1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Performance Studies is to provide research and creative work, teaching, and service to the campus, university, community, state, and disciplines. The Department seeks to work cooperatively with other departments and university units to further the study, creation, and production of performance.

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 Performance Studies 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 Performance Studies Department 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:
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 titles can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Faculty titles in the Department of Performance Studies are pulled from the Dean of Faculties’ published definitions (see https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/faculty_titles/guidelines_faculty_titles.pdf):

2.1. By definition, a position is considered to be a faculty appointment if the primary title includes the word “professor,” “instructor,” “lecturer,” or “librarian” in the title, regardless of other rank of appointment qualifiers associated with the title. However, not all faculty appointments are eligible to participate in all faculty shared governance activities in the University, Colleges, or Departments, but must adhere to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate or other approved College or Department guidelines.

2.2. Appointments with the word Dean or Provost, and with a specified faculty rank higher than Assistant Professor, are normally tenured faculty appointments. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

2.3. Categories for faculty titles are expected to align as follows (with exceptions requiring Department Head recommendation and approval of the college Dean, and the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost):

2.3.1. Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed
appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments).

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

2.3.3. [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor, and [Adjective] Assistant Professor are non-tenure track appointments. This adjective modifier includes the words Adjunct, Clinical, Executive, Instructional, Research, Senior, and Visiting. Faculty in these appointments will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Faculty with Research in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well. Adjunct and Visiting are normally used for appointments to faculty members whose long term primary employment commitment is not to TAMU. Visiting appointments should normally be used in cases where the faculty appointment is expected to cease after no more than three years (although the appointments are one-year or semester appointments, reappointment is possible), whereas Adjunct appointments will indicate an expectation that a longer term as a faculty member is expected. Departments may use any of these non-tenure accruing appointments for faculty members who consistently and significantly contribute in all three areas, scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, if the unit and faculty member benefit from such a non-tenure-track appointment.

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

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

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: teaching; research/scholarly activity/creative work; 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.

Teaching Load. The College of Liberal Arts standard teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty is two courses a semester; the standard load of APT faculty with lecturer in their titles is four courses a semester; and the standard load for faculty with instructional and practice in their titles is three courses a semester.

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:

- Clear pedagogical goals and careful preparation of syllabi and course materials
- Adherence to University expectations for classroom teaching
- Evidence of addressing diversity and inclusion in student learning
- Maintaining a positive and welcoming classroom environment
- Encouraging and supporting student achievement and academic success (retention and graduation)

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research, scholarly activity or creative work comprises the greatest percentage of tenure-stream faculty members’ effort. All tenure-stream faculty members are expected to: 1) stay current and actively contribute to their fields, 2) produce work in forms appropriate to their fields, 3) contribute to the intellectual/artistic development of their respective field of expertise.

Evaluation of research, scholarly activity or creative work does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information must be considered when assessing this work. Quantitative measures may be valuable but are not in themselves to assess a faculty member’s contributions. Quantity of work is not in itself demonstration of quality or impact. Faculty members’ development and growth, including shifting focus, retraining, or otherwise beginning new research/scholarly/creative endeavors is a factor.
Administrative and heavy service loads may impact research/scholarly/creative activity and are taken into account. Other measures/sources of assessment may include: 1) alignment of research/scholarship/creative work with a faculty member’s goals, 2) quality of venues in which work appears, 3) ongoing influence as indicated by peer engagement with the work. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating performance in research, scholarly activity or creative work are:

- Productivity of original scholarly work or original creative works
- Significant recognition in appropriate venues
- Evidence of development and growth as a researcher/scholar/artist
- Professional engagement and leadership roles

3.3 Service

Service to the Department and College is expected. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to show initiative in service, and contribute their expertise toward the Department’s success. Service requires not only participating in routine committee work but contributing in ways that yields tangible results. Measures/sources of assessment include: 1) active service on Department committees as assigned and reported by committee chairs, 2) service on special projects, task forces, and ad hoc working groups, 3) leadership roles and initiatives, which increase as faculty members advance in rank. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating performance in service are:

- Committee service at TAMU with roles and outcomes
- Leadership roles and achievements in the Department, College, and University
- Special projects that enhance the Department’s mission
- “Invisible” labor such as ad hoc mentoring, counseling and support of students and colleagues, service for other departments or units, organizational activities that promote collegiality and enhance department mission
- Professional service
- Community service reflecting academic expertise

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Performance Studies recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. There are multiple levels of performance of the responsibilities associated with teaching, research, and service, as appropriate for the specific tracks and ranks and may vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each area, based on discussions with faculty (see Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M1).

