1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Science is to provide the highest quality science education to all Texas A&M majors, while leading in fundamental scientific research. The faculty of the College of Science deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of scientific leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College of Science for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of Texas A&M University and the College of Science; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

In this document, the College of Science clarifies from its perspective the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding evaluation of all faculty positions in the college. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, department heads, department and college evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Science. Evaluations of one’s colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the college depends upon the quality of these reviews.
This document articulates general College of Science 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.

It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the college. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to their specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities and/or compensation. These documents are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the College of Science Executive Committee, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The college has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities, however, most focus on some combination of research and teaching. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the college recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the college, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable college evaluations. Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

I. Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the
University and college in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

**Tenure.** Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and academic citizenship and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from university, college, and departmental perspectives. The College of Science conducts formal college-level reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the College of Science clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Dean of Faculties).

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor**, **Associate Professor** and **Professor**.

**Assistant Professor.** The position of Assistant Professor is a tenure-track appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and academic citizenship and service. Faculty members in the Assistant Professor title will hold doctoral degrees, develop externally funded research programs, and teach graduate and undergraduate courses. The amount and nature of the faculty members' service contributions are likely to differ, but Assistant Professors are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Associate Professor.** The position of Associate Professor is a tenure-track or tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and academic citizenship and service. Faculty members in the Associate Professor title will hold doctoral degrees, have developed externally funded research programs, and have a record of effective teaching of graduate and undergraduate courses. A record of service contributions to the department, college or university are expected of Associate Professors, along with the expectation of being good academic citizens.

**Professor.** The position of Professor is a tenured appointment for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching, research and academic citizenship and service. Faculty members in the Professor title will hold doctoral degrees, have established, and sustained an externally funded research program and have a record of effective teaching of graduate and undergraduate courses. A record of service contributions to the department, college, university, or national organizations are expected of Professors, along with the expectation of being good academic citizens.

**II. Academic Professional Track**

The College of Science recognizes the vital contributions that all faculty members make to our mission and is committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation
and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members is essential. Decisions on promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the college and department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote, and retain APT faculty members, whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the college and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the College of Science for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching or research, and service or scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Departments may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic professional track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic professional track rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines across departments or programs. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence to be used for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Research faculty members are also in the College of Science academic professional track and are usually under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the College of Science include the Professorial and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial track includes adjectival designations, such as “Instructional”, “Research” and “Visiting”. APT ranks in the College of Science are the following modified titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Senior Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Assistant Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Associate Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Professor, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer.

**Instructional Track**

Appointment to APT instructional faculty rank generally requires, at a minimum, a master’s degree and evidence of superior teaching experience. APT faculty can, in some circumstances, be assigned to graduate courses. In such cases, the faculty member should have unique qualifications and be properly credentialed. Assignments to teach graduate courses should not be made without approval of the Department Head.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching or related field. Instructional Assistant Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.
**Instructional Associate Professor.** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching or related field. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Teaching performance and additional contributions in scholarship and service shall be part of the annual evaluation. They are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Instructional Professor.** The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Such scholarly or service contributions shall be recognized broadly, inside or outside the TAMU community. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching or related field. Instructional Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials. Instructional Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Lecturer Track**

**Lecturer.** The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to make contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Lecturer title will normally hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching or related field and primarily be engaged in instruction. The standard teaching loads are determined by the department. Lecturers engaging in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities evaluated in annual reviews.

**Senior Lecturer.** The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title will normally hold a master’s or terminal degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. The standard teaching loads per semester are determined by the department. Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation. Senior Lecturers engaging in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities evaluated in annual reviews.

The title of Assistant Lecturer is rarely used in the College of Science. In those instances, the faculty member will normally hold a master’s degree, but not a terminal degree.

**Progression between APT tracks.** The College of Science allows flexibility in how departments handle transfer of faculty members between the lecturer and instructional APT tracks. For example, progression from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor could be considered a promotion based upon the evaluation criteria and evidence of teaching
effectiveness and excellence described in this document. Alternatively, a department could consider such a track transfer to be a reclassification of title and not a promotion. Importantly, departments must be consistent in their progression/promotion processes, articulate them clearly in departmental evaluation and promotion guidelines, and make these processes clear to their faculty members as they progress through their careers.

Research Track

Research Assistant Professor. The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. For Research Assistant Professors engaged in teaching, those educational activities shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

Research Associate Professor. The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Associate Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. For those Research Associate Professors engaged in teaching, those educational activities shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

Research Professor. The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent scientific research and meritorious scholarly reputation and appropriate service credentials. For those Research Professors engaged in teaching, those educational activities shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

The College of Science uses other instructional titles (e.g., Senior Professor, Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor). Additionally, titles such as Executive Professor and Professor of the Practice are used in a more limited manner. Credentials and responsibilities for these titles are department-specific and appointments require Dean’s approval.

Multi-year Instruction Track Appointments

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 governing Fixed Term APT Faculty (http://policies.tamus.edu/12-07.pdf) does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore the following College of Science guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate’s qualifications, as per the criteria stated in departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the Department Head and approved by the Dean.
Faculty members appointed to *Instructional Associate Professor* will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with Dean's approval.

Upon promotion to *Instructional Professor*, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with Dean's approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed, but it is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with University standards ([University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion](https://www.tamu.edu/)). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

### 3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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; academic citizenship and service; and/or administration). 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 nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable college evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and academic citizenship and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in teaching, but also in at least one additional area, either research/scholarly activity or academic citizenship/service.

### Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the college. The value of a faculty member to the institution determines the degree to which the institution is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the institution of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the college, their department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the college, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for
continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable, from the College of Science perspective, for annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following sections.

3.1 Teaching
Teaching is central to the mission of the college, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). 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 easily to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but are not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Departments shall develop guidelines for the evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching, including specific assessment methods and measures. These shall include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) student learning and 5) comparison of student DFQ rates. Additional relevant information on DFQ rates of a particular course or section may be provided for fuller context.

Essential qualifications for College of Science instructors include the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished science teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance includes coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used for assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development is an important measure of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a college, University, or professional society outstanding teacher award.

With regard to teaching evaluation, a Teaching Evaluation Table should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>BIOL111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BIOL112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units and that additional information or columns included by departments are acceptable. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 **Teaching quality.** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one’s discipline.

3.1.2 **Essential pedagogy.** The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.1.3 **Educational innovation.** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are, taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

3.1.4 **Teaching professionalism.** Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation, and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students’ classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

3.1.5 **Impact upon students.** A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 **Degree of teaching responsibility.** The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to college teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

3.1.7 **Promotion of active, high-impact learning.** Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, as possible.

### 3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful scholarly activity is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. For purposes of the college, research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration (whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective), scholarly application, invention or innovation, or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full
Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, preferably, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated science, published work or production of patents. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking, and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT faculty titles may require scholarly work beyond teaching. Scholarship is broadly defined here as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers, and communicated. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge, as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching. Departments shall develop guidelines for the evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in scholarship, including specific assessment methods and measures.

The college expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. The relevant criteria considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 **Intellectual curiosity.** The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.

3.2.2 **Scientific communication.** Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

3.2.3 **Research funding.** Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.

3.2.4 **Collaborative approach.** Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued by the College of Science.

3.2.5 **Education contributions.** Educating the next generation of scientific leaders and researchers is an important mission of the college.

3.2.6 **Contributions to the field.** Scholarly activities, such as board membership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

3.2.7 **Acknowledgments of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgments of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.

3.2.8. **Generation of patents.** Inventive or innovative activities resulting in the production of patents are considered evidence of scientific impact.

3.3 **Academic Citizenship and Service**
Faculty academic citizenship and service are central to the mission of the college. The college must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international
prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the
collection that a faculty member may make through their academic citizenship and by serving
on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the college and the
university. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ
as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members
are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Academic citizenship** is defined as a measure of one’s commitment and ability to work
effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the
department, college, university, and profession through service. The key dimensions of academic
citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues.
Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other’s abilities
to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships
between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and
service. Collegiality is used here in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation
among colleagues. It should be noted that collegiality, if used in faculty evaluation inappropriately,
can lead to practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm
and may also threaten academic freedom.

The College of Science will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital
to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty
disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of
collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks
and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality
interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2
states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of
professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” is a requirement
for promotion and tenure.

**Academic Service** contributes to the College of Science mission of advancing science locally,
in the State and Nation. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the
operation of the department, college, and the university. Furthermore, faculty are expected to
contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic
programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public
at-large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve at-large in a professional capacity that enhances
the stature and reputation of the College of Science.

The scope of college activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many
activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in
committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional
development programs. The College of Science also expects its faculty members to render
extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at
large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens,
executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are
expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in
the department, college and/or the scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty titles may require service to the unit beyond teaching. The contribution that an
APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day
functioning and progress of the department, the college, and the university. The amount and
nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career development. Departments shall develop guidelines for the evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in scholarship, including specific assessment methods and measures.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

3.3.1 **Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member’s collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

3.3.2 **Professional communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators and must work toward solutions of problems.

3.3.3 **Departmental engagement.** Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one’s academic rank.

3.3.4 **Colleague/Student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.

3.3.5 **Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees, or administrative roles (e.g., section chief, assistant/associate department head, or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 **Service to the field.** Academic citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The College of Science recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Most obviously, the indicators of excellence and effectiveness of performance may vary among faculty on academic professional tracks and those on tenure track. Indicators of excellence and effectiveness will differ for faculty whose roles are primarily in the area of research, as opposed to teaching. Additionally, performance and its 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. Rather, the College of Science provides guidelines for the development and implementation of departmental faculty evaluation processes. Nonetheless, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations of teaching, research/scholarly activity, academic citizenship, and service. The following list outlines only some of the many indicators that department may employ in the evaluation and promotion of their faculty ranks. Documentation of excellence and effectiveness during faculty evaluation is best provided by peer review.

4.1 **Indicators of Excellence in Teaching** can include, but are not limited to:

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by department heads, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
• selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
• contribution to new instructional program development,
• serving as a chair, co-chair, or member of numerous graduate advisory committees,
• publications with authorship by trainees (i.e., undergraduate writing education),
• successful curriculum development grants, and
• obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching can include, but are not limited to:

• positive evaluations in postgraduate questionnaires (if applicable) to evaluate knowledge and preparation,
• excellence in service teaching in a course within one’s discipline that contribute to success of another college’s students,
• evidence of rigorous and equitable grading (i.e., DFQ rates that meet college expectations),
• development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
• coordination of multi-disciplinary courses,
• development of a new course, Honors course, or major revision of an existing course,
• direction of independent student research,
• promotion of mentoring of colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality,
• development of innovative pedagogical materials or strategies for active learning.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity can include, but are not limited to:

• obtaining of funding for scholarship activities,
• active participation in a prominent area of research or signature program,
• active participation in research within a University-recognized center or institute that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary,
• publication of peer-reviewed scientific articles, technical reports, or monographs,
• presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings,
• publication of papers of original research or case reports in proceedings of regional professional meetings,
• recognition from peers by obtaining awards in the field
• invitations to present at national or international meetings,
• contribution of area of expertise to scholarship of others,
• authorship of review articles,
• preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs,
• preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science,
• recognition from peers in the field (e.g., awards, honors, invitations to present),
• authorship of textbook or book chapters,
• evidence of leadership or significant contribution to successful team research/scholarly activities,
• national attention, as demonstrated by special recognition,
• key participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
• dissemination of teaching materials at local, state, or national workshops,
• creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
• patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements.

4.4 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity** can include, but are not limited to:

• recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards,
• invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings,
• publications of original research in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines,
• presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings,
• favorable citation index listing of research publications,
• significant competitive external funding for research,
• effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention,
• key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
• significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements,
• coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary investigations and projects, including a variety of international programs,
• publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s),
• recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars,
• evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface of academic disciplines,
• originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspectives on, and uses of information and/or data,
• active participation in a University-centered scholarly or creative activity,
• contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others,
• sharing of knowledge about teaching within faculty groups, and
• adoption of innovative and communicated pedagogical methodologies by others.

4.5 Indicators of **Excellence in Academic Citizenship and Service**, can include, but are not limited to:

• engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
• making personal contributions to the public mission of the University to forward its programs for the public good,
• engaging in activities that foster diversity, inclusion, and a culture of respect,
• serving as an effective member of a committee within the department, college, or university,
• serving as an effective chair of a committee within the department, college, or university,
• serving as an officer or board member in a local, state, or national professional organization in one's discipline,
• effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
• attraction of significant development support,
4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Academic Citizenship and Service, can include, but are not limited to:

- recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs,
- striving to achieve departmental and college goals and mandates,
- engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,
- making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group,
- engaging in the creation of a University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance,
- serving on departmental, college, and University committees and task forces,
- contributing to the promotion of unit diversity, inclusion, and climate,
- serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,
- contributing to external developmental efforts,
- serving on a mentoring committee for early career APT faculty,
- promoting significant teaching, research, or service experiences for students,
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
- serving as an advisor to student organizations,
- serving in other administrator roles (e.g., section chief, assistant department head, or director title) within the department, college, or university,
- participating in K-12 or other public outreach,
- participating in publications describing the effectiveness of community-based projects, and
- presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science.

