internship placement.
- Excellent instruction in classes that have 100 or more students enrolled as demonstrated through indicators such as the incorporation of high impact pedagogical practices and student evaluations.
- Outstanding curricular innovation as evidenced through the development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses (e.g., pedagogical shift, technological innovation).
- Significant contribution to the development of service-learning initiative and projects.
- Developing and leading study-abroad programs.
• Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the University Honors program).
• Outstanding contribution to the department’s commitment to diversity and/or international/globalization (e.g., development of new initiative, creation of DEI pedagogical workshop).
• Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
• Receipt of college-level or University teaching award (or equivalent).
• Publication of textbook or peer-reviewed instructional materials.

4.2. Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** includes, but is not limited to:
• Effective construction of courses using sound pedagogical strategies.
• Meeting minimum syllabus requirements, adhering to college and university teaching policies and state laws such as posting one’s syllabus and CV on HOWDY, meeting class at the scheduled time.
• Hosting regularly scheduled office hours.
• Responding promptly and professionally to student concerns and problems.
• Submitting midterm and final grades on time.
• Revising syllabus and course pedagogy in light of student evaluations to keep it current and relevant. Writing student letters of recommendation.
• Satisfactory student evaluations (e.g., an average of 4.0 or higher overall teaching evaluations).
• Teaching independent studies (COMM 485, 491, and 685) and honors contracts as well as participation on graduate and honors thesis committees as appropriate by disciplinary area, rank, and academic track. Incorporating high impact practices and engaged student activities in the course syllabus.
• Development of class assignments or activities that encourage engaged learning.
• Hosting speakers who address diversity and/or international/globalization issues relevant to the course content.

4.3. Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** includes, but is not limited to:
• Highly productive research agenda as evidenced by publications in leading refereed journals, book publications in strong book presses, and refereed book chapters.
• Frequent citations of publications.
• Strong external reviews of journal articles and book.
• Receipt of a significant A&M research award or fellowship (e.g., AFS Distinguished Research Award, Rothrock).
• Receipt of a major national or international research award from a professional communication association such as the International Communication Association, National Communication Association, Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender, American Academy on Communication in Health, and AEJMC or equivalent national or international professional associations such as the American Political Science Association or Academy of Management including divisional or caucus research awards.
• Invited keynote address or plenary session at national or international conferences
• Serving as a PI or Co-PI on a funded external grant from a foundation or federal agency such as the National Science Foundation.

4.4. Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** includes, but is not limited to:
• Publications in highly regarded national or international refereed journals
• Publication of scholarly book(s) and/or significant progress on the next book project.
• Editing a scholarly book.
• Presentation of conference papers at national or international meetings.
• Submission of internal and external grants.
• Awards recognizing scholarly work such as article of the year awards, outstanding young scholar etc.
4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

- Significant direction of committees, strategic initiatives, and projects that further departmental, university/college, and disciplinary activities:
  (a) **Departmental Leadership**: Impact on accomplishing departmental goals and priorities through activities such as the completion of projects when chairing committees, chairing a search committee, sponsoring student organizations, and leading significant projects (e.g., leading Academic Program Review, organizing a conference).
  (b) **College and/or University Leadership**: Chairing College and/or University Committees (e.g., CLA Graduate Instructional Committee, Undergraduate Instructional Council) or leading strategic initiatives.
  (c) **Disciplinary Leadership**: Includes indicators such as chairing a division of a regional or national communication association (e.g., National Communication Association), serving on editorial boards for journals and books, conference planning and organization, performing promotion, tenure and program reviews, and serving as panel member for a national funding agency such as NSF.

- **Community engagement**: Includes indicators related to fostering public understanding as well as collaborative projects with community partners regarding communication. Indicators of fostering public understanding and disseminating information to the public regarding communication may include public research reports; reports to business and government; publications in trade magazines, popular press outlets, or academic professional association publications aimed at a non-specialist audience (e.g., *Communication Currents*, *Academy of Management Perspectives*); published white papers series that are “problem-solution” translations of scholarly work or public policy statements; podcasts; YouTube videos and channels; websites, blogs; Twitter; films; and video. Indicators of collaborative projects with community partners may include activities with public or non-university clients in the form of demonstration projects, policy analysis, evaluation research, and needs assessment; developing academic-practitioner collaborations, conferences, and colloquia; and the establishment of initiatives, demonstration projects, and centers

- Serving as a journal editor for a top-tier disciplinary or interdisciplinary journal, book editor for a top-tier book series.
- Serving as president of a national/international communication association, or earn a national award for service.