The University Rules state general criteria for the evaluation of teaching, research or creative work, and service. Those criteria are broad and general, and in clarification, the following standards apply to faculty
members in the Department of Performance Studies. Multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary work will be considered equal to discipline-specific work of comparable quality and impact. Performance Studies faculty with joint appointment with other academic departments or programs may be evaluated according to review criteria that diverge somewhat from these bylaws, as agreed upon by the heads of the specific units and approved by the Dean’s Office. All faculty are expected to comply with applicable rules, policies, and procedures, including completion of required trainings by the date the annual review report is submitted in order to receive a satisfactory rating.

Teaching includes (1) classroom performance in all of its aspects, as well as (2) various types of more individualized instruction and activities. The first category includes participation in team-teaching, revising current courses, developing new courses, developing new teaching techniques, and serving as a guest lecturer. The second category includes such activities as individual tutoring, directing “problem courses,” participating in thesis and dissertation direction, advising students, supervising internships or independent study programs, directing Honors Program projects, and leading Honors Program group presentations.

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
- National, regional, or University level teaching recognition
- Major external funding for teaching initiatives (PI or co-PI) with outcomes that benefit the Department/College/University
- University, College, or other teaching awards
- Leadership in Departmental curriculum re-design or other long-term, sustainable curricular/programmatic change
- Leadership in teaching initiatives in the College with impact
- Active participation in development of community-based educational initiatives with significant impact and visibility
- Documented impact of published pedagogical books, articles, texts, workbooks, software or other instructional materials
- Publication of texts, workbooks, software or other instructional materials
- Publication of books or articles on pedagogy
- Successful substantial curriculum development grants

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
- Positive peer evaluations (including classroom visitation or other types of direct observation).
- High student ratings
- Written testimony from current or former students
- Student achievements, including progress in subsequent courses
- Development and implementation of new courses or course materials and significant revision of existing courses or course materials
- Departmental or college-funded grants for teaching, curriculum development, etc.
- Success of students and student projects in independent study courses
- Chair of graduate student committees
- Service on graduate student committees
The nature of each course taught should be considered in determining competence in teaching. A large section presents particular challenges, especially when taught without the assistance of graduate students or student workers, as does any course with a high percentage of non-majors taking the course to satisfy a requirement. The level of course (100, 200, 300, and 400) also should be considered, as also whether the course is designated specifically for Honors students.

Regarding student course evaluations, consideration should be given to the fact that teaching styles vary greatly from individual to individual and that some subjects are more popular with or controversial for students than others.

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

- Major external grants or other significant external funding (PI or if appropriate co-PI) resulting in production of research/scholarship/creative activity
- Major national or international fellowships at highly regarded research institutes
- An exceptional quantity of high-quality work indicating exceptional productivity in the context of effective teaching and service
- National recognition for lay audiences such as performances on, featured interview on national radio/television broadcasts/streaming services or in documentary films, commentaries on/interviews included in DVD/Blu-ray productions
- National/International prizes
- Editorship of a national or international journal, both ongoing and for stand-alone special issues