4.7 Collegiality in Academic Citizenship and Service

Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues united in a common purpose. Supportive colleagues are important in the practice of good academic citizenship and service. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Collegiality, if used in faculty evaluation inappropriately, can lead to practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm. However, consistent behavior that undermines academic citizenship interferes with the missions of the university, college, and department. Evidence of such undermining behavior might necessitate an unsatisfactory evaluation of a faculty member.

4.7.1 Indicators of Unsatisfactory Academic Citizenship and Service, can include, but are not limited to:

- persistent pattern of unprofessional behavior
- persistent pattern of engaging in activities that impede the achievement of organizational goals and mandates,
• persistent pattern of engaging in personal attacks on others,
• persistent pattern of bullying or intimidating others, and
• persistent pattern of engaging in activities that discourage interaction among students, staff and faculty colleagues from different cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same timeline for all promotions.

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, academic citizenship, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the College of Science are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, research, and scholarship, with attention to academic citizenship and service. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and sustainable research support, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities.

5.1.2 Associate Professor. Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the college and indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual’s specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

5.1.3 Professor. Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.
For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

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 activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

The promotion process for APT faculty is unique in the several ways, as stated in the Dean of Faculties guidelines (https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure). Importantly, the university does not require support letters for APT faculty promotions. However, The College of Science does require, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. Departments can request external letters if they desire to do so. No letters are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by a department committee, department head, college committee and dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the dean of faculty, for approval by the provost and president.

Annual evaluation and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the quality, significance, and impact of the teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments (where applicable) areas follows:

5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as a lecturer (or equivalent),
- excellent annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an instructional assistant professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an instructional associate professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership,
- evidence of scholarly activities or service, as applicable,
- internal/external grant funding to support teaching or scholarly activities,
- invitations to teach at domestic or international institutions,
- state, national or international outstanding teaching awards,
- placement of students in academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the college, university, or community, and
- significant service to state, national or international organizations.

5.3 Timing of Promotion and Tenure Review
The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by University regulations that define the procedures for the mandatory (penultimate year) review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required. The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows: Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of the tenure consideration year. Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: leave taken without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate’s control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head.
and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters, and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, approximately the first day of November.

5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers
The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate’s personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided in the summer semester (the date determined by the department), so that it may be included with requests for outside letters. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers (and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers). The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee may also request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier includes all elements required by University regulations. No additional documentation is required by the College of Science.

Dossiers for promotion and tenure review. Of the two, formal college-level reviews (mid-term and promotion and tenure), the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. Still, there is an important connection between the midterm review and the tenure review. The promotion and tenure review will take into consideration, in part, whether or not the faculty member’s post-midterm activities incorporated the feedback, recommendations and requests at the midterm review. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate’s tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion and departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the vote.

Candidate’s curriculum vitae and statements. The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member's entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate. Publications and other scholarly contributions are differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statements clearly articulate the accomplishments of the faculty member and provide context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts are defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities is clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service are clearly represented with an indication of their importance.

Outside letters of evaluation. To enhance the effectiveness of the candidate’s dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. Along with the candidate, the Department Head and departmental peer review committee provide recommendations on reviewers, with the Department Head selecting the individuals who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate. Ideally, most reviewers will be full
professors at leading and/or peer institutions. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. All letters for P&T candidates must be “arm’s length”. Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm’s-length will not be considered. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity.

5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews
The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate’s dossier is correctly assembled lies with the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Each department determines the nature of its Promotion and Tenure Committee and establishes written guidelines to govern departmental promotion and tenure recommendations. A copy of the departmental information is available for distribution to the faculty. Promotion and Tenure Committees may be constituted in several different manners as allowed by University promotion and tenure guidelines. For example, the committee may be appointed by the Department Head or elected, with terms of appointment determined by the department. Alternatively, the committee may consist of all faculty members of appropriate rank within the department. When reviewing the dossier, the departmental committee is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams. The Review Committee shall compile and submit a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table with their recommendation, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). This table will contain the following information for all years (or last 5 years) since the previous promotion: a listing by semester and year of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the required Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>BIOL111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BIOL112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member’s teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures. The bylaws of each department shall indicate the specifics of their review process. The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee is
responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on credentials of outside referees. The committee also prepares individual reports evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. Following a confidential committee-wide discussion, the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, no matter how constructed, conducts an anonymous vote (i.e., Yes, No, Absent or Abstain/Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.

**Recommendation of the Departmental P&T Committee.** The candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the Department Head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member’s promotion/tenure recommendation packet. The department may choose to have the entire tenured departmental faculty provide the official P&T vote as a "committee of the whole" or provide a vote in addition to that of the P&T committee for the record. Such an additional vote, if conducted, also becomes a part of the faculty member's promotion packet. The departmental bylaws will indicate whether absentee balloting is permissible and under what circumstances. If absentee ballots are permitted, the bylaws shall indicate the voting procedure.

**Recommendation of the Department Head.** The Department Head prepares and submits an independent recommendation to the Dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to the College of Science. The department head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under consideration. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. Each faculty member shall be informed, through the department head, of the recommendations at each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process and this information shall be transmitted in writing.

**5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review**
After receipt of the candidate’s dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee’s teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of evaluation information (student evaluation scores for individual courses, narratives based on peer review, etc.), the dossier is returned to the Department Head for further action by the departmental committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the departmental review committee evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

**College of Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The Dean of the College of Science, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee consisting of five full professors, one representing each academic department. Each member is appointed for a staggered, three-year term. This college committee reviews dossiers and departmental recommendations for all faculty members undergoing mid-term review and promotion and/or tenure considerations. There is no chair of this review committee, but rather dossiers are distributed equally among the members.
**Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.** College-level reviews are thorough and objective, recognizing that all cases have strengths and weaknesses to be discussed and addressed in final reports, including the quality of the research, teaching contributions, and to a more limited extent, involvement in service. Key objectives of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee are to ensure equitable review across college units and evaluate cases without departmental advocacy. Departmental representatives present their units promotion cases and participate in discussions, as they are positioned to provide the greatest insight into departmental contexts and requirements. To avoid potential conflict of interest, however, departmental representatives are recused from voting on the cases from their own departments. Thus, four committee members vote on each faculty member's dossier. Individuals associated, in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03), with the faculty being considered for promotion and tenure or promotion to full professor may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or votes on that case. In accordance with University recommendations, the Dean will not attend the meetings of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Associate Dean responsible for faculty matters attends the meeting to hear discussions and answer questions, as appropriate. Committee deliberations are conducted in the strictest confidence. Promotion and tenure reviews occur in the fall semester.

In the case of mid-term reviews, the College P&T Advisory Committee is responsible for review and discussion of each packet. No vote is conducted, and no documents go forward from the college. Thus, no recusal of departmental representatives is required. Recommendations are passed from the committee to the Department Head for preparation of a letter to the candidate, signed by the Head and Dean. Mid-term reviews occur in the summer semester.

**Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The committee shall make a clear recommendation on each promotion and tenure case in a memorandum to the Dean. The committee summarizes the general achievements under consideration and explains their perspective on the faculty members' strengths and weaknesses for promotion and/or tenure. The memorandum for each candidate is limited to one page in length.

**Recommendation of the Dean.** The Dean shall make use of College-level reviews in their deliberation and inform the Department Head of the vote of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Dean is responsible for preparing a recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost. When the Dean does not concur with a recommendation, the Dean should inform the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for that decision. Importantly, it is the responsibility of the Dean of Science to ensure that the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member is based on the individual's professional performance and that the denial of tenure shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

**5.7 Promotion to Professor**

The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor. However, the review committee composition may be different in the case where the Department T&P Committee includes members who are Associate Professors. Associate Professors may not participate in a review for promotion to Full Professor. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and Departmental T&P Committee should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate’s international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a
Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see sections 3.1 and 5.5 above). For promotions to full professor, the Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years (whichever is shorter).

5.8 Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors
Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

5.9 Joint Appointments
Joint appointments in cases where a scholar’s expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the College of Science. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the College of Science affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with university, college and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the department must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty.

5.10 Appeals
University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual’s professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

6. Annual Review
Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this document, the College of Science provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the college. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department Heads, department and college evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Science. Evaluations of one’s colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions.
required of any faculty member. The quality of the college depends upon the quality of these reviews.

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

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

College of Science annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. Each department shall publish its annual review procedures, developed with communication between the faculty and Department Head. Annual review guidelines shall be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member's career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The annual review procedure document must include the following elements: purpose of annual review, period of evaluation, aspects of performance to be evaluated, annual activity report format and content, basis for evaluation, timeline and procedures for evaluation, and complaint procedures. The elements are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The exact form of the annual review may differ from department to department but must include the following components: faculty member's report of annual activities, a written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations, annual opportunity for a meeting between faculty member and Department Head to discuss the written review and expectations, and a performance assessment. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The College of Science requires that APT faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with college and university policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. However, contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities. Annual reviews of
performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, including APT faculty, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. For annual reviews of APT 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 an APT faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities, such as teaching, 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 members 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. APT faculty members should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose

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

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

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

  o See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

- The purpose of the annual APT faculty review is to provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position. Reviews also provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved. Finally, such feedback is critical for the faculty member’s progress toward promotion.

Annual reviews by the Department Head are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. Annual evaluations are conducted in an honest and judicious manner. Although University rules do not require the department head to consult members of the department’s faculty in conducting annual faculty evaluations, the College of Science believes such consultation is a good and critical practice. Although the College of Science does not require a faculty committee-driven annual review process, it is important to understand that such a faculty committee is required, by
University regulation, to participate in the mid-term evaluations of faculty that expect to be considered for promotion and tenure and for promotion to full (see College of Science Promotion and Tenure Guidelines). And, at least once every six (6) years, faculty peer evaluation must be part of the post-tenure review process (see section 8.2 below).

Annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the APT faculty member and department/program. 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. Departments shall create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year and their level of progress toward tenure is reported to them in a timely manner. In this regard, Department Heads write a specific annual evaluation to probationary faculty members. This memorandum reports the results of the annual evaluation and states whether they concur with the review committee’s evaluation. If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to qualify for tenure, the person should be given a notice in writing of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint.

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual faculty review, evaluation in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3 above) 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 evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas of teaching performance needing improvement.
Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators and can be evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

Departments may have more than these four rating categories, but these four are required. For example, a most meritorious rating could be used for faculty members that possess a teaching record far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary.

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. Departments should have regular discussions with, or mentoring of, APT faculty to keep them aware of such evidence and its implications for reappointment, merit salary increases, or promotion.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of 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.
- **Meets Expectations/Satisfactory** – evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

Departments may have more than these four rating categories, but these four are required. For example, a most meritorious rating could be used for faculty members that possess a teaching record far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of evidence of **effectiveness** in academic citizenship and service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in academic citizenship and service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in unit service.
- **Meets Expectations/Satisfactory** – evidence of **effectiveness** in academic citizenship and service. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and assignment.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in academic citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.
Departments may have more than these four rating categories, but these four are required. For example, a most meritorious rating could be used for faculty members that possess an academic citizenship and service record far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary.

6.5 Required Components
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations
The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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. Note that all written annual reviews are available to the person being reviewed upon request.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, scholarly activity and service, as appropriate for the assignments, 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 6.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8.2.) 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 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance
If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near-term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 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.”
7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

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

7.2 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022.

See below an example of the mid-term review of faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year 2020</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dossiers for the mid-term review.* The College of Science considers mid-term reviews to be a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are
thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications. Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the department’s review committee. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate’s contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

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

8. Post-Tenure Review

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

1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

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

8.2 Peer review committee
Post-tenure review of all tenured faculty in the College of Science is required. Therefore, each department in its guidelines (and perhaps its bylaws) will “clearly state how peer evaluations of performance are incorporated in the annual review or in a review that occurs no less frequently than once every six years.” Therefore, prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and at least once every six years thereafter, peer evaluation will be a component of the faculty member’s annual review. The Peer Evaluation Committee’s membership shall be determined by the Head and include participation of the departmental faculty. This process may
include an *ad hoc* committee (for example, members of a departmental promotion and tenure committee). The committee will be composed of no less than three faculty peers in rank and the role of committee in post-tenure review shall be outlined in the departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. The purpose of post-tenure review is to promote excellence in the performance of the college faculty.