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

- Responsible and conscientious participation in departmental governance activities such as department meetings, tenure and promotion meetings, departmental committees, or college or university committee (e.g., Liberal Arts Council, Faculty Senate).

- Sustained engagement in professional service. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, professional service might include activities such as serving as a paper reviewer for a conference, reviewing article or book manuscripts, serving as an editorial board member, organizing a conference panel, and serving as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure cases. For Academic Professional track faculty professional service might include, but is not limited to, organizing a pedagogical workshop for the Center for Teaching and Excellence, speaking to departmental or campus groups regarding pedagogy, or serving on the planning committee for pedagogically-centered conference such as CTE Transformational Teaching and Learning Conference.

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 the unit is as follows:

5.1.1. **Assistant Professor**: Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a pattern of excellent research and publication. Patterns of excellence in research and publication are determined within the department and communicated to assistant professors through the annual review process, coupled with external validation by subject-matter experts. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and academic needs. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

5.1.2. **Associate Professor**: Associate professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate effectiveness in all three performance dimensions. In addition, excellence is expected in instruction/teaching or research and publication. Associate professors, relative to assistant professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service effectiveness and excellence. Promotion to professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions, with research and publication typically carrying the heaviest weight.

5.1.3. **Professor**: Professors are expected to demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as: (1) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; (2) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development; (3) leadership in contributing to the body of knowledge in the faculty member’s field/area/s of study; (4) leadership in the development of junior faculty. While there may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by professors, there is continued expectation of examples of excellence in one or more performance areas.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. Promotion reviews for APT faculty in the Department of Communication will be conducted according to the criteria listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

5.3 Process

5.3.1 Procedures for Conducting a Tenure and Promotion Review of Tenure-Line Appointments

- Tenure/promotion reviews are conducted by the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the Department. This committee is composed of all tenured faculty members, although only members in the rank of professor participate in reviews for promotion to professor. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee, in consultation with the Department Head, is responsible for appointing the membership of individual review subcommittees.
- Individual review subcommittees will be composed of four members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee—one member to chair the review, one to write the research report, one to write the teaching report, and one to write the service report. The chair of the review committee will write the overall evaluation report. To the extent possible, the chair of the individual review committee will come from a part of the communication discipline, which is similar to that of the candidate being evaluated.
● The review committee will meet with the candidate to identify external letter-writers that the candidate wishes to have included (and excluded). The committee will then generate a separate list of external letter-writers not on either of these lists. From the two inclusion lists, the committee will make recommendations to the Head on the external letters to solicit. The Head then contact letter-writers to solicit reviews.

● The members of the review committee shall study all relevant documents as submitted by the candidate under review, including the candidate’s narrative statement, all available annual reviews, evidence of research performance, teaching quality, and service contributions, the external letters, and other documents which the candidate may deem relevant. Materials required for a major review are listed in the College of Liberal Arts’ “Tenure and Promotion Guidelines,” a copy of which will be provided to the candidate in preparation for the review.

● The review committee shall study the case and prepare written reports on research, teaching, service, and an overall evaluation. In cases of tenure/promotion, the review committee shall recommend outside letters of evaluation from nationally known scholars at leading peer institutions and shall consider those letters as part of its assessment of the candidate’s research. The Head shall solicit letters, informed by these recommendations.

● Each member of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall have a vote on whether tenure shall be recommended. The evaluation of the Department Head, along with the committee discussion report and vote of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the outside letters of evaluation, and the individual reports on research, teaching, and service, along with the entire dossier submitted by the candidate for tenure or promotion, shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

5.2.1 Process for Promotion Review of Faculty on Academic Professional Track Lines.

● The decision of whether to apply for a promotion is at the discretion of the candidate. The candidate should write a memo to the Department Head by May 1 of the academic year for a promotion case that would be submitted the upcoming fall, indicating their desire to be considered for a promotion in rank.

● The Promotion Committee for Lecturer to Senior Lecturer is composed of Senior Lecturers, APT Instructional and Practice faculty at the ranks of Associate and Professor, and tenured faculty at the ranks of Associate and Professor.

● The Promotion Committee for faculty being promoted from Assistant to Associate Instructional Professor or from Assistant to Associate Professor of the Practice would be comprised of faculty at the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor (instructional and practice in the APT track, and tenured faculty.

