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1. Introduction

Our Mission
The Texas A&M School of Public Health is committed to transforming health through interdisciplinary inquiry, innovative solutions, and development of leaders through the Aggie tradition of service to engage diverse communities worldwide.

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

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

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.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.

In the School of Public Health, the following faculty titles, ranks and categories of performance are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Professional Track</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Instructional Assistant (1–2-year term)</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Assistant / Associate / Full</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Assistant / Associate / Full</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant / Associate / Full</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice / Executive / Senior Assistant / Associate / Full</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track / Tenured Assistant / Associate / Full</td>
<td>As Needed / Assigned</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, and/or creative work; service; patient care and/or community-related equivalent; administration; others, as applicable to the School of Public Health and public health as a discipline and profession. 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).

The School of Public Health takes into consideration research and scholarship, teaching, and service in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance in all three areas: scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

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 can include (but not limited to) the following: Instructional Activities and Mentoring. The criteria are listed in Section 5.0.

Although candidates for tenure at the associate level are often protected from heavy doctoral student mentoring, there should be some evidence of the capacity to successfully mentor doctoral students, when applicable. For faculty who work primarily or even exclusively with MPH or undergraduate students, mentoring can be demonstrated in other ways (e.g., publications with students documenting the student contribution, independent student publications, student accomplishments, etc.). As with scholarship, quality matters more than quantity. The criteria are listed in Section 5.0.
Evidence of exceptional teaching (demonstrated by student or peer recognition of creativity and commitment to teaching) is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional teaching provide the grounds for promotion to professor. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1.4, “exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another. Time in rank is not sufficient for promotion: promotion to professor requires continued demonstration of significant achievement.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work
Given that work in public health, by its very nature, crosses disciplines, the “field of public health” is necessarily a broad, flexible term. In some instances, it will intersect significantly with traditional academic disciplines. In others, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within public health. It may represent the novel merger of two fields. Excellence in public health often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also public health practice.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to verify standard scholarly metrics if relevant, but metrics alone are insufficient in complex determinations about the overall excellence of a candidate. Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty and administrators, are responsible for contextualizing contributions and identifying and defining the most relevant evidence. Most candidates will not be equally strong across scholarship, teaching, and service. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate’s rank and fields or sub-field.

Nonetheless, at a minimum, to be considered for promotion and tenure, candidates should have achieved widely recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting the highest standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of public health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence as reflected in scholarly accomplishments.

3.3 Service
Evidence of excellent service to the Department, School, University, or field of public health is also considered in tenure and promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate’s service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field.

3.4 Patient care: Not Applicable
3.5 Librarianship: Not Applicable
3.6 Administration: Not applicable
3.7 Other

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).

The following indicators of teaching excellence and effectiveness are applicable to all faculty (APT or TT) who have teaching responsibilities among categories of performance.
4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to: Instructional Activities, and Mentoring

4.1.1 Instructional Activities
The SPH provides the following indicators of outstanding merit and of merit. Note that these are examples and do not represent a checklist.

Indicators of Outstanding Excellence (Merit) in Instructional Activities
a. Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
b. Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
c. Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
d. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
e. Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum
f. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
g. Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
h. Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s students
i. Exceptional service as a peer evaluator

Indicators of Merit in Instructional Activities
a. Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
b. Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
c. Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
d. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
e. Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
f. Evidence of high-quality class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments

g. Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
h. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
i. Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
j. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
k. Effective service as a peer evaluator

4.1.2. Mentoring
Candidates for professor in departments that offer doctoral degrees are expected to have chaired or co-chaired student committees or demonstrate successful student mentoring in other dimensions. Candidates for promotion to professor must not only demonstrate the capacity to mentor students, but also junior faculty members. Again, the quality of mentorship is vital and mentorship in name only is insufficient. Indicators of mentorship include but are not limited to criteria suggested in University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Appendix I:

Indicators of Outstanding Merit in Mentoring
a. Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
b. Chair of doctoral research committees
c. Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions
d. Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the University Honors program)
e. Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
Indicators of Merit in Mentoring
a. Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction (involving appropriate comparisons to department norms) and student outcomes
b. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
c. Member of graduate student advisory committees
d. Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)

4.2 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
Scholarship, Reputation, Social Impact, and Funding.