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

- Publication of research in refereed journals
- Publication of new historical analysis, theory, criticism or literature in publications otherwise focused on pedagogy
- Publication of books, monographs, original musical compositions, or recordings in well-regarded academic presses, commercial publishing houses, and recording labels
- Revising, editing, and publishing of scholarly articles or collections, including critical editions or performance editions of music or motion pictures, historical analysis, theory, criticism, or literature
- Delivery of papers in professional settings
- Publication of reviews of scholarly or creative work in well-regarded venues
- Invited appearances/residencies in nationally visible and professional venues such as, but not limited to work as an actor, choreographer, composer, conductor, designer, director, lecturer, playwright, performer, dramaturg
- Invited performances of original musical compositions or works for the stage in well-regarded professional venues
• Invited papers and other scholarly or creative presentations
• Any acting, composing, conducting, designing, directing, performing and writing of/in musical or theatrical activities appropriate to the faculty member’s professional pursuits in nationally visible, professional venues
• Commissions and honors; competitive prizes and awards
• The creation and breadth of adoption of software tools by composers, conductors, designers, directors, improvisers or performers
• Citation of one’s work by other scholars and artists
• Participation in paper-reading sessions, seminars, colloquia, or other activities at professional meetings
• Significant self-development activities (e.g., faculty development leave) leading to increased research or creative work, publication, or performance effectiveness
• Critical professional and peer approval
• Securing of grants, contracts, writers’ residencies or retreats and other evidence of competitive support for research and creative activities with attention to the degree of competitiveness of awarded grants, contracts, etc.
• Research and activity that is well received by scholars or other experts who are recognized authorities in the field
• Collaborative and interdisciplinary research is recognized and encouraged

Research or creative work itself may constitute satisfactory work if it is leading towards, but has not yet culminated in, publication or performance; for example, a faculty member may spend considerable time pursuing scholarly or creative work before publication or performance. Ultimately, however, the final publication or performance is the result upon which evaluation is based.

In evaluating research or creative work, both quantity and quality are considered. There is no fixed quantity of research or creative work that is required for adequate performance, and there is no quantity of research or creative work that can substitute for quality. Quality can be assessed by the standards of the profession.

In addition to quantity and quality, research or creative work is evaluated with respect to its intellectual and creative coherence and promise for future development. Indications of growth and development beyond points achieved in the past are desirable, as are indications that the body of work over time amounts to a substantial contribution to the field, as evidenced by citation by other scholars and published reviews of one’s work. Creative work should demonstrate a high level of skill obtained through experience, study and observation.

4.5 Service includes service to the University, the College, the Program, and the discipline, as well as the community, the city, the state, the nation, and the world. Indicators of **Excellence in Service** includes, but is not limited to:
• Initiating and seeing to completion transformational programs at the Department, College or University level
• Service as editor for professional publications
• Securing external grant funding for the Department
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- Initiatives that significantly advance the Department’s strategic planning goals in tangible ways
- Creation and oversight of new, sustainable programs within or outside the Department
- Creation and oversight of sustainable diversity/inclusion related programs
- Leadership

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

- Referee for publishers of books, journals, and music
- Participation as an adjudicator on panels/committees for outside funding agencies, performance organizations, tenure and promotion reviews of faculty at other universities, etc.
- Service for professional organizations
- Service as an adjudicator of professional musical or theatrical competitions or festivals
- Service on Program, Department, College and University committees
- Active participation in the Faculty Senate and Liberal Arts Council
- Administrative activities within the University
- Special contributions to the development of the university or its programs
- Advising undergraduate students
- Advising student clubs and other groups
- Adjudicating student musical or theatrical competitions or festivals
- Public sector service such as production of recordings, archival work, and the development of local, regional, or national public sector music and theatre programs including but not limited to artist-in-residence programs and music and theatre festivals
- Invited speeches and other presentations in public, non-academic settings utilizing professional expertise
- Community service in, or applying one’s areas of, expertise.

Less obvious but still important indicators of service include establishment of professional ties to colleagues in other departments, colleges, universities, and other professional institutions and organizations. This is especially important if such ties are related to activity germane to the goals of the Department (for example, the goal of furthering interdisciplinary work involving both the Department and other academic entities). Emphasis is given to service efforts which promote internationalization and/or campus diversity and which demonstrate recognition in national and international venues.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members are evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty activity (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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 Department of Performance Studies are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.

5.1.2 Associate Professor: (1) an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field; (2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University; (3) an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and (4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member. Associate professors who are not composers will be judged by the quality of the presses that publish their books and articles, the number of books and articles actually published (and importantly which are refereed and by what editors), citations of their scholarship, number of grants awarded and from which agency, and conference presentations. In the case of composers, their impact will be judged by the number of records/CDs of their works that are issued and by which label; how many works they have had commissioned and by which organizations and companies; where their works are played, by whom, and how often; and how many times their music is downloaded and through what platforms.

Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service.

(a) Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The College's expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the College also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.