**8.3 Process**

The annual review of tenured faculty will evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly productivity in teaching, research and academic citizenship and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and shall be reported as either satisfactory, unsatisfactory or needs improvement. This annual review shall be used to determine the merit of the faculty member’s performance and accomplishments. An annual review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria described in the department guideline. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of Science accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement.

**8.3.1** Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee will, at a minimum, include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports and associated evaluations, and all documentation typically required by the department for annual reviews.

**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.¹ If

¹ It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

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

8.4 Professional Development Review
A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.6). 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 8.5) 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.

8.4.2.1 The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

8.4.2.2 Once charged, the College of Science requires that the ad hoc Professional Development Review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

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. If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 8.5 below) 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).

8.8 Flexibility
Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

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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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Biology is to provide the highest quality biological education to all Texas A&M majors, while leading in fundamental biology research. The faculty of the Department of Biology deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of scientific leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to promote, and thus retain, faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Biology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

In this document, the Department of Biology clarifies from its perspective the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, the department head, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

This document articulates general Department of Biology guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, promotion, and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:
In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the department. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities and/or compensation.

These documents are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the Department of Biology faculty, the College of Science, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The Department of Biology has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities, however, most focus on some combination of research and teaching. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the department, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable annual, tenure, and post-tenure evaluations. Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

I. Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities and reflects continued worth to the university and college in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

Tenure. Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and academic citizenship and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should
be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from university, college, and departmental perspectives. The Department of Biology conducts formal reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the Department of Biology clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Dean of Faculties).

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.

II. Academic Professional Track

The Department of Biology recognizes the vital contributions that all faculty members make to our mission and is committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation, and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members is essential. Decisions on promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the college and department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote, and retain APT faculty members, whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the college and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the Department of Biology for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching or research, and service or scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). The department may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic professional track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic professional track rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. This document provides a general set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Research faculty members are also in the Department of Biology academic professional track and are usually under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the Department of Biology include the Professional and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial track includes adjectival designations, such as “Instructional”, “Research” and “Visiting”. APT ranks in the Department of Biology are the following modified titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Senior Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Assistant Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Associate Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, and Laboratory Instructor.

Instructional Track

Appointment to APT instructional faculty rank generally requires, at a minimum, a Ph.D. degree and evidence of superior teaching experience. APT faculty can be assigned to graduate courses with the approval of the department head, as long as the instructor is properly credentialed.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Assistant Professors are not expected to
engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Instructional Associate Professor.** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Instructional Associate Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Instructional Professor.** The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field. Instructional Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials. Instructional Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Lecturer Track**

**Lecturer.** The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Lecturer title will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. The typical teaching load is two large sections per semester. Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Senior Lecturer.** The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or compliment their instructional duties. The typical teaching load is two large sections per semester. Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Laboratory Instructors**

**Laboratory Instructors.** The position of Laboratory Instructor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members in the Lab Instructor position will normally hold a Ph.D. degree in the teaching field and primarily engaged in teaching the laboratory portion of our lab courses. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or compliment their instructional duties. The typical teaching load is six lab sections per semester. Lab Instructors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Progression between APT tracks.** The Department of Biology considers progression from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor to be a promotion based upon the evaluation criteria and evidence of teaching effectiveness and excellence described in this document. Such promotions follow the timeline set each academic year for tenure-track and tenured faculty member promotions.

**Research Track**

**Research Assistant Professor.** The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but may make additional
contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the research field. Research Assistant Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Research Associate Professor.** The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research but may make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the research field. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. They are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

**Research Professor.** The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make additional contributions in teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent scientific research and meritorious scholarly reputation and appropriate service credentials. Research Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but if such activities are performed, they may be considered in annual evaluations.

If the Department of Biology needs to use other instructional titles (e.g., Senior Professor, Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Executive Professor and Professor of the Practice), then credentials and responsibilities for these titles will be developed at that time. Appointments into any of these titles require the dean’s approval.

**Multi-year Instruction Track Appointments**

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 governing Fixed Term APT Faculty ([https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/](https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/)) does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore the following Department of Biology guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate’s qualifications, as per the criteria stated in departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the Lab Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the department head and approved by the dean.

Faculty members appointed to Instructional Associate Professor will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the department head and with dean’s approval.

Upon promotion to Instructional Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the department head and with dean’s approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed, but it is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with university standards ([University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion](https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/)). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.
3. Areas of Faculty Performance (in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; academic citizenship and service; and/or administration). Expectations for faculty members in their assigned areas of 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 nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable performance evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and academic citizenship and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in two of these three areas (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and citizenship and service), but, in some cases, can make contributions in all areas.

Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the department. The value of a faculty member to the department determines the degree to which the department is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the department of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the department, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable for annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following sections.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the department’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but not sufficient to fully evaluate teaching. Evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching shall include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) student learning; and 5) comparison of student DFQ rates.

Essential qualifications for Department of Biology instructors include the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student’s performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes.
Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development is an important measure of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a college, university, or professional society outstanding teacher award.

A Teaching Evaluation Table should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>BIOL111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BIOL112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 Teaching quality. The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one’s discipline.

3.1.2 Essential pedagogy. The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.1.3 Educational innovation. Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

3.1.4 Teaching professionalism. Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation, and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students’ classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

3.1.5 Impact upon students. A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility. The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to departmental teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

3.1.7 Promotion of active, high-impact learning. Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, as possible.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful scholarly activity is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. Research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration, whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective, scholarly application, where a thesis proposes the application of existing facts and ideas to products and methods of procedure,
or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated and published work. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals (with respect to one’s field of study) carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking, and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT faculty titles require scholarly work beyond teaching. Scholarship is broadly defined here as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers, and communicated. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge, as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

The Department of Biology expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 **Intellectual curiosity.** The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.

3.2.2 **Scientific communication.** Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

3.2.3 **Research funding.** Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.

3.2.4 **Collaborative approach.** Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued by the Department of Biology.

3.2.5 **Education contributions.** Educating the next generation of scientific leader and researchers is an important departmental mission.

3.2.6 **Contributions to the field.** Scholarly activities, such as board membership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the university are important criteria for evaluation.

3.2.7 **Acknowledgements of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgements of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.

3.3 **Academic Citizenship and Service**

Faculty academic citizenship and service are central to the mission of the department. The department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence, and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make through his or her academic citizenship and by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, college, and university. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to be good academic citizens.
Academic citizenship is defined as a measure of one’s commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the department, college, university, and profession through service. The key dimensions of academic citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other’s abilities to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and service.

The Department of Biology will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

Academic Service contributes to the Department of Biology’s mission of advancing science locally, in the state and nation. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the department, college, and the university. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at-large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the Department of Biology.

The scope of department activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional development programs. The Department of Biology also expects its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty titles require service to departmental goals beyond teaching. The contribution an APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, the college, and the university. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career development.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

3.3.1 Personal integrity and accountability. A faculty member’s collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

3.3.2 Profession communication. Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators and must work toward solutions of problems.

3.3.3 Departmental engagement. Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one’s academic rank.

3.3.4 Colleague/Student mentoring. Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.
3.3.5 **Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees, or administrative roles (e.g., section chief, assistant/associate department head, or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 **Service to the field.** Academic citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the university are important criteria for evaluation.

4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The Department of Biology recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and 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 of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review.

4.1 **Indicators of Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by mentors, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- contribution to new instructional program development,
- serving as a co-chair or member of graduate advisory committees,
- publications with authorship by trainees (i.e., undergraduate writing education),
- successful curriculum development grants, and
- obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development.

4.2 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- positive evaluations in postgraduate questionnaires to evaluate knowledge and preparation,
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading (i.e., DFQ rates that meet College expectations),
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
- coordination of multi-disciplinary courses,
- development of a new course, honors course, or major revision of an existing course,
- direction of independent student research,
- Mentoring colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- development of innovative pedagogical materials or strategies for active learning.

4.3 **Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity** include, but are not limited to:

- obtaining significant external competitive funding for scholarship activities,
- active participation in a prominent area of research or signature program,
- active participation in research within a university-recognized center or institute that is either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary,
- publication of peer-reviewed scientific articles, technical reports, or monographs,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings,
- publication of papers of original research in proceedings of regional professional meetings,
- contribution of area of expertise to scholarship of others,
- authorship of review articles,
- preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs,
• preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science,
• recognition from peers in the field (e.g., awards, honors, invitations to present),
• publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s),
• evidence of leadership or significant contribution to successful team research/scholarly activities,
• national attention, as demonstrated by special recognition,
• key participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
• dissemination of teaching materials at local, state, or national workshops,
• creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
• patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements.

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

• recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards,
• invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings,
• publications of original research in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines,
• favorable citation index listing of research publications within the appropriate disciplines,
• obtaining competitive external funding for research,
• effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project that has garnered significant national attention,
• key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
• significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements,
• coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary investigations and projects, including a variety of international programs,
• recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars,
• evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface of academic disciplines,
• originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspectives on, and uses of information and/or data,
• active participation in a university-centered scholarly or creative activity,
• contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others,
• sharing of knowledge about teaching within faculty groups, and
• adoption of innovative and communicated pedagogical methodologies by others.

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Academic Citizenship and Service, include, but are not limited to:

• engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
• making personal contributions to the public mission of the university to forward its programs for the public good,
• engaging in activities that foster diversity, inclusion, and a culture of respect,
• serving as an effective member of a committee within the department, college, or university,
• serving as an effective chair of a committee within the department, college, or university,
• serving as an officer or board member in a local, state, or national professional organization in one's discipline,
• effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
• attraction of significant development support,
• consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
• selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards,
• service as an editor or associate editor of a publication in one's discipline, and
• service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions, or foundations

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Academic Citizenship and Service, include, but are not limited to:
recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs.

actively and effectively striving to achieve departmental and college goals and mandates.

engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,

making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group,

engaging in the creation of a university culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance,

actively serving on departmental, college, and university committees and task forces,

significant contributions to the promotion of unit diversity, inclusion, and climate,

actively serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,

contributing to external developmental efforts,

serving as a mentor for junior faculty members,

promoting significant teaching, research, or service experiences for students,

promoting national and/or international experiences for students,

serving as an advisor to student organizations,

serving in formal administrative roles within the department, college, or university,

actively participating in K-12 or other public outreach,

actively participating in publications describing the effectiveness of community-based projects, and

presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same timeline for all promotions.

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, academic citizenship, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Biology are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, research scholarship, with attention to academic citizenship and service. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and research support, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities.

5.1.2 Associate Professor. Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the College and indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual’s specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.
5.1.3 **Professor.** Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

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 activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track faculty.

The promotion process for APT faculty is governed by the Dean of Faculties guidelines ([https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure](https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure)), but departments have some flexibility in implementing these guidelines. Candidates for promotion will supply a current CV, and a teaching portfolio as part of the dossier. The Department of Biology requires, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor. Candidates may request external letters if they desire to do so. No letters are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Because the Department of Biology treats all changes in APT ranks as a promotion, dossiers will be evaluated through the same stages as tenure-track promotions (department, college, provost, and president) and on the same time frame.

Annual evaluation and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the **quality**, **significance**, and **impact** of the teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments (where applicable) are as follows:

5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer may include, but are not limited to:

- experience as lecturer (or equivalent teaching experience),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor may include, but are not limited to:

- experience as a senior lecturer position,
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- significant contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.
5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor may include, but are not limited to
- experience as an instructional assistant professor (or equivalent),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- continued contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership, and
- evidence of scholarly activities or research, as applicable.

5.2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor may include, but are not limited to:
- experience as an instructional associate professor (or equivalent),
- outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- major contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership
- evidence of scholarly activities or service, as applicable,
- seeking or obtaining grant funding to support teaching,
- invitations to present at national or international conferences,
- state, national or international outstanding teacher awards,
- placement of students in academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the college, university, or community, and
- significant service to state, national or international organizations.

5.3 Timing of Promotion and Tenure Review
The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by university regulations that define the procedures for the mandatory (penultimate year) review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required. The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows: Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of the tenure consideration year. Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested by the candidate. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the department head, dean, and dean of faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: taken leave without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate’s control.
In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters, and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, approximately the first day of November.

5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers
The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate's personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided in the summer semester (the date determined each year by the associate head of operations), so that it may be included with requests for outside letters. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers, and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers. The department does not require any justification for anyone named to the 'Do Not Contact' list. The department may request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier will include all elements required by university regulations.

Dossiers for promotion and tenure review. Of the two, formal college-level reviews (mid-term and promotion and tenure), the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. Still, there is an important connection between the midterm review and the tenure review. The promotion and tenure review will take into consideration, in part, whether or not the faculty member's post-midterm activities incorporated the feedback, recommendations and requests at the midterm review. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate's tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion and departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the vote.