4.2.1 Scholarship
There is no absolute number of journal articles or books that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of public health, there is no specific h-Index score that can be considered as a required threshold for all fields or disciplines. In addition, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate all estimate this citation metric differently. While scholarly metrics can be important yardsticks, the question of whether a candidate has achieved a sufficient body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field should weigh all of the following:

Indicators for Scholarship
a. Significance and focus of prior research and research trajectory as measured by the candidate’s career statement, CV, relevant scholarly metrics (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
b. Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals (e.g., the best in the candidate’s field) as measured by metrics such as Scimago Journal Rank and as judged by experts in the candidate’s field;
c. Number and significance of primary-authored (typically first- or last- authored) published articles;
d. Patents that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts;
e. Achievement of an overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

4.2.2 Reputation
Reputation as an independent scholar and researcher who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The Departments and School should weigh all the following:

Indicators for Reputation
a. Faculty being considered for promotion to the associate level with tenure should have, at least, emerging national and international reputations.
b. Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.
c. At both the level of associate professor and professor, evidence of the candidate’s national or international reputation is typically measured by the quality and depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate’s work in letters from leading scholars in the discipline or field in question. See Section III, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.

4.2.3 Social Impact
While social impact is not required for tenure and promotion, a tool such as Altmetrics can provide an objective measure of the social impact of a candidate’s scholarly work, which may be used to augment traditional indicators of academic impact (as defined in Section I.A.1.a above). However, a high level of social impact is not sufficient to compensate for deficiencies in academic impact.
4.2.4 Funding
While in some fields scholarly impact and reputation is not dependent on securing external research funds, and the School does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion or tenure, in all fields research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, external funding may serve as an indicator of the candidate’s research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are insufficient for tenure or promotion. The quality of scholarship is ultimately determinative.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Service
Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure track lines. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional service, defined as “sustained service to the University [that] is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding,” provide the grounds for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, “exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another.

At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g., search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in major conferences and serving on task forces.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of top-tier journals in the field of public health or the candidate’s sub-specialty, chairing significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g., search committees), serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, serving on, or chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, NSF, NIOSH, etc.).

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

The School of Public Health takes into consideration research and scholarship, teaching, and service in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance in all three areas: scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

The criteria for the unit is as follows:
5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Appointment to tenure-track assistant professor implies the candidate meets the criteria for the rank.

5.1.2 Associate Professor: Criteria for promotion and tenure from assistant to associate rank requires demonstration of excellence in public health. This includes
a. Exemplary or above rating in research/scholarly activities
b. Satisfactory or above in teaching/pedagogy
c. Satisfactory or above in service

5.1.3 Professor:
    a. Sustained achievements of exemplary or above rating in research and at least one of the two other categories (teaching or service)
Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure track lines. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in **extraordinary circumstances** can exceptional service, defined as “sustained service to the University [that] is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding,” provide the grounds for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, “exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another.

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.

Academic Professional Track Faculty (research and instructional, clinical, lectures, and/or practice appointments) who are candidates for promotion on non-tenure-accruing track lines should demonstrate excellence in one area, in addition to service. Expectations are not, however, necessarily limited to only two areas, as described below. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2, APT faculty “should have significant responsibilities beyond solely teaching (or research for research faculty).”

Offer letters for APT positions should clearly state whether faculty members are responsible for excellence in teaching (and the number of courses to be taught) or research (and any expectations for external grant support) and the nature of their responsibilities.

As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.4, consideration for promotion normally occurs after five years in a given rank, though faculty may seek promotion earlier.

APT Faculty with Teaching as a Primary Expectation

5.2.1 Instruction for APT – Teaching Focus

At a minimum, faculty with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate proficiency in instruction/teaching and render service contributions related to departmental and college academic needs. Assessment of both performance dimensions, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual.