(b) Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles based on the dissertation should be published as
early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate’s plans for completing work derived from the dissertation and development of a research program beyond the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity.

(c) Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities.

Over time an associate professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of professor.

5.1.3 Professor: A candidate for professor should demonstrate: (1) continuing accomplishment in teaching; (2) continuing accomplishment and some measure of national or international recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and (3) evidence of valuable professional service.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service (See Appendix I of Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion University Rule 12.01.99.M1 http://rules.tamu.edu/TAMURulesAndSAPs.aspx#12).

(a) Rather than simply evaluating the total productivity of a faculty member since tenure (e.g., completion of a second book, series of articles, or a specific number of grant awards), the College will assess as grounds for promotion the quality, trajectory, and impact on the field of a candidate’s entire body of scholarship, as well as the candidate’s national (or international) visibility. More particularly, successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be well established and highly respected figures in their fields, and should demonstrate achievements sufficient to merit such a promotion in any AAU institution aspiring to be a consensus top 10 public university. It is important that a candidate’s standing in the field and the impact of the research record be documented by the department through multiple indicators.

(b) Outstanding teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student achievements, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential, as is a commitment to graduate education and the mentoring of graduate students in departments with graduate programs.
(c) Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution.

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 Performance Studies will be conducted according to the criteria listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

A promotion in the academic professional tracks will be based on excellence in teaching, as exemplified by consistently high student evaluations, strong annual peer classroom visitations, curricular development, rigorous course syllabi, high-impact experiences (e.g., field trips, Honors teaching, undergraduate research), and teaching grants. It is highly recommended that a candidate will work with the Center for Teaching Excellence to develop a teaching portfolio.

A promotion will also be based on a very strong service record. Service may consist of internal activities (departmental committees, college and university committees, supervision of departmental entities like the Costume Shop, etc.) and/or external activities (strong engagement with the community, offices in professional organizations, editorial boards, etc.). Because a faculty member in an instructional rank has 25% of her duties devoted to service, promotion in the service category must be very strong and impactful. It will be the responsibility of both the candidate and the committee to show this through documentation and the evaluation of that documentation.

5.3 Process

The Department Head shall assess the status of all faculty members in the Department annually for purposes of determining eligibility for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion reviews. This determination should be done with the assistance provided by informal consultation with the faculty member. Individual faculty members may also request early tenure review. After consulting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Head shall appoint a Review Subcommittee from the Tenure and Promotion Committee for each faculty member to be reviewed. Such a subcommittee shall consist of a chair from the candidate’s program or a related field, and at least three additional faculty members, a majority of which shall be from the candidate’s program or from related fields in other departments/programs as appropriate. One or more of the members will be responsible for writing a report on the candidate’s performance in each
of three areas: research and/or creative work, teaching, and service. All members of the Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate’s credentials in each area and contribute to the written report. External letters or other documentation may be solicited to supplement the report in each area for mid-term review. For tenure and promotion cases, external letters must be solicited for the research/creative work report. At least half of the solicited letters should be from a list the candidate provides. The results of each stage of a candidate's review process shall be made known to the candidate as the review proceeds.

It is the expectation of the Department of Performance Studies that candidates for tenure will have served the full probationary period to which they are entitled. In cases of clearly exceptional accomplishment the department may wish to propose a candidate for early tenure. A faculty member may request early tenure. Such a request will be evaluated by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Head, and advice given to the prospective candidate. A prospective candidate’s decision to go forward or not to go forward will be honored after advice has been given.

For cases of promotion in the instructional category, the subcommittee shall consist of a chair from the candidate’s discipline or a related field, and at least two additional faculty members, a majority of which shall be from the candidate’s discipline or from related fields in other departments. One or more of the members will be responsible for writing a report on the candidate’s performance in each of two areas: teaching and service. A report on research or creative work will be written only if the position explicitly includes a research or creative work component. Letters of evaluation will be solicited from outside the Department with approval of the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

Materials for Review Provided by the Faculty Member. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide as complete a documentation of his or her work as is possible and to do so in the light of the policies, procedures, and criteria described below. This information shall be provided to the Review Subcommittee. The faculty member should submit a complete up-to-date that which includes the items listed in the CLLA Procedures for Review, Tenure, and Promotion.