Candidate’s curriculum vitae and statements. The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member's entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate. Publications and other scholarly contributions must be differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statements should clearly articulate the accomplishments of the faculty member and provide context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts must be defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities should be clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service should be clearly represented with an indication of their importance.

Outside letters of evaluation. To enhance the effectiveness of the candidate's dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. The candidate will suggest 10 potential reviewers, and the Annual Review Committee (ARC) will suggest an additional 10 potential reviewers. The department head, in conjunction with the associate head of operations will contact five reviewers who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate's credentials. Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. All letters for P&T candidates must be “arm’s length”. Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm’s-length will
not be considered. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity.

5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate’s dossier is correctly assembled lies with the candidate, his or her mentors, and the associate head of operations. The Annual Review Committee acts as the preliminary Promotion and Tenure Review committee for the Department of Biology. The formal tenure and promotion committee in the department is a committee of the whole, meaning that all faculty members of the appropriate rank, may discuss and vote on candidates for promotion to they rank they hold or lower.

The Annual Review Committee, acting as the departmental preliminary P&T committee, is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the ARC shall undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams. The ARC shall compile and submit a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). This table will contain the following information for all years since the previous promotion (or last 5 years): a listing by semester and year of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the required Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>BIOL111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BIOL112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member’s teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

**Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.** The Annual Review Committee is responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on credentials of outside referees. The committee also prepares individual reports evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. Following a confidential discussion, the committee-of-the-whole conducts an anonymous vote (i.e., Yes, No, Absent or Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Typically, the department head should not attend this discussion nor participate in the vote. In cases where it is necessary for the head to attend the discussion, his or her involvement will be limited to answering specific procedural or administrative questions. Under no circumstance should the department head engage in discussion of the merits of the case.

All eligible faculty members are expected to participate in the discussion and vote for all tenure and promotion cases. If absolutely necessary, absentee voting is allowed, but this privilege should be used only in extenuating circumstances. Voting for tenure and promotion cases will be done through an electronic voting system.
Recommendation of the Departmental P&T Committee. The candidate’s qualifications for tenure and promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the department head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member’s promotion/tenure recommendation packet.

Recommendation of the Department Head. The department head prepares and submits an independent recommendation to the dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to the College of Science. The department head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under consideration. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. Candidates shall be informed, through the department head, of the recommendations at each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process and this information shall be transmitted in writing.

5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review
After receipt of the candidate’s dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example, the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee’s teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of evaluation information (student evaluation scores for individual courses, narratives based on peer review, etc.), the dossier is returned to the Department Head for further action by the departmental committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the departmental review committee evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

5.7 Promotion to Professor
The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor, except that only full professors on the ARC will serve as the department’s preliminary review committee. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and ARC should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate’s international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a candidate’s teaching evaluation chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see section III above). For promotions to full professor, the candidate’s teaching evaluation chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years (whichever is shorter).

5.8 Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors
Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

5.9 Joint Appointments
Joint appointments in cases where a scholar’s expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the Department of Biology. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the Department of Biology affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with university, college and departmental
promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the department must request a review and evaluation from the chair of the intercollegiate faculty.

5.10 Appeals
University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the department head and, if necessary, the dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

6. Annual Review
Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this document, the Department of Biology provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty member, department heads, department and college evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Science. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

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 will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment who 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 members 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.

Department of Biology annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. The following annual review procedures developed with communication between the faculty and department administration. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member's career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The annual review procedures described below include the following elements: purpose of annual review, period of evaluation, aspects of performance to be evaluated, annual activity report format and content, basis for evaluation, timeline and procedures for evaluation, and complaint procedures. These elements are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).
The annual review must include the following components: faculty member's report of annual activities, a written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations, annual opportunity for a meeting between faculty member and department head to discuss the written review and expectations, and a performance assessment. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The Department of Biology requires that APT faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with college and university policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. However, significant contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities. Annual reviews of performance are conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

All University-employed faculty members, including APT faculty, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible. For annual reviews of APT 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 an APT faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities, such as teaching, 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 members 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. APT faculty members should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

Annual Review Policy for the Department of Biology

6.1 Purpose and Procedure of the Annual Review: The Department of Biology performs an annual evaluation of each faculty member's teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service. The purpose of the evaluation is to recognize a level of performance and productivity that is appropriate and desirable for the department and provide guidance when performance and productivity is less than satisfactory. The review process provides an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his or her department leadership. The annual reviews also form the basis of Post-Tenure Review, as described in the Department of Biology Post-Tenure Review Policy. See section 8 of this document.

6.2 Focus
Assistant Professors
Each year, in addition to evaluating the previous year's performance, the ARC will provide an evaluation and a written summary of overall progress toward tenure and promotion, with particular emphasis on mid-term reviews. The guidelines for promotion and tenure are provided in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. Success in research/scholarship, teaching and service will be recognized, and any areas of concern will be identified. The ARC will advise the department head that the candidate is making 1) excellent progress (meritorious), meaning the candidate is excelling in all aspects of his/her position; 2) satisfactory progress, meaning the candidate is on track toward tenure and promotion; 3) needs improvement, meaning the candidate is very close to an unsatisfactory mark and will need to make improvements in one or more categories to stay on track toward tenure and promotion; 4) unsatisfactory progress, meaning significant deficiencies in one or more categories must be addressed in order to be considered for tenure and promotion. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the rating for progress towards tenure and promotion. This information will be included in the evaluation report.

Associate Professors
For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a scholarly impact on their field (e.g., publications, invited
seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement). The ARC evaluates and provides recommendations to the department head for potential promotion of associate professors to professor according to the guidelines in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. The department head provides a written report of progress towards promotion.

**Professors**

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will provide evidence of having a sustained and significant scholarly impact on their field (e.g., publications, invited seminars, grant and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement).

**Academic Professional track and temporary faculty**

The ARC annually evaluates the quality of the faculty member’s performance, which is primarily based on teaching and related activities, and provides a recommendation to the department head, who will determine the overall performance rating. Additional performance recognition is given for research/scholarship participation, publications, and service.

**Mechanism of the Annual Review:** The department head performs an annual evaluation of faculty. The Annual Review Committee (ARC) serves in an advisory capacity to the department head and provides a written report of yearly performance and productivity, and a recommended rating in each category of research, teaching, and service. A copy of the ARC report is provided to the faculty member, along with an evaluation report from the Department Head. Pre-tenure faculty members will meet with the department head to discuss their annual review and any issues arising from it. Tenured faculty members may request to meet with the department head to discuss their review.

**Composition of the Annual Review Committee:** The Annual Review Committee is composed of the associate head of operations (ex officio and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors. At least one senior APT faculty member will be appointed to the ARC to assist with other APT faculty reviews. ARC members will be evaluated by the associate head of operations, who will be evaluated directly by the department head. ARC members will serve a three-year term.

**Performance to be Evaluated:** Members of the ARC summarize and evaluate annual reports provided by the faculty on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in accordance with a standard weighting of 60% research/scholarship (e.g. grant proposal preparation, manuscript preparation, conference attendance, invited talks, compliance), 30% teaching (e.g. formal courses, graduate and undergraduate research training), and 10% service (e.g. major departmental, college, or university committees, grant and manuscript reviews and other service to the field). Modified loads are discussed with the head and approved by the dean. Any approved changes to the standard load for an individual faculty member will be communicated to the ARC by the department head. Each faculty member also provides an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and any additional materials they deem relevant for the committee’s consideration. The department provides student evaluations of teaching to the committee.

**Report:** The ARC provides an advisory rating to the department head for each faculty member on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous year as *Meritorious, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory* based on established evaluation criteria (examples listed below) and in accord with departmental standards. In addition, the ARC provides an advisory overall rating to the department head that is based on the individual criteria ratings. The department head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the final criteria and overall ratings. The department head ratings will be provided in an evaluation report to the faculty member. This report will include a statement on expectations for the next year in research, teaching, service. The faculty member indicates receipt of the evaluation report by signing a copy of the document and is given the opportunity to provide written comments for their personnel file if they so choose. If a faculty member declines to acknowledge receipt of the report, that will be noted in the file. All faculty members will have an opportunity, if desired, to meet with the department head to discuss their review.
head to discuss the written review and expectations. For faculty members who receive a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory rating in any single category, or an overall Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory rating, the department head will consult with the faculty member to formulate a timely improvement plan with milestones. An overall Unsatisfactory rating is reported to the Dean of the College of Science, along with a written plan, developed by the faculty member and Department Head for near-term improvement.

**Complaint Procedures:** A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the stated guidelines, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the College of Science, and with a copy to the dean of faculties. The dean of the College of Science will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the College of Science may be appealed to the dean of faculties.

**Timeline:**

In January of each calendar year, the department head will request the following from each faculty member:

1. A completed annual report form
2. A current curriculum vitae
3. Course syllabi and exams
4. Rationale for any changes to the standard research/scholarship, teaching, and service load that were not granted prior approval
5. Copies of any supplemental research, teaching and/or service reports the faculty member choses to submit

**Other responsibilities of the ARC:** The ARC also serves as the preliminary tenure and promotion committee for the Department of Biology. They help assemble the candidate’s dossier, including external review letters, provide an initial summary of the candidate’s credentials in all relevant areas, and write up a summary of the committee-of-the-whole discussion and vote. In addition, the ARC makes recommendations for faculty award nominations to the department Awards Committee.

**6.3 Period of Evaluation:** The period of evaluation is a calendar year, although plans for and progress on multiyear projects may be considered. The annual review will be performed the spring semester following the year to be evaluated. The reports are due on February 1 of each year. The ARC will evaluate the annual reports in February and March, and then provide their recommendations to the department head in April. The department head will review the recommendations of the ARC, determine the ratings in each criteria area and the overall rating, and provide a written report of the evaluation to the faculty member by July 1.

**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 as one of five categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” “Satisfactory,” and “Meritorious.” Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

The criteria listed below are common, established measures of faculty effectiveness, and while it is expected that faculty will meet some of the metrics for a given performance ranking, the metrics should not be treated as a checklist. Furthermore, accounting for differing paths of career development, it is expected that flexibility of performance criteria should accrue with seniority. Taking such flexibility in consideration, the ARC and department head will evaluate the strengths of a faculty member’s research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in their totality, and accounting for the contribution of a faculty member toward accomplishing the university’s overall mission, when evaluating performance.

**6.4.1 Teaching**

Teaching excellence is a goal of the Department of Biology. According to the College of Science guidelines, the ARC will review teaching performance indicators from the table provided on the annual report Form. This table includes semester, course number, number of students in the course, mean course GPA, mean
overall student evaluation rating, and the percentages of D, F, Q grades. Unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of the public trust. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching. The head, in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a teaching review committee consisting of three faculty members. This committee will review the faculty member’s syllabi, exams, course notes, student evaluations, mean course GPA, the percentages of D, F, and Q grades, and classroom performance, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member. The faculty member and the teaching review committee will develop a written plan for near-term improvement.

**Indicators of meritorious performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**
1. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
2. Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
3. Obtaining extramural funding for curricular enhancement
4. Selection for a university, college, or professional society outstanding teacher award
5. Authoring of textbooks or other instructional materials
6. Outstanding teaching evaluations (> 4.0 based on a 1–5-point scale) from students, while maintaining rigor.
7. Significant improvements in the percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g., <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses)

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**
1. The presentation of accurate, up-to-date, well-organized information and concepts
2. Receiving acceptable (>2.5 based on a 1–5-point scale) teaching evaluations from students, while maintaining rigor
3. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are standard for the level of course (e.g., <20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and <10% for 300 and 400 level courses).
4. Satisfactory resolution of student complaints
5. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
6. Satisfactory progress to degree of graduate students
7. Service as a member of graduate student advisory committees
8. Coordination of multi-section courses
9. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

**Indicators of needs improvement in teaching include, but are not limited to:**
1. Significantly negative teaching evaluations (<2.5 based on a 1–5-point scale) from students
2. Percentages of D, F, Q rates that are significantly lower than the standard for the level of course (e.g. >20% for 100 and 200 level courses, and >10% for 300 and 400 level courses)
3. Regular and unresolved student complaints
4. Presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information
5. Not meeting deadlines for graduate student committee meetings and preliminary exams

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**
1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a Needs Improvement rating in teaching in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 30% teaching load over a calendar year
3. Neglecting to meet formal teaching responsibilities

**6.4.2 Research and Scholarship.** The generation of new knowledge through research is the hallmark of a world-class university and an integral part of the Department of Biology.