Indicators of Outstanding Merit in Instructional Activity for APT – Teaching Focus

Instructional Activity: Student evaluations of formal classroom or lab instruction alone are not sufficient to judge instructional proficiency. Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 suggests the following indicators of outstanding merit and merit (note that these are examples and do not represent a checklist):

a. Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
b. Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
c. Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
d. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
e. Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
f. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
g. Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
h. Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member’s students
i. Exceptional service as a peer evaluator
Indicators of Merit in Instructional Activity for APT – Teaching Focus

a. Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
b. Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
c. Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
d. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
e. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
f. Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
g. Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
h. Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
i. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
j. Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
k. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
l. Effective service as a peer evaluator

5.2.2 Mentorship for APT – Teaching Focus
Candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on non-tenure-accruing lines (i.e., Instructional, Clinical, and Executive, Professional and/or Practice if applicable)* should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students effectively. APT with Instructional Emphasis candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship:

a. Student mentorship: Candidates with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for teaching assistant positions, and/or teaching positions.

b. Faculty mentorship: Candidates for promotion to professor with teaching as a primary responsibility must also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the instructional and, if appropriate, research track. Faculty could meet this criteria by serving as an outstanding peer evaluator.

5.2.2 Scholarly Activities for APT – Teaching Focus
Scholarship is not a requirement for promotion to associate professor. Unless the candidate’s APT appointment includes the atypical condition of scholarship among the requirements, scholarly activities are NOT included among the areas evaluated. While APT-Teaching Focused faculty may exercise the option of engaging in research and scholarly activities outside of their regular appointment (e.g., grant-funded summer research), these activities are not used in the evaluation of merit toward promotion. As is true of other faculty, faculty with primary responsibility for teaching should establish a regional, national, or international reputation for teaching, service, and scholarly accomplishments. See Section III, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters.

5.2.3 Service for APT – Teaching Focus
Evidence of significant service to the School, Department, University, or field of public health is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate’s service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field. The category of service is understood broadly to include student advising and pedagogically related activities outside the classroom. It may in addition, include:

i. At the level of associate professor: contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g., search committees), serving on tasks forces, participation in organizing major conferences, providing continuing education to the field, and/or training other teachers.

---

1 This does not apply to individuals who hold positions as lecturers. For these individuals, only requirements regarding teaching apply.
ii. At the level of professor: service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include chairing significant ad hoc, standing committees (e.g., peer evaluation committees), or tasks forces; serving on or chairing significant national or international committees.

Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for promotion. Candidates should provide a statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the Department, School, University, or field.

APT Faculty with Research as a Primary Expectation
This appointment is for faculty who are not interested in holding or being evaluated on teaching and service areas of responsibility but would devote time in the pursuit of research and other scholarly endeavors. APT-Research faculty are not expected to teach as part of their responsibilities. They may, if needed, teach “on occasion” as per DOF Handbook (Sections 2.3 and 4.3). Teaching on a regular basis should not be part of their responsibilities. Commensurately, service to the unit (department, school/college, university) is not an area of responsibility for APT-Research faculty either, unless explicitly included in their contract and the effort is funded in alignment with all policies/regulations (e.g., billed to departmental discretionary account instead of federal research grant).

5.2.4 Research / Scholarship for APT – Research Focus
Research faculty are expected to secure extramural funding to support on average 100% of their salary for their appointment. Other than adhering to any university and system policies regarding funding sources, there is no minimum requirement on the number of grant submissions, nor are there restrictions on sources of funds (e.g., federal grants, state contracts, foundation endowments), nor on funding dollar amounts other than the need to cover their salary.

There is no absolute number of journal articles or books that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of public health, there is no specific h-Index score that can be considered independent of specific field or discipline. In addition, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar all estimate this citation metric differently. While scholarly metrics can be important yardsticks, the question of whether a candidate has achieved a sufficient body of quality research should weigh all of the following:
   a. Significance and focus of prior research and research trajectory as measured by the candidate’s career statement;
   b. Number of first-authored/senior-authored published articles as a measure of both impact and scholarly independence;
   c. Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals;
   d. Achievement of an overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field at the rank sought by the candidate.