The faculty member should also provide the Review Subcommittee with a list of unpublished proposals, and working papers, an enumeration of research projects and creative work in progress with an indication of the stage of completeness. The file presented to the Review Subcommittee should also contain copies of publications and records of performance and/or productions, teaching scores and other teaching-related data, plus any additional supporting evidence, such as unsolicited letters, documents, syllabi, and examinations.

In addition, faculty members will submit a 3-page, single-spaced personal statement placing the above materials and the faculty member's own career in whatever perspective seems appropriate.
Review Subcommittee. The Review Subcommittee shall prepare three draft reports: a research or creative work report, a teaching report, and a service report. The chair of the Review Subcommittee is responsible for the discussion and recommendation report that shall reflect the discussion of the three individual reports and the full committee’s evaluation and recommendation. Any member(s) of the Review Subcommittee may submit a minority report, which shall be appended to the discussion and recommendation report.

Research or Creative Work Report. The Research or Creative Work Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the Research or Creative Work qualifications of the faculty member. The subcommittee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section 4 of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

Teaching Report. The Teaching Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the teaching qualifications of the faculty member. The committee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section 4 of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

Service Report. The Service Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the service of the faculty member. The subcommittee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section 4 of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

Discussion and Recommendation Report. This report, which is prepared by the chair of the Review Subcommittee, should highlight the most important features of the three subcommittee reports, summarize the discussion, provide a recommendation and report the committee vote.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure reviews shall consist of all tenured faculty members in the Department. For the purposes of reviewing a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor, the committee shall consist of all members of the Department who hold the rank of Professor.

The committee shall receive the three draft reports of the Review Subcommittee for the faculty member and vote on whether to continue, tenure, and/or promote the faculty member. The three draft reports prepared by the Review Subcommittee will form the basis for consideration of a case by the Promotion and Tenure Committee along with the candidate’s dossier for review. Following open discussion by the committee, the decision shall be by majority vote, submitted by written secret ballot. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for ensuring that the final version of the four reports, including the Discussion and Recommendation Report, represents the faculty voice. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward its vote, final report, and material from the Review Subcommittee, to the Department Head.
Absentee Ballots. Members of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee who are unable to attend the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting because of professional conflicts (e.g., teaching conflict, briefly out of town on university business with an appropriate travel and leave request on file) may cast an absentee ballot prior to, but not after, the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting.

Members of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee who are unable to attend the meeting for a reason covered by formal university leave policy (e.g., sick leave, jury leave) may cast an absentee ballot prior to the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting. If the reason for the absence arises within the twenty-four hours immediately prior to the start of the meeting and makes it impossible for a ballot to be obtained and cast before the meeting (e.g., emergency hospitalization), the absent committee member will be given twenty-four hours after the start of the meeting to obtain and cast an absentee ballot. In this context, the results of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee vote will not be announced until after all absentee ballots are cast.

All absentee ballots must be accompanied by a written and signed statement from the person casting the ballot certifying that the person casting the absentee ballot has reviewed the complete dossier of the individual under consideration, including the external letters of evaluation.

Department Head’s Reports. After reviewing the committee’s report, the Department Head shall prepare a report for the Dean, which includes a report of the vote of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and an independent personal recommendation regarding the faculty member, which will be shared with the chair of the Review Committee and the Associate Head. The Department Head will also ensure that the candidate’s dossier includes the reports of the three review committees and the report of the chair of the review committee and all supporting materials provided by the faculty member.

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.

Annual Reports and Annual Merit Reviews. The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service; in the case of tenure-track assistant professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will also review performance and supply its recommendation to the Head. In preparation for each year's review, the faculty member will submit a report of the activities and accomplishments during that calendar year to the Head, along with any supporting documentation deemed appropriate. The Head may wish to consult with faculty members about their reports, or faculty members may wish to schedule conferences with the Department Head and/or Associate Head for the same purpose. The conferences can serve to clarify the nature of a faculty member’s work and its presentation. These conferences are not mandatory and should be viewed as a way of supplementing the written report and enhancing communication between the Head, Associate Head and the faculty member. The Head will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report to the faculty member. The criteria for the evaluation are provided below. The Head’s evaluation shall serve as the basis for the recommendation for merit salary increases. This review shall take into account the results of any prior reviews completed for purposes of contract renewal, midterm and end-of-term tenure review, and promotion consideration. Along with prior information, reviews for salary recommendations shall consider the most recently available information supplied by the faculty and generated by the Head.