● The Promotion Committee for faculty being promoted from Associate Instructional Professor to Instructional Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice to Professor of the Practice would be comprised of faculty at the rank of Professor (Instructional and Practice) in the APT track, and Professor in the tenure track.

● The Promotion Committee is responsible for appointing, in consultation with the Head, the membership of individual promotion-review subcommittees.

● The members of the review committee shall study all relevant documents submitted by the candidate as part of their dossier. The dossier and review process will follow the guidelines provided by the college’s documents regarding the hiring and promotion of faculty in academic professional track titles and Texas A&M University “Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.”

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (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.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member’s performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose

● Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.

● Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.

● Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

See University Rule 12.01.99.M1. 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 Process

Annual reviews are normally conducted from February to April with evaluations communicated in writing to faculty members by the end of May. The Department Head will request annual reports from faculty by February 15. Faculty members indicate receipt of the Department Head’s evaluation by signing the copy that will be entered into their personnel file. The faculty member may also provide written comments for the file if they so choose.

6.2.1 Annual Review of Tenure-Accruing Positions.

● The department shall conduct annual reviews of non-tenured faculty on tenure-line appointments. The purpose of these reviews is to assess progress toward tenure and promotion, and to identify both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service over the course of the previous academic year.
● A recommendation to terminate a candidate’s appointment can be made at the end of any annual review period. Major reviews of progress-to-date normally occur in the third year of employment and in the sixth year when the candidate must stand for tenure. A negative midterm review of a pre-tenured faculty member could result in the issuance of a one-year terminal contract.

● Annual reviews conducted by the department will occur in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the probationary appointment. Departmental and college-level reviews are conducted in the third and sixth years of probationary appointment.

● The following procedures will be employed in conducting annual reviews: (a) The Department Head will request annual reports from faculty members under review by February 15. (b) The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint a P&T member to report on each candidate for annual review. To the extent possible, the person will be from the same research area as the faculty member whose work is being evaluated. (c) Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall examine the annual report and other relevant material concerning an annual review. (d) Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall meet to consider each annual review and will make recommendations to the Department Head concerning: (1) an overall assessment of the faculty member’s work and progress toward promotion and tenure; (2) a recommendation on whether the faculty member’s probationary appointment should be renewed.

● The faculty member’s overall evaluation will be the product of the three areas, weighted as follows: teaching 30%, research 50%, and service 20%.

● The Department Head shall review the Committee’s recommendation and shall draft a letter to the faculty member providing an assessment (including specific suggestions with respect to research, teaching, and service, as needed) and indicating whether a person’s probationary appointment will be recommended for renewal. Faculty members indicate receipt of the Department Head’s written evaluation by signing the copy that will be entered into their personnel file. The faculty member may also provide written comments for the file if they so choose.

● The Department Head will meet with the faculty member to provide him or her with an assessment of his/her progress toward tenure and to make suggestions for the ensuing year.

● Faculty members indicate receipt of the Department Head’s evaluation by signing the copy that will be entered into their personnel file. The faculty member may also provide written comments for the file if they so choose.

6.2.2 Annual Review of Tenured Faculty Members

● The purpose of these reviews is to clarify institutional and individual goals, assess the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals, and facilitate the professional development of the faculty member. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. Such assessment will identify both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service over the course of the previous academic year.

● The annual review of tenured faculty members is the responsibility of the Department Head, who may consult with other senior faculty members as appropriate.

● Each faculty member will submit an updated curriculum vitae and a completed “Annual Faculty Report,” which will become a part of the departmental personnel files.

● Tenured faculty members are evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The previous three years, starting with the preceding calendar year is used to evaluate research, and the preceding calendar year is used to evaluate teaching and research to assess the quality of the faculty member’s overall academic record.

● Normally, a faculty member’s overall evaluation will be the product of the three areas, weighted as follows: teaching 30%, research 50%, and service 20%. However, the relative focus on teaching, research, and service may change as faculty member’s careers evolve; as they assume departmental, college, or university administrative positions; or if they are involved with extraordinary levels of community engagement. In
consultation with the Department Head, the weights associated with teaching, research, and service may be renegotiated on an ad hoc basis when appropriate.

- If either the Department Head or the faculty member requests, a personal conference will be scheduled to discuss the written review.
- Faculty members indicate receipt of the Department Head’s evaluation by signing the copy that will be entered into their personnel file. The faculty member may also provide written comments for the file if they so choose.