5.2.5 Scholarly Impact for APT – Research Focus
Reputation. Reputation as an independent scholar and researcher who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The Departments and School should weigh all of the following:
   a. Faculty being considered for promotion to the associate level should have, at least, “emerging” national and/or international reputations. Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.
   b. Evidence of the candidate’s national or international reputation is typically measured by the quality and depth of recognition demonstrated by detailed knowledge of the candidate’s work in letters from leading scholars in the discipline or field in question.

See Section III, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.
5.2.6 Mentorship for APT – Research Focus
Although not the primary consideration, candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on research faculty lines should demonstrate some capacity to mentor either other faculty or students effectively. Faculty members promoted to professor non-tenure accruing lines must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship.
   a. Student mentorship: Candidates with research as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for research positions.
   b. Faculty mentorship: Candidates for promotion with research as a primary responsibility should also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the research track.

5.2.7 Service for APT – Research Focus
Local-level service (e.g., department, school, university committees) is not a requirement for APT-Research focused faculty. However, evidence of excellent service to the field of public health as part of their scholarly activities is considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate’s service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field.
   a. At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on boards of organizations impacting research (e.g., pharmaceutical company advisory board). Likewise, service may entail participation in research-related components of major conferences and serving on task forces.
   b. At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of leading journals in in the field of public health or the candidate’s sub-specialty, serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, NSF, NIOSH, etc.).
   c. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for promotion. Candidates should provide a statement describing their service and how it has impacted the Department, School, University, or field.

5.3 Process & Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion
Faculty, Departments, and the School all have responsibilities in the process of tenure and promotion. All tenure and promotion discussions are strictly confidential. Dossiers may be made available to candidates only with an Open Records Request (see System Policy 61.01.02). For more information on making an Open Records Request see https://openrecords.tamu.edu. Committee members and administrators may not share a dossier with a candidate without an Open Records Request.

5.3.1 Responsibilities of the Faculty Member
Faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting a dossier that accurately and thoroughly reflects the breadth and depth of their accomplishments, as reviews at all levels are based only on materials included in the dossier.

All Tenure-Track faculty candidates for promotion and for tenure (TT) must:
   a. Provide an accurate and current CV, which should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.)
      i. For Publications/Presentations: Candidates should specify how authorship order is defined in their discipline (e.g., is the primary author listed first or last? is authorship alphabetical? etc.);
      ii. For multi-authored papers, candidates should document their contribution;
      iii. Student authors should be clearly indicated
   b. Provide a statement (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship, teaching, and service. The different elements of the statement should provide selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate it. Detailed instructions
can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines, Appendix H. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

i. **A statement of scholarship** that describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory. Scholars both within and outside the candidate’s discipline who read this statement should be able to “clearly see the number on the jersey.” In other words, this should be a clear, crisp, highly accessible statement of the specific contributions that set the candidate apart, how those contributions have changed the field, and the arc of the candidate’s career.
   - The statement should identify the candidate’s most important papers/books. The candidate should provide no more than three exemplary papers that reflect the core argument about scholarly impact. These three scholarly contributions will be sent to all referees and will be a part of the dossier up to the Dean’s review.

ii. **A teaching statement** that addresses the candidate’s philosophy and impact of methods or approaches relating to student achievement, course content, course development, curriculum development, mentoring, and/or service-based learning. It must include evidence of performance. For promotion to professor, the statement must provide evidence of “higher-level” efforts or leadership (e.g., course or curriculum conceptualization, innovative teaching methods, mentorship of junior faculty instructors, etc.). While a formal Teaching Portfolio is not required (see Section 3.b.ii below), robust evidence of teaching ability is required. Candidates may submit peer evaluations of classroom teaching methods and innovations but are expected, at a minimum, to reflect on peer evaluations. Candidates are expected to provide at least the following:
   - examples of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods;
   - student teaching evaluations in chronological form with appropriate comparisons to Department norms (the Office of Academic Affairs will provide a Teacher Tracker report)

iii. **A service statement** addressing the impact of contributions to the Department, School, University, field, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

   c. Submit and verify other required documentation (as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure ) and provided in summary form by the Office of Academic Affairs;

   d. Submit the names of at least 7 appropriate scholars to serve as potential external letter writers. Dossiers must include five to seven evaluation letters. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. When identifying external referees, the candidate should consider the following:
   - Referee letters will normally be tenured professors (and will, at a minimum, have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring) preferably at institutions belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least institutions with a Carnegie “R1” classification. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.
   - Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a referee in the past 5 to 10 years.
   - Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.
Academic Professional Track Candidates with Primary Research Emphasis: Candidates for Promotion must:

a. Provide an accurate CV, which should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.)