Salary recommendations shall be based on the three criteria of research or creative work, teaching and service. Other considerations may include salary inequity, compression, and inversion. Procedures for appealing salary recommendations are discussed in the University Rules "Faculty Grievance Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights" (12.01.99.M4).

With regard to the relative merits of the three broad areas of concern in the evaluation of faculty members, no absolutely fixed criterion or "weighing factor" can be sensibly adopted. Accordingly, the use of a criterion for determining the relative merits of research or creative work, teaching and service in evaluating faculty must be sensitively and intelligently applied. Ordinarily, however, for tenured and tenure-track faculty, research or creative work should count 50%; teaching, 30%; and service, 20%. The department head consults the faculty member or the work that services the formula. For example, if a faculty member carries an especially heavy teaching load during a given year, his or her research activity would probably not be as productive. If a faculty member is engaged full-time...
in research because of course buyouts from grants or is on University Development Leave, there would be no basis for evaluating his or her teaching during a given year.

A faculty member who believes that the annual review process did not comply with the department’s published guidelines may file a written complaint to the Dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. See 12.01.99.M1 2.4.3.5

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback, mentoring, and advice regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
  - For full professors, the annual review will address whether the faculty member is sustaining the standard of excellence that a full professor should display commensurate with her rank: continuing to produce significant scholarship or creative works; writing grants; showing initiative in graduate teaching and undergraduate curriculum; mentoring junior faculty; being a leader in service, such as, offices in national organizations, serving on university committees, and chairing departmental committees.
  - For associate professors, the annual review will address whether the faculty member is sustaining a trajectory of accomplishments which will position her for promotion to full professor. The head will advise the faculty member on the quantity and quality of published work, venues of publication, and impact of the work (scholarly and creative); the faculty member’s engagement with the graduate and undergraduate programs; and the importance of service beyond the department.
  - For assistant professors, the annual review will discuss the faculty member’s accomplishments in the light of the departmental and college guidelines for tenure and promotion, not just that year’s achievements. The head will seek the advice of the department’s tenured faculty in evaluating the faculty member’s trajectory on the tenure track. The head should be clear on what things the faculty member should be doing to present a successful case in the sixth year.
  - For ATP faculty, the head should offer an assessment of how well the faculty member is positioning herself for promotion: lecturer to senior lecturer, and an assistant or associate professor to the next rank. While most annual reviews for ATP faculty are typically focused on continuous growth without a specific promotion in mind, it is important for a head to discuss in the annual review letter an ATP faculty member’s potential for promotion and how the faculty member can position herself for consideration for promotion.
- 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

The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service; in the case of tenure-track assistant professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will also review performance and supply its own recommendation to the Head. In preparation for each year's review, the faculty member will submit a report of the activities and accomplishments during that calendar year to the Head, along with any supporting documentation deemed appropriate. The Head will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report to the faculty member. The Head’s evaluation shall serve as the basis for the recommendation for merit salary increases. This review shall take into account the results of any prior informal and formal reviews completed for purposes of contract renewal, mid-term and end-of-term tenure review, and promotion consideration. Along with prior information, reviews for salary recommendations shall consider the most recently available information supplied by the faculty and generated by the Head.

Salary recommendations shall be based on the three criteria of research or creative work, teaching and service. Other considerations may include salary inequity, compression, and inversion. Procedures for appealing salary recommendations are discussed in the University Rules "Faculty Grievance Procedures not concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights" (12.01.99.M4).

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

6.3 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but will also use a three-year window 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 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:

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

**Exceptional.** 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. Documented meritorious accomplishments in innovative teaching.

**Satisfactory.** Appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Meeting classes and teaching competently.

**Needs Improvement.** Minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in classroom teaching (including pedagogical effectiveness, accuracy of material presented, relevance to the topic as defined in the course catalogue), syllabus construction, effective use of research/creative work in teaching, evaluating student work, equitable treatment of students, meeting classes, etc. Evidence suggests danger of falling below the level of acceptability.