**Indicators of meritorious performance in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:**
1. Publication in top tier journals in your field (≥2/year)
2. Leadership in obtaining funding for large scale or multiple-investigator projects
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for national research organization
5. Invited plenary speaker at national and international meetings
6. Receiving a major fellowship or research award
7. Publication and funding resulting from collaborations in other fields
8. Licensing patents

Indicators of satisfactory performance in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:
1. Regular publication (> 1/year) of research as corresponding author in peer reviewed journals
2. Successful pursuit of extramural research support as PI/coPI
3. Presentation of research at national and/or international meetings
4. Publication of a scholarly book, or a chapter in a scholarly book
5. Publication in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
6. Significant self-development activities, such as faculty development leave
7. Applying for, receiving, and/or licensing patents

Indicators of needs improvement in research and scholarship include, but are not limited to:
1. Lack of publication in peer reviewed journals
2. Continued inability to obtain extramural research support, and/or unwillingness to submit applications
3. The absence of other scholarly activity

Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:
1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a Needs Improvement rating in research and scholarship in the previous Annual Review
2. 0% research/scholarship activity over an academic year

6.4.3 Academic Citizenship and Service. Service to the department, college, university, and the scientific community at large is recognized an essential component of good academic citizenship.

Indicators of meritorious performance in service include, but are not limited to:
1. Officer in a national professional organization
2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
4. Member of review panel for a national research organization
5. Program chair, or similar chair, for a national or international meeting
6. Officer in Faculty Senate, CPI, or other elected university committee.
7. Committee chair of national professional organization
8. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee

Indicators of satisfactory performance in service include, but are not limited to:
1. Regular attendance and participation in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks.
2. Service on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organization
4. Program or committee chair for regional or state meeting
5. Reviewer for refereed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
6. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies
7. Advisor to student organizations
8. Directing consulting, continuing education, and/or outreach activities
9. Contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization

Indicators of needs improvement in service include but are not limited to:
1. Failure to regularly participate in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks
2. Refusal to serve, or to be nominated to serve, on departmental, college, or university committees
3. Unwillingness or inability to contribute to the mission of committees the faculty member serves on

Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service include but are not limited to:
1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a Needs Improvement rating in service in the previous Annual Review
2. Less than 10% service load over a calendar year

6.5 Required Components
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations
The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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
In the Department of Biology, pre-tenure faculty members must meet with the department head to discuss the annual review. Other faculty members may request a meeting with the department head to discuss the annual review. 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 standard weights given to research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service, are 60%, 30%, and 10%, respectively, for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Deviations
from these percentages must be negotiated with the department head and confirmed by the dean. In all cases, these 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, 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.”

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

7.1 Purpose
- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.

This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.

If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

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

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

**Dossiers for the mid-term review.** The Department of Biology considers mid-term reviews are a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the department’s review committee. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate’s contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

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

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

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

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

8.1 Purpose

The purpose of post-tenure review is to promote continued academic professional development, and to ensure tenured faculty in the department maintain a satisfactory or better level of performance and productivity. Post-tenure review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of performance and productivity.

8.2 Peer review committee

The Annual Review Committee, which is composed of the associate head of operations (ex-officio and voting member) and 6 tenured faculty elected by the department, with no fewer than 3 Full Professors, also serves as the Department of Biology’s Post-Tenure Review Committee. Members may review only colleagues at their rank or lower.

8.3 Process

In addition to the required annual review, every tenured faculty member will undergo post-tenure review every three years following the granting of tenure or following an academic promotion. The post-tenure review will evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly productivity in teaching, research and academic citizenship and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and shall be reported as either meritorious, satisfactory, unsatisfactory or needs improvement. This review shall be used to determine the merit of the faculty member’s performance and accomplishments over the preceding three-year period. A post-tenure review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria described in the departmental guidelines. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of Science accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement.

A faculty member can be exempted from post-tenure review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist.

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Post-tenure Review Committee will, at a minimum, include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports and associated evaluations, and all documentation typically required by the department for annual reviews.

8.3.2 The Post-tenure 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 must be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be reviewed again in three years.
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 post-tenure 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 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 will share the report with the other department head of the secondary unit.

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the Dean of Science and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent post-tenure review, the outcome of those reviews, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The post-tenure 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” post-tenure 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. 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 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.

8.4.2.1 The dean will meet with the department head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the professional development review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

8.4.2.2 Once charged, the Department of Biology requires that the ad hoc professional development review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the department head.
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 post-tenure review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 in University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

8.4.5.3 If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, then 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 of University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01) 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 collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, 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, 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).

8.8 Flexibility
Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

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. In general, faculty members seeking emeritus status in the Department of Biology should retire or otherwise leave the university in good standing, receive a positive recommendation by vote of the faculty, and indicate a desire to continue contributing to the mission of the department.
ISSUED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD: NOVEMBER 2, 2020

APPROVED BY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE: NOVEMBER 20, 2020
INTRODUCTION

This statement sets forth policies and procedures for evaluating faculty of the Department of Chemistry, Texas A&M University. This document details procedures that followed in the department, and as such is a supplement to the “College of Science Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation” which provides more information and examples concerning criteria for review of faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. It also conforms to the superior documents on Policies and Procedures for Texas A&M University.
As set out in the Chemistry Department By-Laws (Section 1.1.1), faculty membership extends to persons holding half-time or greater academic appointments wholly or primarily in the Department of Chemistry and with titles of Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, or Lecturer shall be voting members of the faculty of the Department of Chemistry (hereinafter, Department). A full-time appointment is defined as 100% time during the nine academic months.

Faculty

1.1. Renewal of Term Appointments

1.1.1. Departmental recommendation for renewal of a term appointment shall require the approval of the Department Head and a favorable recommendation from the appropriate division or first-year program director.

1.1.2. In the event of non-renewal of a term appointment, the affected faculty member shall receive from the Department Head, upon request, a verbal explanation of the decision not to renew.

1.2. APT Faculty

APT (Academic Professional Track) faculty are non-tenure track faculty members whose primary function is classroom teaching. Appointment as a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Instructional Professor, Associate Instructional Professor, or Instructional Professor is generally restricted to persons who have an earned Ph.D. in chemistry or in a closely allied field, where appropriate. The initial term of appointment is one year; subsequent one-year appointments may be offered. Lecturers will be recruited, to the extent possible, by an open announcement of the position. An Ad Hoc committee will review the applications, schedule candidate interviews, and recommend candidates for employment. Interviews will include an open departmental lecture or seminar by the candidate.

1.2.1. Requirements for Progression through APT Faculty Ranks

1.2.1.1. The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who may make but are not required to make contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Lecturer title in the department will normally hold a PhD degree
and primarily be engaged in instruction. The standard teaching loads are determined by the department.

1.2.1.2. The title of Senior Lecturer will be considered for faculty who meet the criteria for Lecturer, and who have at least three years of experience as a full-time Lecturer or its equivalent. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or compliment their instructional duties. Standard teaching loads are determined by the department. Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation. Initial appointment to the rank of Senior Lecturer requires a recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the division or teaching unit, the Department Head, and approval by the Dean.

1.2.1.3. Assistant Instructional Professors shall be faculty with teaching experience typical of at least a Senior Lecturer. An Instructional Assistant Professor has a primary responsibility in teaching, but also makes additional contributions in scholarship, curriculum development, or service both within and possibly outside the department at TAMU.

1.2.1.4. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship, curriculum development, or service that are visible in their impact within and outside the department at TAMU. While they are not expected to engage in scientific research, such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

1.2.1.5. Instructional Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching, but also make significant and impactful contributions in scholarship and/or service. To reach the rank of Instructional Professor an individual is expected to have acquired meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials that signal recognition both within TAMU and beyond the TAMU community. While Instructional Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

1.2.1.6. The term of appointment of a faculty member with the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Instructional Professor, Associate Instructional Professor, or Instructional Professor who has held any faculty position other than Assistant Lecturer for five or more academic years of full-time service, will be three
years. Such faculty shall receive one-year’s advance notice if it is the intention of the Department not to renew the appointment.

1.2.1.7. A Lecturer or Instructional Professor, of any rank, with one to four academic years of full-time service will be notified by March 15 if it is the intention of the Department not to renew the appointment for the following academic year.

1.2.1.8. One-year of unpaid leave may be granted to Senior Lecturers or Instructional Professors, of any rank, upon application to the Department Head.

1.2.2. Status, Expectations, and Professional Development

1.2.2.1. APT faculty are members of the Department faculty and will be accorded status comparable to that of tenured and tenure track faculty.

1.2.2.2. APT faculty will be included in all departmental academic affairs including faculty meetings, and division meetings when appropriate to enable them to function effectively in their teaching and curriculum development, service, or research roles (if any).

1.2.2.3. APT faculty will be provided office space and the computer facilities necessary to fulfill their teaching responsibilities.

1.2.2.4. APT faculty will be encouraged to initiate and/or participate in scholarly activities associated with all aspects of chemical education.

1.2.2.5. APT faculty will be encouraged to participate, when possible, in the research activities of tenure-track faculty in the Department but is not required of APT faculty. Such participation should not detract from APT faculty members’ performance of their primary teaching function.

1.2.2.6. APT faculty may apply for associate membership on the graduate faculty in accordance with University Office of Graduate Studies guidelines. When an APT faculty member serves on a chemistry graduate student’s advisory committee, it must be as an additional member of the committee and not as a replacement for one of the tenure-track committee members.
1.2.3. Annual Review

1.2.3.1. Performances of all APT faculty will be reviewed annually (based on the previous calendar year) by the Department Head, who will be assisted in gathering information by faculty the Head designates for student and peer evaluations.

1.2.3.2. Performance criteria will be based primarily on teaching and related activities, with additional recognition given, where appropriate, to research participation, publications, and service.

1.3. Role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in Faculty Evaluations

1.3.1. Responsibilities

The P&T Committee gives the Department Head its advice and recommendations on the granting of tenure and promotions. The committee also provides the Department Head and faculty with annual performance reviews of assistant and associate professor tenure track faculty and makes recommendations on joint appointments and emeritus status. The committee also performs mid-term reviews of tenure track assistant and associate professors.

1.3.2. Mode of Operation

The P&T Committee meets, as required, throughout the year. It reviews the annual reports of assistant and associate professors, the files of all proposed appointments with tenure and promotions and advises the Department Head on the solicitation of evaluations by off-campus professionals and other needed documentation of teaching, research, and university and public service. Records are kept of the final disposition of committee recommendations.

1.3.3. Operating Procedures

1.3.3.1. Procedures for Annual Review of Tenure Track Faculty below the rank of Full Professor

Each spring, the P&T Committee prepares an annual review of the progress of each of the faculty members in tenure-track positions who are below the rank of full professor. These annual reviews are based primarily upon updated annual reports solicited from the faculty members and written appraisals of teaching by the appropriate division chair or a tenured faculty member appointed by the division chair. The committee does not
discuss the annual reviews with the faculty member being evaluated and prepares the recommendation without the Department Head's input. The Department Head later shares the P&T evaluations with the faculty member being evaluated and meets individually with each of these faculty and reviews their P&T Committee’s evaluations with them. Although the Department Head may provide his or her own written recommendation, the committee’s verbatim written recommendations will be provided to the faculty member. This review occurs in the spring semester of each year.

The material that faculty are required to provide to the P&T committee for their evaluation includes a complete annual report prepared according to the Department Head guidelines as well as an up dated CV. In addition, a list of courses taught, with the number of students enrolled, and the numbers of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, Qs, and other grades (Is or Ws) listed in a tabular format. If the letter grade distribution or number of Qs for a particular course is unusual, the faculty member should provide a short, written explanation of whatever is considered unusual.

1.3.3.2. Procedures for Annual Review of Academic Professional Track Faculty

Each spring the P&T Committee prepares an annual review of the progress of each of the APT faculty members in non-tenure track positions. These annual reviews are based primarily upon updated annual reports solicited from the faculty members. The Department Head provides these written reviews to the APT faculty members and meets with each of them to discuss the P&T Committee’s annual review. This review should occur in the spring semester of each year. The Department Head does not participate in writing the annual review, and the P&T committee does not discuss the annual reviews with the faculty members.

1.3.3.3. Mid-term Reviews of Un-tenured Tenure Track Faculty

The timing of a candidate’s mid-term evaluation is determined by the candidate’s initial appointment letter. In general, the mid-term review will be completed at the end of the candidate’s third year for candidates whose initial appointment was at the assistant professor level. Candidates can, however, request a one-time delay of one year in their mid-term review, based on personal considerations. This request must be made to the
Department Head before the time when an evaluation is scheduled to begin. Requests may be approved by a simple majority vote of the P&T Committee. If the candidate has missed eight or more work weeks due to reasons enumerated in the Family and Medical Leave Act, the Department specifically encourages the request for a one-year extension and will automatically support this request.