b. Provide a statement (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship, and service. This statement provides an opportunity for the candidate to tell the story of how their work impacts the Department, School, University, or field. The different elements of the statement should provide selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate it. Detailed instructions can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines, Appendix H. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

   i. A statement of scholarship that describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory. Scholars both within and outside your discipline who read this statement should be able to “clearly see the number on your jersey.” In other words, this should be a clear, crisp, highly accessible statement of the arc of your career and major contributions that set you apart.

   ii. A statement regarding educational contributions that addresses the candidate’s contributions to education with an emphasis on mentorship. For promotion to professor, the statement must provide evidence of “higher-level” efforts or leadership (e.g., mentorship of junior faculty instructors, etc.).

   iii. A service statement addressing the impact of contributions to the Department, School, University, field, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

c. Submit and verify other required documentation (as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure) and provided in summary form by OAA.

d. Submit the names of four appropriate potential letter writers. Dossiers must include at least three and no more than six letters external letters that speak primarily to research accomplishments and contributions. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. When identifying external referees, the candidate should consider the following:

   i. Referee letters must have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring, preferably at AAU institutions or Carnegie R1 classifications. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.

   ii. Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a referee in the past 5 to 10 years.

   iii. Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

Academic Professional Track Faculty with Primary Teaching Emphasis: Candidates for promotion must:

a. Provide an accurate CV with personal information removed (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.);

b. Provide a statement (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses teaching, and service. Detailed instructions can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines, Appendix H. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

   i. a Teaching Portfolio‡ that provides selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive)
evidence of the quality and scope of teaching performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. For promotion to professor, the dossier must provide evidence of “higher-level” efforts or leadership (e.g., course or curriculum conceptualization, innovative teaching methods, mentorship of junior faculty instructors, etc.). The portfolio provides an opportunity for the candidate to tell the story of how their work impacts the Department, School, University, or field. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate that theme throughout the portfolio. The portfolio should contain three sections:

- **Statement of teaching approach and philosophy** (which may also include descriptions of course responsibilities, syllabi or syllabi overviews, assignments, case studies or other material prepared for courses)
- **Evaluative material** from others (which may include material from peer evaluations, student letters, honors or awards including grants, invitations to teach from outside institutions or other evidence of reputation as a teacher). The portfolio must include:
  - student teaching evaluations in chronological form with appropriate comparisons to Department norms (the Office of Academic Affairs will provide a Teacher Tracker report)
- **Products of good teaching** (which may include exemplary student work). Candidates are expected to provide robust evidence that includes at least the following:
  - examples of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods;
  - **A Service Statement** addressing the impact of contributions to the Department, School, University, field, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

**c.** Submit and verify all other required documentation (as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at [https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure](https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure)) and provided in summary form by OAA.

**d.** Submit the names of four appropriate potential letter writers. Dossiers must include at least three and no more than six internal letters (Department, School, or University) with an option to request a letter from others associated with an external organization in which the candidate has been active. Any internal letter should come from peers who have some substantive basis for evaluation (e.g., direct observation of teaching). Any peer who provides a letter must review the full dossier (except for other referee letters). At least one letter must come from outside the School. Letters should focus on teaching with attention to appropriate scholarship or service accomplishments and contributions. Letter writers should have achieved the rank the candidate is seeking. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. When identifying external referees, the candidate should consider the following:
  - Letter writers should have achieved, at a minimum, the same rank the candidate is seeking
  - Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

**5.3.2 Responsibilities of the Department** involve initial preparation of a dossier that includes the following for the various faculty tracks:

**Letters for Candidates on Tenure-Accruing Lines:**

**5.3.2.1 five to seven evaluation letters from external referees.** Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. Department Heads should identify at least seven potential external referees. When identifying external referees, the Department Head should consider the following:

**5.3.2.1.1** Referee letters will normally be tenured professors (and will, at a minimum, have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring), preferably at institutions belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least at Carnegie R1 institutions. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU or R1 institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external reviewer is required.
5.3.2.1.1.2 Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to avoid a conflict of interest, candidates will not have collaborated with the referee for 5 to 10 years;

5.3.2.1.1.3 Ideally, no more than one referee from the same institution should be included;

5.3.2.1.1.4 Referees should be contacted via e-mail and documentation should retained;

5.3.2.1.1.5 The report must include a list of all external reviewers contacted, even if they did not receive the dossier for review. The report should briefly summarize referee reasons for declining a review.

5.3.2.1.1.6 Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

Letters for Candidates on Academic Professional Tracks – Teaching Emphasis:

5.3.2.2 at least three and no more than six evaluation letters from referees outside the Department at the University, national, or professional level that speak to a candidate’s teaching, and service accomplishments and contributions. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. Department Heads should identify at least four appropriate potential referees and consider the following:

5.3.2.2.1 Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship.

5.3.2.2.2 The list of potential external letter writers should not overlap with the list provided by the candidate;

5.3.2.2.3 When soliciting letters, Department Heads must draw from both the department head and candidate lists.

Letters for Candidates on Academic Professional Tracks – Research Emphasis:

5.3.2.3 at least three and no more than six evaluation letters from referees outside the Department at the University, national, or professional level that speak to a candidate’s teaching, and service accomplishments and contributions. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. Department Heads should identify at least four appropriate potential referees and consider the following:

5.3.2.3.1 Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship.

5.3.2.3.2 The list of potential external letter writers should not overlap with the list provided by the candidate;

5.3.2.3.3 When soliciting letters, Department Heads must draw from both the department head and candidate lists.

Department Head Responsibilities for All Candidates (regardless of whether on a tenure-accruing or non-tenure-accruing line)

a. Department Heads are responsible for:

i. meeting with and advising the candidate about the strength of the different elements of the dossier and the timing of tenure and/or promotion;

ii. For candidates on any line whose application for promotion to professor is unsuccessful, a minimum of one year is required before resubmission. This only applies for promotions that do not involve tenure.
iii. verification of the dossier before review by departmental committees;
iv. verification of the dossier before submission to the Office of Academic Affairs for submission to
the School Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee
v. following Dean of Faculties guidelines in the conduct of reviews

b. The departmental review committee is responsible for an analysis that provides a meaningful validation
of the case for tenure (not a descriptive summary of the candidate’s work). The final recommendation
must demonstrate that the committee analyzed the case carefully and provide:
   i. Evidence that committee members have read and engaged with the sample of work provided by
      the candidate;
   ii. A clear judgement and, when there is a discrepancy between reviewers, a rationale for the
      committee assessment:
        • Committees may introduce and discuss relevant external data in making decisions. Any
          information introduced should be described and summarized in the Committee
          recommendation letter.
   iii. Consistency in reviews across candidates.

5.3.3 The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA)
The OAA is responsible for the following during the promotion and tenure process:
1. Facilitating high standards of academic integrity and academic freedom;
2. Assuring fairness and equity throughout the processes of promotion, tenure, and post-tenure
   review;
3. Providing individual consultation at the request of faculty and Department Heads on matters related
   to scholarship, teaching, strength of scholarship and teaching, timing of tenure and promotion, and
   best practices for preparing dossier elements;
4. Providing technical support for the School Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure Committee;
5. Communicating changes in standards or procedures to faculty, Department Heads, and the School
   Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee;
6. Disseminating an annotated checklist and timeline to candidates and Departments based on current
   Dean of Faculties deadlines and requirements (which are revised on an annual basis)
7. Verifying candidate dossiers and:
   i. if complete and accurate, delivery to the School Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
      Committee;
   ii. if incomplete or inaccurate, return to appropriate party
8. Assembling, verifying, and submitting the final dossier to the Dean of Faculties.