6.2.3 Annual Review of Faculty on Academic and Professional Track (APT) Lines

- The department shall conduct annual reviews of academic professional track faculty. The purpose of these reviews is to assess, on an annual basis, the faculty member’s performance, and to make such recommendations as seem warranted to assist the candidate in producing the strongest possible record at the time that the candidate wishes to pursue promotion. Such assessment will identify strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching and service over the course of the previous academic year. The Department Head shall conduct the review.
- A recommendation to terminate the candidate’s appointment can be made at the end of any annual review period. Lecturers and academic professional track assistant professors who have been on faculty for more than five consecutive years will be given a one-year notice on non-renewal. Any faculty hired at or promoted to senior lecturer or academic professional track at the associate or full level shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University’s intent not to renew the appointment.
- Each APT faculty member will submit an updated curriculum vitae and a completed “Annual Faculty Report,” which will become a part of the departmental personnel files.
- For Instructional Professors, teaching is weighted as 70% of total effort and service is weighted as 30% of total effort. For Lecturers, teaching is the sole performance category that is considered in the annual review for lecturers and is weighted at 100%.
- If either the Department Head or the faculty member requests, a personal conference will be scheduled to discuss the written review.
- Faculty members indicate receipt of the Department Head’s evaluation by signing the copy that will be entered into their personnel file. The faculty member may also provide written comments for the file if they so choose.

6.3 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.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.4 Time Period of Review

Normally, annual reviews will focus on three years (the previous year and the two prior years) for evaluation of research and on one year (the previous year) for teaching and service. The exception is that with teaching and service, as with research, a rating of “unsatisfactory,” is determined based on three years (the previous year and the two prior years), as described below.

6.5 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual evaluation, performance will be rated using categories: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Excellent” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence over the review window. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.5.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:

- **Unsatisfactory**: A rating of “Unsatisfactory” reflects the absence of a satisfactory or higher level of competence in the classroom for the previous year and the prior two consecutive years, as defined below by “Satisfactory.”
- **Needs Improvement**: A rating of “Needs Improvement” occurs when a faculty member fails to meet the “Satisfactory” rating in the current calendar year and no more than one of the prior two years.
- **Satisfactory**: A rating of “Satisfactory” is associated with a faculty member’s meeting basic classroom teaching expectations as well as demonstrating teaching effectiveness through the incorporation of high impact pedagogical practices. The former includes constructing courses using sound pedagogical strategies, meeting minimum syllabus requirements, adhering to college and university teaching policies and state laws such as posting one’s syllabus and CV on HOWDY, meeting class at the scheduled time, hosting regularly scheduled office hours, responding promptly and professionally to student concerns and problems, submitting midterm and final grades on time, revising syllabus and course pedagogy in light of student evaluations to keep it current and relevant, writing student letters of recommendation, and satisfactory student evaluations (e.g., an average of 4.0 or higher overall teaching evaluations), and teaching independent studies (COMM 485, 491, and 685) and honors contracts as well as participation on graduate and honors thesis committees as appropriate by disciplinary area, rank, and academic track. Evidence of teaching effectiveness through the incorporation of high impact pedagogical practices would include indicators such as featuring high impact practices and engaged student activities in the course syllabus, the development of class assignments or activities that encourage engaged learning, and hosting speakers who address diversity and/or international/globalization issues relevant to the course content.
- **Excellent**: A rating of “Excellent” is associated with a combination of curricular innovation, high levels of student mentoring, evidence of excellent student performance, and excellent instruction in classes that have 100 or more students enrolled as demonstrated through indicators such as the incorporation of high impact pedagogical practices and student evaluations. Indicators of curricular innovation may include the development of new courses, significant course development through technological innovation, substantial revision of an existing course, teaching honors classes, the development of service-learning projects, developing or leading study-abroad programs, participating in or leading pedagogical workshops, contributing to the department’s commitment to diversity and/or international/globalization by attending internal (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence, Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity) or external workshops (e.g., National Communication short course), conference presentations on pedagogy, and pedagogical grants. Indicators of high levels of student mentoring at the undergraduate level may include supervising multiple undergraduate research projects. At the graduate level, indicators of high levels of student mentoring may include indicators such as chairing two or more graduate committees or serving on four or more graduate committees. Excellence in student achievement may be demonstrated through student research success (e.g., conference presentation, publications, research awards) and job or internship placement. Teaching large lecture classes include classes that have 100 or more enrolled students.
- **Outstanding**: Indicators of a rating of “Outstanding” during a calendar year include multiple of the following: College-level or University teaching award (or equivalent), publication of textbook or peer-reviewed instructional materials, completion of a significant pedagogical project, and multiple contributions to the development of high-impact learning environment. The appropriateness of a particular indicator is contingent on the faculty members’ rank, length of service, and academic track.