For mid-term reviews, candidates are required to supply the same items of information as those that will later be required for consideration of promotion and tenure. This information should follow the same suggested format as that used for the faculty member’s departmental file, and should include:

1.3.3.3.1. A copy of a curriculum vitae, which should include a record of publications, oral presentations, seminars, research grants, graduate students, postdoctoral students, visiting scholars, teaching, and service.

1.3.3.3.2. A complete set of reprints of the most recent and important publications (up to six) as an independent scientist.

1.3.3.3.3. A tabular list of courses taught, their initial enrollments, GPA, As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, Qs, and other grades (Is or Ws). If the letter grade distribution or number of Qs is considered unusual, the faculty member should provide a short, written explanation of whatever is considered unusual.

1.3.3.3.4. If the distribution or number of Qs is considered unusual, the faculty member will be informed.

1.3.3.3.5. A narrative statement of up to three pages in length, which describes the candidate’s major accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. One member of the committee will be responsible for assembling a complete file for the candidate that contains all relevant information about the candidate’s research, teaching, and service performance. Relevant information may vary with the individual, but can include the candidate’s:
1.3.3.5.1. curriculum vitae

1.3.3.5.2. previous annual reviews by the P&T Committee

1.3.3.5.3. solicited and unsolicited evaluations from internal and external referees

1.3.3.5.4. evaluation of teaching and performance, based on student surveys and faculty comments, including ones derived from classroom observation

1.3.3.5.5. For each course taught (since any previous promotion, if applicable) a sample homework, a sample quiz, a sample hour exam, a sample final exam, and a course syllabus should be submitted

1.3.3.5.6. other material considered relevant and reliable by the committee

If desired, the candidate may submit other materials to the committee or discuss procedures with the Department Head. The candidate is also required to give a departmental seminar. The committee does not meet with faculty members under evaluation. The completed file is sent to all committee members for their individual review prior to consideration by the entire committee. A recommendation is prepared, discussed, and modified until the committee reaches a general consensus. The resulting recommendation is transmitted to the Department Head by the committee chairman. The Department Head does not participate in the committee’s evaluation of faculty.

1.3.4. Generating a Recommendation for Tenure

The timing of a candidate’s tenure evaluation is determined by the candidate’s initial appointment letter. In general, the tenure review will begin at the end of the candidate’s fifth year, for candidates whose initial appointment was at the assistant professor level. Candidates can, however, request a one-time delay of one year in their consideration, based on personal considerations. This request must be made to the Department Head before the time when an evaluation is scheduled to begin. Such requests may be approved by a simple majority vote of the P&T Committee. If the candidate has missed eight or more work weeks because of reasons enumerated in the Family and Medical Leave Act,
the Department specifically encourages the request for a one-year extension and will automatically support such a request.

To be considered for tenure, a candidate is required to supply all information relevant to the tenure decision before the tenure evaluation begins. This information should consist of the following and should follow the same suggested format as used for his/her departmental file:

1.3.4.1. A curriculum vitae which should include a record of publications, oral presentations, seminars, research grants, graduate students, postdoctoral students, visiting scholars, teaching, and service.

1.3.4.2. A complete set of the most recent and important publications (up to six reprints/preprints of original contributions to the referred literature).

1.3.4.3. A list of six suggested external referees who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s research. These referees should be distinguished, active research leaders in the candidate’s field, but may not include collaborators or previous mentors or supervisors.

1.3.4.4. A tabular list of courses taught, their initial enrollments, GPA, As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, Qs, and other grades (Is or Ws). If the letter grade distribution or number of Qs is considered unusual, the faculty member should provide a short, written explanation of whatever is considered unusual.

1.3.4.5. For each course taught, sample homework, sample quizzes, a sample hour exam, a sample final exam, and a course syllabus should be submitted.

1.3.4.6. A narrative statement of up to three pages in length, which describes the candidate’s major accomplishments in teaching, research, and service.

1.3.4.6.1. Letters are solicited from at least three of the candidate’s suggested external reviewers, plus others selected by the committee. The letters of recommendation will be held in confidence as permitted under a ruling by the Attorney General of the State of Texas.

1.3.4.6.2. One committee member will be responsible for assembling a complete file that contains all relevant
information about a candidate’s research, teaching, and service performance. Relevant information may vary with the individual, but can include the candidate’s:

1.3.4.6.2.1. curriculum vitae

1.3.4.6.2.2. previous annual reviews by the P&T Committee

1.3.4.6.2.3. solicited and unsolicited evaluations from internal and external referees

1.3.4.6.2.4. evaluation of teaching performance, based on student surveys and faculty comments, including ones derived from classroom observation by peers

1.3.4.6.2.5. material published or submitted for publication by the candidate

1.3.4.6.2.6. other material considered relevant and reliable by the committee

If desired, the candidate may submit to the committee other materials that are considered relevant or may discuss procedures with the Department Head. The candidate is also required to give a departmental seminar. The committee does not meet with faculty members under evaluation.

1.3.4.6.3. The complete file is sent to all committee members for their individual review prior to consideration by the entire committee. A recommendation is prepared, discussed, and modified until a consensus is reached. A vote is then taken by secret ballot and the resulting recommendation is transmitted to the Department Head by the committee chair. The Department Head does not participate in the committee’s evaluation of faculty.

If a committee member believes that they may have a conflict of interest because of a personal, familial, or financial relationship with a candidate being evaluated, they must recuse themselves from the P&T committee’s evaluation process.
1.3.5. Guidelines for Promotion of APT Faculty

1.3.5.1. Evaluation of Lecturers

The P&T committee does not evaluate Lecturers and Senior Lecturers on an annual basis. That evaluation is performed by the Department Head with input from the First-Year Program Coordinator or the relevant Division Chair. Although the P&T Committee does not evaluate Lecturers and Senior Lectures on an annual basis, the Department Head or the Executive Committee may ask the P&T committee to perform an evaluation of Lecturers or Senior Lecturer on an *ad hoc* basis. Such an evaluation requires that the person being evaluated provide an updated curriculum vitae which typically includes reviews of student evaluations, peer evaluations, instructional materials, and any outside activities related to teaching, research (if any), and service. The P&T committee in such cases provides the Department Head and Executive Committee with a written response that is shared with the person being evaluated, who may then comment on any questions raised by the Department Head or the Executive Committee.

1.3.5.2. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor

Evaluation by the P&T committee is part of the promotion process and involves a recommendation procedure that is equivalent to that outlined for granting tenure.

Candidates for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor should provide the P&T committee with the same materials described above for consideration of tenure and promotion to associate professor, with the exception that the focus of the evaluation is on classroom teaching and service. Research activity may be considered but is not a primary criterion for these promotions. Outside letters are not required for promotion to Senior Lecturer or to Instructional Assistant Professor.

1.3.5.3. Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

The P&T committee advises the Department Head on all promotions to Instructional Associate Professor. The materials to
be provided by the candidate are equivalent to the materials described above for consideration of tenure and promotion to associate professor with the exception that the focus of the evaluation is on classroom teaching and service. Research activity may be considered but is not a primary criterion for these promotions. Letters from individuals outside the Chemistry Department or external to Texas A&M University are required for promotion to the rank of Instructional Associate Professor.

1.3.5.4. Promotion to Instructional Professor

The committee advises the Department Head on all promotions to Instructional Full Professor. The materials to be provided by the candidate are equivalent to those described above for consideration of tenure and promotion to full professor with the exception that the focus of the evaluation is on classroom teaching and service. Research activity may be considered but is not a primary criterion for these promotions. Letters from individuals outside the Chemistry Department or external to Texas A&M University are required for promotion to the rank of Instructional Full Professor.

1.3.5.5. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor normally is considered concurrently with the tenure decision, and one will not usually be awarded without the other. File materials for associate professors for annual reviews include a complete annual report prepared according to the Department Head guidelines as well as an updated curriculum vitae. In addition, a tabular list of courses taught, their initial enrollments, GPA, As, Bs, Cs, Ds, Fs, Qs, and other grades (Is or Ws) must be provided. If the letter grade distribution or number of Qs is considered unusual, the faculty member should provide a short, written explanation of whatever is considered unusual.

1.3.5.6. Recognition of AAUP Tenure Probation Period

The timing of the recommendations of the committee is set so that the Department Head receives them before October 1st of the sixth year of the candidate’s probationary period. After final action is taken by the administration (in the spring of the sixth year), the candidate is notified so that the decision is known
before the beginning of the seventh year. Thus, an evaluation must begin in the spring of a candidate's fifth year of service.

1.3.5.7. Promotion to Professor

Eligible associate professors are reviewed annually for possible promotion. Recommendations for promotion to Professor are made based on the criteria set forth in the Department of Chemistry P&T guidelines. The first complete evaluation for promotion to full professor will be made no later than the year after a faculty member has served in the associate professor rank for four years. Each year, associate professors are sent a memorandum by the Department Head that requests that their files be updated. When a candidate is to be considered for promotion, the file is reviewed, and letters are solicited from individuals external to the university to evaluate the quality of the candidate’s research. The details for the review procedures, evaluation, and vote are the same as for the tenure recommendation procedure; a departmental seminar is required. The deadline for a recommendation for a promotion usually occurs in mid-October in any given year.

1.3.5.8. Tenure Recommendation for New Faculty Hired at the Associate or Full Professor Level

The P&T committee advises the Department Head on all appointments that involve the granting of tenure. The committee participates in an evaluation and recommendation procedure that is equivalent to that outlined above for granting of tenure.
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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Mathematics is to be a leader in research in mathematics while providing the highest quality mathematics education to Texas A&M students. The faculty of the Department of Mathematics deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Mathematics for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their fields of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document establishes the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Mathematics. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations. Evaluations of colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the Department depends upon the quality of these reviews.
This document articulates Department of Mathematics guidelines, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Rule</th>
<th>URL</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.

These documents are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the Department of Mathematics Faculty, College of Science Executive Committee, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The Department of Mathematics has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities. Within the Department, faculty may be tenure track, academic professional track, or visiting. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the Department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable Departmental evaluations.

Definition of faculty ranks, and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

2.1 Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the University, College, and Department in anticipated intellectual development and performance. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s research, teaching, and service.
Tenure. Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for cause. See Sections 4 and 6 of https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable, productive, and professional in research, teaching and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure will be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from University, College and Departmental perspectives. The Department of Mathematics conducts formal reviews of tenure track faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the Department of Mathematics clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines.

Included in the Tenure Track are the following titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor**, **Associate Professor**, **Professor**, and **Distinguished Professor**. The categories of performance for faculty in the tenure track are research, teaching, and service. Tenure track faculty are typically assigned to teach three semester courses each academic year. Assistant Professors are not expected to make substantial contributions in service.

### 2.2.1 Lecturer Track

**Lecturer.** The position of Lecturer is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members holding the title of Lecturer will have a master’s or PhD, normally in Mathematics. They are expected to devote the entirety of their professional time to classroom instruction and closely related activities and are not expected to make contributions in the areas of service or scholarly/creative activity. Lecturers are typically assigned a four-course teaching load each semester.

**Senior Lecturer.** The position of Senior Lecturer is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching. Faculty members holding the title of Senior Lecturer will have a master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. They are expected to devote the entirety of their professional time to classroom instruction and closely related activities and are not expected to make contributions in the areas of service or scholarly/creative activity. They may be expected to engage in some leadership or administrative activities if these activities are required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. Senior Lecturers are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

### 2.2.2 Instructional Track

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make contributions in service or scholarly/creative work. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Assistant Professor will have a master’s or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD program. Instructional Assistant Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

**Instructional Associate Professor.** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also exhibit significant impact beyond excellence in classroom instruction, including contributions in service or scholarship. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Associate Professor will have a master's or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD program. Instructional Associate Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

**Instructional Professor.** The position of Instructional Professor is an APT appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also exhibit substantial impact in the Department, College, University, or broader mathematics community. Faculty members holding the title of Instructional Professor will have a master’s or PhD, normally in Mathematics. A PhD in Mathematics is preferred due to the advanced training provided by a PhD.
program. Instructional Professors are typically assigned a three-course teaching load plus one leadership or administrative activity each semester.

2.2.3 APT Faculty Appointments
The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore following the College of Science guidelines, granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointment have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate’s qualifications, as per the criteria stated in Departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the Department Head and approved by the Dean. Faculty members appointed as Instructional Associate Professor will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean’s approval.

Upon promotion to Instructional Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval. The multi-year term appointment or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the Department and College. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with University standards (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

2.3 Visiting Titles
A Visiting Assistant Professor with a limited term appointment is usually a recent PhD graduate. Their appointment in the Department is of a postdoctoral nature with an assigned mentor and duties consisting of research and teaching. A Visiting Professor is usually an established scholar appointed for one or two semesters.

The Department of Mathematics may use other titles (e.g., Senior Professor).