5.3.4 Responsibilities of the School Promotions & Tenure Committee
The Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee is governed by the Bylaws of the School
Appointment, Tenure, and Promotions Committee, which makes clear that its deliberations are
confidential. It should conduct a searching analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for
tenure. Reports should:
1. be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any discrepancies
   between the recommendation of the School committee and the Department committee
   recommendations or Department Head recommendations;
2. not duplicate the analysis provided by the Department;
3. make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for its assessment;
4. be consistent in its assessment of candidates (e.g., if an h-index is weighed and discussed for any
   candidate, it should be weighed and discussed for all candidates)
5. be consistent in its judgment of candidates (e.g., if it critiques the quality of external referees for one candidate, it must make clear that it applied the same yardstick to all candidates)
   a. not include a vote for any member who had the right to vote on the case at the Department level;
   b. i. such members should not abstain from voting since they are not considered eligible to vote.

5.3.5 Responsibilities of the Office of The Dean
The Dean of the School of Public Health is responsible for an independent analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure. The Dean’s letter of recommendation to the Provost should be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any mixed or negative votes. The Dean should make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for the Dean’s assessment. The Dean adheres to all Dean of Faculties Guidelines and University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

5.4 Procedures for Post-Tenure Review
Each tenured faculty member at the School of Public Health will undergo a comprehensive peer review once every five years, as set out in University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01. Tenured faculty with University/School-appointed administrative duties requiring 75 percent or more time are not subject to post-tenure review. When individuals subject only to administrative review step down from those positions and return to their respective home departments they will be subject to post-tenure review following a period of five years to allow time for re-adjustment to full academic duties and responsibilities. During the period of time that faculty administrators are not subject to post-tenure review, they will not be permitted to participate in or vote on the tenure and promotion decisions of other faculty members in their Department or within the School unless explicitly required by their administrative obligations. Tenured faculty promoted to Professor have been subject to a searching evaluation and will not be subject to post-tenure review for another five years provided that they were successfully promoted.

5.4.1 Responsibilities and Rights of the Tenured Faculty Member.
The tenured faculty member undergoing PTR should provide the following:

- Current CV
- Personal Statement (covering research, teaching, and service)
- Annual Performance Reviews (past 5 years)
- Student Course Evaluations (past 5 years)
- Any other pertinent materials

The tenured faculty member has the right to file an appeal to the Dean of Faculties at any point in the process as per University Rule 12.01.99.M4, Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights.

5.4.2 Responsibilities of the Department Head
The Department Head is responsible for annual faculty evaluations and assuring that faculty members submit complete and accurate materials for Periodic Peer Review to the Office of Academic Affairs.

5.4.3 Responsibilities of the Office of Academic Affairs
The Office of Academic affairs is responsible for verifying that each faculty member undergoing Periodic Peer Review has submitted appropriate materials and, if complete and accurate, delivering to the School P&T Committee. If the materials are incomplete or inaccurate, Academic Affairs will return materials to the Department Head. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for reporting the results to DOF.

5.4.4 Responsibilities of Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee
The Dean is responsible, if necessary, for selecting an ad hoc review Professional Development Review Committee in collaboration with the faculty member and Department Head. In an instance in which the
faculty member contests the findings of the Professional Development Review Committee, the Dean will make a final decision. In an instance in which there is failure to agree on a Professional Development Review Plan, the Dean will forward the matter to the DOF for mediation.

5.5 Professional Development Review
As set out in University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01, if the School P&T Committee concludes that there are grounds for an overall “unsatisfactory” evaluation on the Periodic Peer Review or if a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “unsatisfactory” annual reviews from the Department Head, a professional development review will be initiated. A tenured faculty member may request a professional development review at any time. The Dean and Department Head may exempt a faculty member from Professional Development Review under mitigating circumstances such as serious illness.

Unless the faculty member requests for the review to be conducted by the Department Head, the review should be conducted by an ad hoc, three-member review committee appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Head and the tenured faculty member being reviewed, consisting of faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed. The ad hoc review committee may include faculty from other departments, colleges, and universities if appropriate.