6.5.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:
● **Unsatisfactory:** A rating of “Unsatisfactory” reflects the absence of a satisfactory or higher level of competence in research for the previous year and the prior two consecutive years, as defined below by “Satisfactory.”

● **Needs Improvement:** A rating of “Needs Improvement” occurs when a faculty member fails to meet the “Satisfactory” rating in the current calendar year and no more than one of the prior two years.

● **Satisfactory:** A rating of “Satisfactory” is associated with a faculty member’s current level of research productivity and the sustainability of their research program. To earn a “Satisfactory,” a faculty member must meet two criteria: (1) Research Productivity: Publishing the equivalent of three substantial peer-reviewed articles in strong venues within a 3-year window or having a single-authored book in its fourth or fifth year of publication. The equivalent of three substantial peer-reviewed articles may include a combination of peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. Co-authored books will be considered on a case-by-case basis. In the case of humanities-oriented research, book proposals, progress on the next book project, and in-press books are considered in addition to published work. (2) Research Sustainability: Indicators such as internal and external grant submissions, conference papers, and additional research artifacts under review are considered as evidence of continuing development of a faculty member’s research program.

● **Excellent:** A rating of “Excellent” is associated with a strong record of research productivity and/or either internal or external validation of one’s research accomplishments: (1) Research Productivity: Evidence of a highly productive research agenda including indicators such as publishing the equivalent of six or more published articles in a three-year window, having a single-authored book in its second or third year of publication. The equivalent of six substantial peer-reviewed articles may include a combination of peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. Co-authored books will be considered on a case-by-case basis. (2) Research Validation: Evidence of research validation includes indicators such as significant A&M research awards (e.g., AFS Distinguished Research Award, Rothrock), divisional or caucus research awards from a national or international communication association such as the International Communication Association or National Communication Association or equivalent national or international professional association such as the American Political Science Association or Academy of Management, keynote address or plenary session at national or international conferences, or PI or Co-PI on a funded external grant from a foundation or federal agency such as the National Science Foundation.

● **Outstanding:** To be rated as “Outstanding,” a faculty member needs to be either: (a) in the top 10% of the rank ordering for faculty publication in the most recent calendar year, (b) publish a single-authored book in the most recent calendar year of the three-year window [co-authored books will be considered on a case-by-case basis], or (c) earn a major national or international research award in the calendar year from a professional communication association such as the International Communication Association, National Communication Association, Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender, American Academy on Communication in Health, and AEJMC or equivalent national or international professional associations such as the American Political Science Association or Academy of Management.

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

● **Unsatisfactory:** A rating of “Unsatisfactory” occurs when the faculty member does not score “satisfactory” for service in the current and the two prior years, based on the definitions below.

● **Needs Improvement:** A rating of “Needs Improvement” occurs when a faculty member does not score satisfactory or higher in the current year but no more than one of the prior two years, based on the definitions below.

● **Satisfactory:** A rating of “Satisfactory” is associated with faculty members: (1) Responsible and conscientious participation in departmental governance activities such as department meetings and/or tenure and promotion meetings. If a faculty member cannot attend such meetings, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the convener of the meeting, (2) Serving on one or two departmental standing or strategic initiative committees or one departmental committee or one college or university committee (e.g.,
Liberal Arts Council, Faculty Senate), and (3) Sustained engagement in professional service. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, professional service might include activities such as serving as a paper reviewer for a conference, reviewing article or book manuscripts, serving as an editorial board member, organizing a conference panel, and serving as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure cases. For Academic Professional track faculty professional service might include, but is not limited to, organizing a pedagogical workshop for the Center for Teaching and Excellence, speaking to departmental or campus groups regarding pedagogy, or serving on the planning committee for pedagogically-centered conference such as Wakonse South. These three activities are judged in a manner that are appropriate to length of service, rank, and academic track.

- **Excellent**: A rating of “Excellent” is associated with faculty members demonstrating leadership and impact within and beyond the department. Some combination of the following activities must be present to receive a rating of “Excellent” depending on rank, length of service, and academic track.