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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, service appropriate to career stage, and/or administration). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) 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 assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and service. APT faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in support of the department’s teaching mission.
Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted once per year. Tenure Track faculty additionally are evaluated during the Mid-Term Review, as candidates for Tenure and Promotion, and during the Post-Tenure Review. The relevant criteria for evaluation of faculty performance in the Department of Mathematics are defined below.

3.1 Teaching
Teaching is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those with other responsibilities in place of teaching (e.g., administrative assignments). All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the Department’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods are considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching may include (in no particular order): 1) a self-reflection document; 2) peer evaluation of teaching and teaching materials; 3) peer review of webpages and resources provided for students; 4) student feedback taken from end-of-course student evaluations; 5) peer assessment of the reasonableness of end-of-course grade point averages, grade distributions, and overall student success rates.

Essential qualifications for Department of Mathematics instructors are the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished mathematics teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of students’ performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. For tenure track faculty, outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development are important measures of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a Department, College, University, or professional society outstanding teacher award.

With regard to teaching evaluation, for mid-term review, tenure and promotion, and once every year for tenured and APT faculty, a Teaching Evaluation Table shall be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year(s): a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation for an appropriate selection of questions posed to the students (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F and Q grades. A definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The criteria that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 Teaching quality. The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one’s discipline.
3.1.2 Essential pedagogy. The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and student engagement; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.
3.1.3 Educational innovation. Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness, developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.
3.1.4 Teaching professionalism. Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation, and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students’
classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

3.1.5 Impact upon students. A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility. The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to Departmental teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

3.1.7 Promotion of high-impact teaching strategies. Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should interact with their students to the greatest extent possible.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions are critical to our academic reputation for excellence in research. Scholarly activity is creative intellectual work; it should be validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner in order to have impact.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training students in research, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be widely respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or international level.

A shared characteristic of research and scholarly activity is the production of peer-evaluated and published work. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. The capacity for identifying, seeking, and obtaining research funding is a measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

The Department and College expect that all tenure-track faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. Some APT faculty are expected to engage in scholarly/creative activity, which might involve, but is not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

The relevant criteria that may be considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 Scientific inquiry. The foundation of quality scholarly activity is identifying a topic needing study and conducting an appropriate investigation.

3.2.2 Scientific communication. Original research and scholarly activity are considered to be evidence of scientific impact once accepted for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

3.2.3 Research funding. Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research or other scholarly activity are indicators of excellence.

3.2.4 Collaborative approach. Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, collaborative, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued.

3.2.5 Educational contributions. Educating the next generation of mathematical leaders and researchers is an important mission of the Department and depends on the research skills of the faculty.
3.2.6 Contributions to the field. Research related activities, such as editorial board or panel membership, that benefit mathematics and science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

3.2.7 Acknowledgments of impact. For tenure and promotion, assessments from eminent scholars in the field are of great importance. Other factors considered in assessing impact include awards, citations, journal quality, funding and speaking invitations and these also apply to internal decisions on merit compensation. Care is taken to consider these various metrics within the context of what is appropriate in a given researcher’s subfield.

3.3 Service

Faculty service is central to the mission of the Department. The Department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution a faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the Department, the College, and the University. The amount and nature of a faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, stage of career, and career track. Some APT faculty are expected to engage in service, and the leadership or administrative activities assigned to APT faculty (i.e., course coordination, hiring graders, advising, etc.) are duties essential to the overall operations of the department and are categorized as service for evaluation and promotion purposes.

All faculty members are expected to be professional in carrying out their service, that is to exhibit a consistent commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the Department, College, University, and profession. Key dimensions are collegiality and teamwork, that is, positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and service.

The Department will not discourage debate or disagreement; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

Academic service contributes to the Department mission of advancing mathematics locally, statewide, nationally, and internationally. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the Department, College, and the University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the Department of Mathematics.

The scope of Department activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, special training or professional development programs. The Department also encourages its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks competently. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.
Criteria that may be considered in evaluating service performance are:

3.3.1 **Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member’s professionalism and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

3.3.2 **Professional communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators and must work toward solutions of problems.

3.3.3 **Departmental engagement.** It is important that faculty members engage in activities that benefit others apart from themselves. This includes accepting appropriate amounts of committee work commensurate with academic rank.

3.3.4 **Colleague/student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleagues and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is valued.

3.3.5 **Academic leadership.** Serving on departmental, college or university task forces, major committees or in administrative roles (e.g., assistant/associate department head or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 **Service to the field.** Citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards, or panel memberships, that benefit mathematics outside of the University, are important criteria for evaluation.

4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The Department of Mathematics recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for use in evaluating faculty performance. These indicators are a compilation of items typically viewed favorably by evaluation and promotion committees and should not be viewed as a checklist of requirements nor as a complete list.

All of the following indicators will be judged with respect to quality and impact.

4.1 **Indicators of Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:
- outstanding evaluations based on classroom visitation by departmental administrators, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for Department, College, University, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- substantial involvement in undergraduate or graduate research,
- significant leadership of existing instructional programs, or the creation of new programs,
- development of a significant new course,
- the creation of new pedagogy, which is adopted by others, both internal and external to the university,
- internal or external grant support for classroom teaching or course development.

4.2 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:
- teaching a variety of service mathematics courses that contribute to academic success of students majoring in another department or college,
- teaching mathematics courses that contribute to the success of mathematics majors,
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
• routinely practicing rigorous, meaningful, and equitable grading of student work (as shown by, e.g., DFQ rates and course GPAs that reflect departmental norms for similar courses after accounting for the context within which specific sections are taught),
• serving as a course coordinator,
• mentoring colleagues in teaching methodologies that aim to improve teaching methods,
• completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
• engagement in professional development activities that lead to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
• development of instructional materials or pedagogical strategies (e.g., active learning or flipped classrooms) that lead to improved educational experience.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:
• peer-reviewed publications in highly ranked journals,
• external grant support,
• invitations to speak at conferences, workshops, and colloquia that represent clear evidence of national and international impact, as appropriate for the faculty member’s rank,
• directing graduate or undergraduate students in research with documented impact,
• recognition from peers in the field (e.g., national, or international awards, honors, invitations to give/panel lectures),
• favorable citations of research publications, with respect to research area,
• publication of monographs or books,
• leadership of successful collaborative research/scholarly activities,
• creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
• patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements.

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:
• presentation of original research or other scholarly work at professional meetings,
• publication of original research or other scholarly work in proceedings of professional meetings,
• effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project,
• key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
• contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others, and
• creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that are adopted by other institutions.

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service, include, but are not limited to:
• chairing a major committee with demonstrable impact at the university, state, national, or international level,
• effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards,
• attraction of significant development support,
• consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
• selection for Departmental, College, University, or professional association outstanding service or mentoring awards,
• service as an editor or associate editor for a highly rated journal,
• service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions, or foundations,
• leadership of outreach activities,
• leadership of a major program which has demonstrable impact within the university or beyond,
• excelling in a major departmental administrative role, and
• serving as a course coordinator for multiple semesters.
4.6 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Service**, include, but are not limited to:

- serving as an effective member of a committee within the Department, College, University, or professional society,
- recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the Department, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs,
- actively and effectively striving to achieve Departmental goals,
- significant contributions to the promotion of diversity, inclusion, and climate,
- mentoring early career faculty,
- leadership and organization of seminars, workshops, or conferences,
- promoting significant teaching, research, or service experiences for students,
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
- serving as an advisor to student organizations,
- serving in administrative roles (e.g., assistant/associate department head or director title) within the Department, College or University, and
- actively participating in K-12 or other public outreach.

5. **Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Transition**

For promotion, tenure, and transition in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance.

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, and service appropriate to career stage), with primary emphasis on the **quality**, **significance**, and **impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Mathematics are as follows:

5.1.1 **Assistant Professor**. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching and research. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and research support and building their teaching skills and portfolio.

5.1.2 **Associate Professor**. Emphasis for tenure-track faculty should be placed on further development of scholarship as indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the faculty member’s specialty area. Associate Professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate Professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must have documented effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. A tenure-track faculty member must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.
5.1.3 Professor. Continued excellence, leadership, and national/international recognition are required. Leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; evidence of collegiality and professionalism; and excellence in instruction and mentoring students. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Faculty members in the APT ranks other than Instructional Professor will typically be considered for promotion or transition after five years in rank. Considerations for promotion or transition will include the quality, significance, effectiveness, and impact of the faculty member’s teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities. Excellence in teaching is a core consideration in all evaluations of APT faculty in the Department of Mathematics, but it is also recognized that APT faculty carry out a wide range of duties depending on Departmental needs. For this reason, the criteria listed below should be considered in the context of the particular duties assigned to the APT faculty member being evaluated or considered for promotion. These criteria should not be viewed as a checklist of requirements, but rather as a guide to items typically viewed favorably by promotion committees.

5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Foundational criteria include, but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- at least a three-year consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Lecturer,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience of at least five years as a Lecturer or agreed upon equivalent experience.

Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should additionally exhibit some of the following:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- service or supervisory role in program activities,
- implementation of instructional and pedagogical strategies that lead to improved student learning or students’ educational experience,
- successful teaching across a variety of service-level courses or to a variety of student audiences,
- successful teaching of courses with challenging or non-traditional formats, such as online or very large lecture sizes,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the Department.

5.2.2 Criteria for Transition to Instructional Assistant Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Senior Lecturer,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism.
In addition to these foundational criteria, candidates for transition to Instructional Assistant Professor should exhibit additional accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including additional contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- contributions to outreach activities,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations.

5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- at least a three-year consecutive trend of high ratings on annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Instructional Assistant Professor,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience of at least five years as an Instructional Assistant Professor (or equivalent).

In addition to these foundational requirements, candidates for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor should exhibit substantial accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including significant contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that have enhanced the teaching function of the Department,
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- contributions to outreach activities,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations.

5.2.4 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor

Foundational criteria include but are not limited to:

- mastery of mathematics content needed for teaching,
- consecutive trend of outstanding annual evaluations of teaching performance while in rank of Instructional Associate Professor,
- continued professional growth in teaching,
- outstanding performance in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- experience as an Instructional Associate Professor (or equivalent).

In addition to these foundational requirements, candidates for promotion to Instructional Professor should exhibit substantial accomplishments beyond excellence in classroom teaching, including significant contributions in service or scholarly/creative activities. While the general range of activities considered is similar to that for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, candidates for promotion to Instructional Professor should exhibit substantial impact.
outside of the University or leadership of programs within the University. Examples may include, but are not limited to:

- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- creation of teaching materials or pedagogical strategies that have enhanced the teaching function of the Department,
- participation in program or curriculum development or similar activities,
- leadership in outreach activities,
- program leadership,
- internal or external grant funding to support teaching or scholarly activities,
- invitations to speak or teach outside of the University,
- contributions to the scholarship of learning, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- contributions to mathematical research, as evidenced by scholarly publications, grants, or speaking invitations,
- awards at the College, University, state, or national level for outstanding teaching,
- actively assisting students in the search for academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the Department, College, University, or community,
- significant service to state, national, or international organizations.

5.3 Timing of Tenure and Promotion Review for Tenure Track Faculty

The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by University regulations. Specifically, the review is conducted during the year determined as follows: calendar year hired plus the probationary period and minus 2 years equals the tenure consideration year. Normally in the Department of Mathematics, the tenure review will be conducted during the fall of an Assistant Professor’s sixth year of service. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation letter to the Department Head.

Extension of the probationary period may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the Provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: taken leave without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate’s control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean and the Provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a Department Head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters, and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, approximately the first day of November.

5.4 Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In cases involving tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from the Committee of Tenured Faculty (Committee T) as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee T comprises all tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics, with the title/rank of Associate Professor, Professor, or Distinguished Professor. At the time a tenure or promotion recommendation is required, with the following exceptions: any tenured faculty member excluded by the guidelines of the Dean of Faculties (e.g., faculty members who participate in the tenure process beyond the initial level,
including the Head of Department); visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose
courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee T. All members of
Committee T as defined above, including those not in residence, are eligible to vote, with the exception of
any member voting at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a member of Committee T serving on a promotion
advisory committee with voting privileges). All members of Committee T may attend meetings even if
ineligible to vote, and the Head of Department may also attend.

The exclusions listed above may be found in the Guidelines of the Dean of Faculties at
https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines

It is noted in the guidelines that the role of the Department Head in discussions of candidates by Committee
T is restricted to procedural questions, if called upon.

Committee T shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure (Subcommittee P&T) having four
members who serve two-year terms. Each year before March 1, Committee T shall elect two of the four
members from a list of candidates nominated as follows. Three or more of the candidates shall be nominated
by the Executive Committee; any number of others may be nominated at large by members of Committee T.
The chair of Subcommittee P&T shall be appointed by the Head together with the Executive Committee. In
the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee P&T, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement.