**Unsatisfactory.** The absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching. Failure to meet classes; failure to teach competently; failure to evaluate student performance work in terms of rational standards; substandard student course evaluations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:
Most Meritorious. Those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier venues, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election as fellows of professional societies or academies as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Exceptional. Strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity/creative work. Quality and quantity of work far exceeds expectations and standards for active contribution; evidence that professional and academic duties related to research and creative work; extraordinary and significant scholarly achievements; documented significant impact of scholarly/creative contribution(s) through such evidence as citation counts, reviews, mentions in professional blogs or online venues, downloads, performances of compositions, etc., as appropriate to document impact.

Satisfactory. Appropriate evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity/creative work. Work done or in progress meets broad expectations for professional competence; evidence of active contributions to the unit and profession; discharges professional and academic responsibilities as they relate to the candidate’s performance in scholarship/research/creative work; evidence of consistent growth and productivity; evidence of staying current in one’s field; participating in the intellectual life of the department and profession.

Needs Improvement. Minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity/creative work. Evidence suggests danger of falling below the level of acceptability; evidence indicates decline in growth, productivity, and active scholarly contributions to the academic or profession; evidence suggests lack of productivity; evidence leads to questions of professional competence in research or creative work; lack of active participation in the intellectual life of the department and profession.

Unsatisfactory. The absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence research/scholarly activity/creative work. Activity clearly falls below accepted standards of professional competence or exhibits disregard for professional responsibilities related; failure to perform professional and academic duties related to research or creative work; absence of intellectual growth and productivity; failure to stay abreast of one’s field; failure to participate in the intellectual life of the department and profession.

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

Most Meritorious. Those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.
Exceptional. Strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service. Work is significantly advancing the department, university, and/or profession; documented impact in service, leadership, or administrative duties.

Satisfactory. Appropriate evidence of effectiveness in service. Discharges professional and academic responsibilities with competence; evidence of consistent growth and productivity; performing service or administrative duties well and responsibly; contributing to the maintenance and growth of the department, college, university, and/or profession.

Needs Improvement. Minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching. Evidence leads to questions of professional competence and lack of active participation in the intellectual life of the department and profession.

Unsatisfactory. The absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in service. Performance clearly falls below accepted standards of professional engagement with the department, College, University, or the profession.

6.5 Required Components

6.5.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities. See Appendices for Annual Report Forms for tenure-stream and academic professional track faculty. See also Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head’s, program director’s, or supervisor’s evaluation and expectations

The Head 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. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an
“Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

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

6.7 Time-Line

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

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.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

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

7.2 **Process**

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

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

7.3 **Feedback from midterm review**
The Department of Performance Studies will conduct the midterm review following the College guidelines as 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 committee comprised of three faculty members will constitute the Peer Review Committee for tenured faculty in a given year. Required ranks of committee members will be determined based on faculty to be reviewed, as noted below.

- Two Professors will review Professors undergoing peer review.
- The full committee of three will review Associate Professors undergoing peer review.

In any given year, those tenured faculty who are undergoing peer review will not be eligible for election to the committee, but all tenured faculty will be eligible to vote for the committee members. If the list of eligible faculty members is insufficient to assemble the required committee, committee members acceptable to a majority of the voting (tenured) faculty may be recruited from tenured faculty outside the department.

8.3 **Process**

8.3.1 **Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee.** The Head will provide committee members with the written criteria for meeting the standards of satisfactory performance as listed in the Department of Performance Studies Guidelines for Annual Reports and Reviews, Mid-term, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Reviews. The Head will also provide
the annual review materials turned in by the faculty members to be reviewed;
annual review forms from the previous five years or since the last peer review whichever the candidate prefers; and,
Faculty members undergoing review may include materials in addition to those called for in the regular annual review process.

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 Department of Performance Studies guidelines and are consistent with annual evaluations.

The Peer Review Committee will produce a report indicating a “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” performance to the Head, with explanation. Reports of “unsatisfactory” require unanimous agreement by the Peer Review Committee.

The Head will produce an independent evaluation of performance as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.”

Report of Peer Review to Faculty Member. The Department Head’s annual review report to the faculty member undergoing peer review must incorporate the Peer Review Committee’s assessment.