**Leadership.** Significant direction of committees, strategic initiatives, and projects that further departmental, university/college, and disciplinary activities.

  **Departmental Leadership:** Impact on accomplishing departmental goals and priorities through activities such as the completion of projects when chairing committees, chairing a search committee, sponsoring student organizations, and leading significant projects (e.g., leading Academic Program Review, organizing a conference).

  **College and/or University Leadership:** Chairing College and/or University Committees (e.g., CLA Graduate Instructional Committee, Undergraduate Instructional Council) or leading strategic initiatives.

  **Disciplinary Leadership:** Includes indicators such as chairing a division of a regional or national communication association (e.g., National Communication Association), serving on editorial boards for journals and books, conference planning and organization, performing promotion, tenure, and program reviews, serving as panel member for a national funding agency such as NSF.

  **Community engagement:** Includes indicators related to fostering public understanding as well as collaborative projects with community partners regarding communication. Indicators of fostering public understanding and disseminating information to the public regarding communication may include public research reports; reports to business and government; publications in trade magazines, popular press outlets, or academic professional association publications aimed at a non-specialist audience (e.g., *Communication Currents*, *Academy of Management Perspectives*); published white papers series that are “problem-solution” translations of scholarly work or public policy statements; podcasts; YouTube videos and channels; websites, blogs; Twitter; films; and video. Indicators of collaborative projects with community partners may include activities with public or non-university clients in the form of demonstration projects, policy analysis, evaluation research, and needs assessment; developing academic-practitioner collaborations, conferences, and colloquia; and the establishment of initiatives, demonstration projects, and centers.

- **Outstanding:** To be rated as “Outstanding,” a faculty member needs to achieve one or more of the following: chair a highly significant University or College committee or strategic initiative, complete a significant departmental service project, serve as a journal editor for a top-tier disciplinary or interdisciplinary journal, book editor for a top-tier book series, serve as president of a national/international communication association, or earn a national award for service.

6.6 Required Components
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.6.1 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 or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit’s practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- **Teaching**
  - Curriculum development.
  - Textbooks or other pedagogical materials published or written.
  - Course supervision.
  - Undergraduate advising.
  - Involvement in undergraduate research experiences.
  - Activities enhancing the undergraduate student experience.
  - Doctoral committees.
  - Master’s degree committees.
  - Graduate student publications.
  - Notable accomplishments by former graduate students.
  - Activities enhancing the graduate student experience.

- **Research**
  - Books published during reporting period.
  - Refereed journal articles published during the report period.
  - Unrefereed journal articles published reported during the report period.
  - Refereed book chapters published during the report period.
  - Unrefereed book chapters published during the report period.
  - Major book reviews published during the report period.
  - Major entries in reference works published during the reporting period.
  - Other publications during the reporting period.
  - Works accepted for publication during this period but not yet published.
  - Works submitted & under review as of January 1 of the current year.
  - Manuscripts in progress as of January 1 of the current year.
  - Scholarly presentations during the reporting period.
  - Research grants from which funds were received or spend during the reporting period.
  - Research grant proposals, contract proposals, or fellowship proposals submitted during the reporting period.

- **Service**
  - Departmental service & engagement.
  - College-level service & engagement.
  - University-level service & engagement.
6.6.2 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.”

6.6.3 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.

6.6.4 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.

6.7 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:

6.7.1 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).

6.7.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.8 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.”

6.9 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.M1.

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.M1.
Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of University SAP 12.01.99.M1 (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 midpoint 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.
The Department of Communication will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

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

A three-person Peer Review Committee will be established. The department head will appoint one member of the Peer Review Committee. The faculty member undergoing peer review will select one member of the committee. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will head the committee. The membership of the Peer Review Committee will be drawn from full professors that are members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty who are undergoing review cannot serve on a peer review committee while they are under review. In special circumstances such as joint appointments, one committee member may be from outside the department.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- **Current CV**
- Summary of teaching, research, and service activities during the preceding six-year period (three pages or less, single-spaced).
- Additional material can be provided to the review committee by the faculty member or if requested by the Peer Review Committee.

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

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

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

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

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

8.4 Professional Development Review

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

8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

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.

A nominee recommended by the Department of Communication, at a minimum, should be in good standing and should have performed well in each of the three areas:

- Satisfactory in teaching
- Satisfactory in scholarship
- Satisfactory in service (e.g., department, college, university, discipline)
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