Within one month of notification that a Professional Development Review will be initiated, the faculty member under review will prepare a dossier that includes, at a minimum, a current CV, teaching portfolio, and statement on scholarship, teaching, and service. The faculty member may include any other materials he or she deems relevant for the review. Also, within one month, the Department Head will add any relevant materials to the dossier. The faculty member may respond to those materials and add additional materials at any time during the review process, which should normally last no more than three months.

As per SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 section 4, a professional development review may find that there are no deficiencies, that there are deficiencies but that they are neither substantial nor chronic, or it may find substantial and/or chronic deficiencies.

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 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 at SPH focus on the immediately previous calendar.

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

6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:
- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
• **Exemplary** – 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.

• **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.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of *effectiveness* is the minimum requirement for *satisfactory performance*. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

6.4.2 *Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* are:

• **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of *effectiveness* in research/scholarly activity.

• **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of *effectiveness* in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, for example, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.

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

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

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

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

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

• **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of *effectiveness* in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.

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

• **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both *effectiveness* and *excellence* in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

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

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

6.5.1 *Faculty member’s report of previous activities.*

The exact form of the faculty member’s report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

- Teaching activities (e.g., list of courses and sections taught, enrollment, course development and/or revisions, practica supervised)
- Research activities and outputs (e.g., grants submitted and awarded, funding amounts, collaborative efforts, presentations, publications, technical reports)
- Service activities (e.g., unit, department, institutional, national, and international-level committees and to the profession, grant reviews, manuscript reviews)
- Professional development activities and efforts (e.g., pedagogy improvement workshops, grant-writing seminar, conflict-management training).

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.
- incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- include short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

For examples see 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 department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member’s unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s, director’s, or supervisor’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.
6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written
review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent
meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work,
patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual’s appointment, the
annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the
Department, College, and University.

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action
As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer
review ratings require further action:

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance
An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty
performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned
responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two
areas of faculty performance.

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

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

6.7 Timeline
The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling
department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit
increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be
completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”
6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.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.
7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. Post-Tenure Review

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

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

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

Careers have a life course. A faculty member’s professional development and career continue to evolve after tenure is awarded. Some individuals may concentrate more of their effort in selected areas. The configuration of professional activities should reflect the interests and abilities of the faculty member and the needs of the School and Department. A tenured faculty member’s decision to concentrate his/her professional contributions in particular areas should involve consultation with the Department Head and Dean, both of whom must agree with the configuration of responsibilities. These agreements should be reflected in his or her post-tenure review. The aim is not to require faculty to clear the tenure bar repeatedly. Tenure is awarded based on actual accomplishments, but it also carries the expectation—indeed, the promise—that faculty continue on a satisfactory professional trajectory.

The recommendations of the faculty member’s Department Head, the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee for the School, the Dean, and, if required (see Procedures for PTR in Section IV below), an ad hoc review committee, are used to make determinations about satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance at the time of post-tenure review.

These recommendations are based on consideration of the following criteria:

a) Active pursuit of a program of scholarship (e.g., publication, participation at professional meetings, etc.)

b) Teaching performance (e.g., achieving appropriate teaching workload, providing academically sound course content, use of methods that promote achievement of student learning outcomes and diverse and inclusive learning environments, and accessibility to students)

c) Mentoring of students

d) Mentoring of junior faculty members

e) Responsible participation in Department, School, and University activities and service opportunities

f) Adherence to the policies and procedures outlined in the Texas A&M University System policy and regulations, Texas A&M University rules, Standard Administrative Procedures (SAPs) and guidelines, and School of Public Health guidelines.

---

2 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
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
For the School of Public Health, the post tenure review is conducted at the department-level, followed by the School-level.

The Department Promotion & Tenure Committee conducts post-tenure reviews at the department-level. This is followed by a review performed by the School-level P&T Committee.

8.3 Process
8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee include the standard materials included in a promotion & tenure review, with the exception of the following:
● External Letters
● Grants Charts

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.

3 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
8.3.8 **By no later than May 31**, 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,
8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

University Rule 31.08.01.M2 states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered. For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates the process for this situation. See the Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status. Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.
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