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.

Selection of Faculty Members to be Reviewed. Faculty members who have not undergone peer review within the past six years will be notified that they will undergo the process by the end of the spring semester. However, depending upon the number of tenured faculty and the years since an individual’s last peer review, it is possible that in some years no review will take place.

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

Procedure in cases of “unsatisfactory” reviews. If the Head’s or the Peer Review Committee’s assessments are that the faculty member’s overall performance is “unsatisfactory,” then the Department Head and the Peer Review Committee, if engaged this year, shall (together or separately, at the faculty member’s discretion) informally discuss the assessment with the faculty member.

After the discussion(s) with the faculty member, if the Department Head’s and the Peer Review Committee’s (if involved) assessments of “unsatisfactory” performance are unchanged, then prior to sending an official letter of evaluation to the faculty member, the Head shall share information about the faculty member’s performance with all members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at the rank of the faculty member and above. The Head shall ask for a vote concerning the assessment of unsatisfactory performance. A majority vote of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, excluding those who have served on the Peer Review Committee, shall determine whether the Head and the Peer Review Committee have demonstrated with a preponderance of the evidence that the faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory. The outcome of this vote shall be conveyed to the faculty member. No evaluation of “unsatisfactory” may be transmitted to the Dean as part of the peer-review of tenured faculty unless the Head and the Peer Review Committee satisfy this burden of proof.

According to University policy, a faculty member who receives three consecutive annual reviews of “unsatisfactory” must undergo a professional review by an ad hoc review committee appointed by the Dean. (See University Rule 12.06.99.MI, Post-Tenure Review, 1 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.)
Occasions when faculty fail to meet professional responsibilities in ways that are grossly unprofessional, negligent, or illegal are covered by specific TAMU policies and may result in immediate action by the department head. This review policy does not apply in such situations.

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6.6.1) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.3.4) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.9). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director-supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

The Department Head will select three faculty members within or outside the Department whose research/scholarly activity/creative work or other expertise are appropriate for review of the faculty member and their work. The review committee will be vetted by the faculty member before formal appointment by the Dean. Once appointed, the committee will meet with the faculty member at least once for consultation, and thereafter as appropriate to address the issues.
The general procedures for post-tenure review are specified in the University Rules (http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf). There it is stated that a professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory overall annual reviews. The professional review procedures as spelled out in the University document will apply (http://rules.saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf).

In keeping with the traditional concept of appropriate cause for dismissal, a rating of unsatisfactory is inappropriate unless the performance of a faculty member clearly falls below accepted standards of professional competence or exhibits utter disregard for professional responsibilities. Unsatisfactory performance does not consist, then, in being the lowest-rated teacher in the department, or in failure to publish or perform. Rather, it is constituted by failure to perform professional and academic duties and by complete absence of intellectual growth and productivity. Given the standards a faculty member must satisfy to qualify for tenure, it is to be expected that such cases will be extremely rare. In the absence of mitigating circumstances, the following might be taken as indications of unsatisfactory performance:

- Research or Creative Work - Failure to stay abreast of one's field; failure to participate in the intellectual life of the department and profession.
- Teaching - Failure to meet classes; failure to teach competently; failure to evaluate student performance in terms of rational standards; substandard student course evaluations.
- Service - Failure to participate in service activity.

Where the performance of a tenured faculty member in a given area is in danger of falling below the level of acceptability in any category, a rating of “Needs Improvement” will be given. A rating of “Needs Improvement” must be accompanied by a clear elaboration of the deficiencies to inform a development plan. The Department Head and Associate Head (if appropriate) will work with the faculty member to devise an improvement plan to correct the deficiency or deficiencies (in accordance with SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 2.5). Where possible, the faculty member's responsibilities may be adjusted to take account of the situation. In all cases, the appropriate resources of the University should be made available for improving an individual's performance.

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. 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)

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
- Set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
- Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
- Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.
8.6 **Assessment**

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the Professional Development Plan.

8.7 **Completion of the Plan**

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the Professional Development Plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Professional Development Plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

8.8 **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).

8.9 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.M1 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.

Appendices
Annual Review Form Tenure-Stream Faculty
Annual Review Form for Instructional Faculty
Annual Review Form for Lecturers
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