Duties of Subcommittee P&T include conducting a third-year review of assistant professors with probationary
periods of seven years or more (pursuant to University Rule 12.01.99.M2 of the University Statement on
Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), assisting in the identification of candidates
meriting early promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, and documenting cases for promotion to
Associate Professor with tenure. The third-year review shall be conducted in accordance with University
The Head shall inform Subcommittee P&T of all tenure-track faculty for whom either a third-year review is
mandatory or for whom tenure review is mandatory.

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are linked for faculty members hired as Assistant Professors.
Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee P&T will begin the preparation of
files documenting each candidate’s teaching, research, and service records. Files will be available for
inspection by all members of Committee T.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate’s being promoted and given tenure are described in Texas A&M
University’s rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and
Promotion) and in the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of the College of Science. In addition to these
qualifications, a candidate’s research shall be evaluated with the following in mind: 1) the quality of a
candidate’s research publications, judged with the help of letters from outside reviewers; 2) outside
recognition; 3) research funding.

An investigation of the quality of a candidate’s teaching shall include some of these: 1) examining reports of
the teaching committee; 2) examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate’s
classes and comparing them with both the candidate’s grade distributions and the average grade
distributions for the corresponding courses; 3) visiting a candidate’s classes; 4) reviewing any other pertinent
information.

Subcommittee P&T will select the names of experts in the candidate’s field and contact them for letters of
evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of referees, Subcommittee P&T will invite the candidates, the
Head, and the tenured faculty to suggest referees, and may contact outside people for suggestions. The
candidate may suggest at most five referees and may also suggest persons who should not be consulted.
Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. Consistent with University
guidelines, all letters for P&T candidates must be “arm’s length.” Letters from previous collaborators, former
supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm’s length will not be considered. Subcommittee P&T will also
arrange for the evaluation of the candidate’s teaching and service records.
It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P&T to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate’s file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner.

When completed a candidate’s file shall contain the following items:

1. Candidate’s statement on teaching, research, and service; limited to 3 pages in total.
2. A curriculum vitae containing professional information that includes a complete publication list; the list of publication shall be divided into works appearing in *refereed* journals and works appearing elsewhere; work that has been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled; work that has been submitted but not yet accepted can be included provided it appears in a separate list; the candidate must sign a statement that the CV is current.
3. Verification of Contents Letter - a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he or she is submitting (as distinct from the other items in the dossier, such as committee reports etc.).
4. Departmental Reports evaluating Teaching, Research, Service and Other Activities - written by Subcommittee P&T (revised, as appropriate, after Committee T deliberations and vote - see below); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of classroom visits, and a Teaching Evaluation Table (see Section 3.1) which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate while in rank as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics.
5. Outside Reviewer’s Letters - should include a list of all referees contacted; those suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; referee qualifications should also be included; letters to the referees and all communications received from the referees should be included.
6. Overall Departmental Report - written by Subcommittee P&T after deliberations and vote (see below) on overall recommendations regarding the candidate’s promotion case.
7. Department Head Recommendation - written after deliberations and vote (see below).
8. Copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works.
9. Any statement or materials the candidate may wish to submit.

Additional details on these items are given in the University Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P&T shall report to Committee T on each candidate at a meeting, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Teaching reports and annual evaluations by the Head will also be made available to Committee T. Committee T shall discuss the reports and the candidates’ cases. After the deliberations of Committee T are completed, Subcommittee P&T shall poll the members of Committee T in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is *two-thirds* or more of the ballots cast for or against and at least *half* of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant tenure and promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant neither tenure nor promotion. The Department Head will notify each candidate of the committee recommendation.

Subcommittee P&T shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee T. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee T who will indicate by signature or by e-mail message that they are accurate accounts of the discussions held by Committee T. Any member (or group of members) of Committee T who feels that a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee T may append a signed letter to the report in question. These reports and any appended letters shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee T on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, except in the following instance. Regardless of the positive or negative vote, the dossier shall be forwarded to the Dean unless the candidate makes a written request to the Head that the file be withdrawn.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.
5.5 Procedures for Promotion to Professor

In a case of promotion to the rank of Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty through an advisory vote by the Committee of Professors (Committee P) and a written report on each candidate as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee P comprises all tenured faculty of the Department of Mathematics, with the title/rank of Professor or Distinguished Professor at the time a promotion recommendation is required, with the following exceptions: any tenured faculty member excluded by the guidelines of the Dean of Faculties (e.g., faculty members who participate in the promotion process beyond the initial level, including the Head of Department); visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee T. All members of Committee P as defined above, including those not in residence, are eligible to vote, with the exception of any member voting at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a member of Committee P serving on a promotion advisory committee with voting privileges). All members of Committee P may attend meetingseven if ineligible to vote, and the Head of Department may also attend.

The exclusions listed above may be found in the Guidelines of the Dean of Faculties at https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

It is noted in the guidelines that the role of the Department Head in discussions of candidates by Committee P is restricted to procedural questions, if called upon.

Committee P shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee P) having four members who serve two-year terms. Each year before March 1, Committee P shall elect two of the four members from a list of candidates nominated as follows. Three or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the Executive Committee; any number of others may be nominated at large by members of Committee P. The chair of Subcommittee P shall be appointed by the Head and the Executive Committee. In the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee P, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement.

Duties of Subcommittee P include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Professor and documenting cases for promotion to Professor.

Candidates recommended for promotion to Professor shall be selected in the following way. In a scheduled meeting of Committee P, Subcommittee P shall report on possible candidates for promotion to Professor. Additional candidates may be suggested by Committee P. Any members of Committee P unable to attend may communicate suggestions and concerns in writing to the whole committee. In its deliberations, Committee P shall have full access to the curriculum vitae of all associate professors, Annual Reports from the past three years, and Annual Reviews from the department. Should no consensus emerge at this meeting, Subcommittee P shall issue a written ballot to Committee P to obtain an advisory vote. Faculty members recommended by the committee will be contacted and given the choice to be a promotion candidate. According to university rules, a faculty member not recommended must also be considered if requested by the faculty member, unless they were considered as a promotion candidate the previous year with recommendation letters solicited by the subcommittee. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Requests by faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year will be granted at the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Subcommittee P will then begin the preparation of files documenting each promotion candidate’s teaching, research, and service records. Subcommittee P will select the names of experts in the candidate’s field and contact them for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of referees, Subcommittee P will invite the candidates, the Head, and Committee P to suggest referees, and may contact outside people for suggestions. A candidate may suggest at most five referees and may also suggest persons who should not be consulted. Consistent with University guidelines, all letters for P&T candidates must be “arm’s length.” Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not arm’s length will not be considered. Subcommittee P will also arrange for
evaluation of the candidate’s teaching and service records. Files developed during the review process will be kept in a central place and will be available for inspection by all members of Committee P.

It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate’s file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner.

When completed a candidate’s file shall contain the following items:

1. Candidate’s statement on teaching, research, and service; limited to 3 pages in total.
2. A curriculum vitae containing professional information that includes a complete publication list; the list of publications shall be divided into works appearing in refereed journals and works appearing elsewhere; work that has been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled; work that has been submitted but not yet accepted can be included provided it appears in a separate list; the candidate must sign a statement that the CV is current.
3. Verification of contents letter - a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he or she is submitting (as distinct from the other items in the dossier, such as committee reports, etc.).
4. Departmental Reports evaluating the Teaching, Research, Service and Other Activities - written by Subcommittee P (revised, as appropriate, after Committee P deliberations and vote - see below); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations during the candidate’s tenure as an associate professor, reports of classroom visits, and a Teaching Evaluation Table (see Section 3.1) which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate during tenure.
5. Outside Reviewer’s Letters - should include a list of all referees contacted; those suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; referee qualifications should also be included; letters to the referees and all communications received from the referees should be included.
6. Overall Departmental Report - written by Subcommittee P after deliberations and vote (see below) on overall recommendations regarding the candidate’s promotion case.
7. Department Head Recommendation - written after deliberations and vote (see below).
8. Copies of selected published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works.
9. Any statement or materials the candidate may wish to submit.

Additional details on these items are given in the University Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P shall report to Committee P on each candidate at a meeting, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Teaching reports and annual evaluations by the Head will also be made available to Committee P. Committee P shall discuss the reports and the candidates’ cases. After the deliberations of Committee P are completed, Subcommittee P shall poll the members of Committee P in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P not to promote. The Department Head will notify each candidate of the committee recommendation.

Subcommittee P shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee P. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee P, who will indicate by signature or by e-mail message that they are accurate accounts of the discussions held by Committee P. Any member (or group of members) of Committee P who feels that a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee P may append a signed letter to the report in question. These reports and any appended letters shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee P on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request to the Head that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of a positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.
5.6 Procedures for Tenured Appointments
In the case of an applicant being considered for a tenured appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, it shall be the responsibility of the Head and the Executive Committee to prepare an appropriate file and present the case for tenure to Committee T. The members of Committee T shall be polled in a de-identified ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to grant a tenured appointment to a candidate is two-thirds or more of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee T to grant a tenured appointment. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee T not to grant a tenured appointment.

5.7 Appeals
University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

5.8 Procedures for Promotion and Transition for APT Faculty
The promotion process for APT faculty is very similar to that of tenured and tenure-track faculty and is on the same timeline as all other promotions. The process is unique, however, in several ways, as stated in the Dean of Faculties guidelines. Importantly, the University does not require support letters for APT faculty promotions. However, the College does require, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. The Department may request external letters when appropriate for evaluation of a candidate's contributions. APT promotion dossiers are evaluated as described in sections 5.8.1-5.8.4 below.

5.8.1 Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer
In cases involving promotion to Senior Lecturer, the Dean will receive the advice of the APT faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee L&I, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee L&I comprises all Senior Lecturers and all Instructional Assistant, Instructional Associate, and Instructional Professors in the Department, with the exception of any individuals who will serve as evaluators of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions). Although the Head is not a member of Committee L&I, the chair of Committee L&I has the discretion to invite the Head to attend Committee L&I meetings. Committee L&I shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee L&I) comprised of four members of Committee L&I, along with one tenured faculty member, with all members serving two-year terms. Each year, before March 1, Committee L&I shall elect two of four Subcommittee members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: three or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee L&I. The tenured faculty member shall be appointed by the Head. The chair of Subcommittee L&I shall be appointed by the Head, together with the APTC. In the event of a vacancy on Subcommittee L&I, the Head shall appoint a suitable replacement. The appointed tenured faculty member will not vote on any promotions to Senior Lecturer.

Duties of Subcommittee L&I include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Senior Lecturer, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee L&I, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee L&I will compile data related to the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Lecturer in the Department and will present a list of candidates recommended for promotion to Committee L&I. In addition, any member of Committee L&I may suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee L&I are complete, Subcommittee L&I shall poll the members of Committee L&I in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the
ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Lecturer for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate’s being promoted are described in Texas A&M University’s rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, http://dof.tamu.edu/. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated solely in the category of teaching. A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall include some of these: examining a candidate's teaching folder; observing a candidate's teaching; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate’s classes and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching and, if applicable, a statement on research and service (limited to a total of 3 pages); a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and instruction of extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University’s rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, http://dof.tamu.edu/.

When completed, a candidate’s file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:
1. Departmental reports evaluating the teaching, research (if applicable), service and other activities, written by Subcommittee L&I (revised, as appropriate, after Committee L&I deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of teaching.
2. The overall Departmental report, written by Subcommittee L&I after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate’s promotion case; the Department Head recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitting materials, a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students’ understanding of the mathematical content they teach, (b) improve their students’ outlook about doing and learning mathematics, (c) inspire or encourage students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level, (d) encourage students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers, and (e) broaden their students’ understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee L&I shall submit a preliminary report to Committee L&I on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee L&I shall meet and discuss the reports and each candidate’s case. After the deliberations of Committee L&I are complete,
Subcommittee L&I shall poll the members of Committee L&I in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee L&I not to promote.

Subcommittee L&I shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee L&I. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee L&I. Members of Committee L&I will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee L&I. Any member of Committee L&I who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee L&I may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee L&I on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of a positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.8.2 Procedures for Transition to Instructional Assistant Professor
In cases involving the transition from Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor, the Dean will receive a recommendation from the Head and documents from the candidate. This transition does not constitute a promotion, but rather should be viewed as a re-hiring into a different academic track, with pay commensurate with the new track. The process is initiated by the Head.

Each Spring semester, the Head, in consultation with APT faculty in the Instructional ranks who sit on the Academic Professional Track Committee (APTC), will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities of all Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and will create a list of all candidates recommended for transition to Instructional Assistant Professor. The Head will formally invite each recommended candidate to submit a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a statement of their teaching philosophy; and a description of all their contributions to the Department, both past and envisioned, that go beyond the Department’s standard teaching mission. These documents are submitted to the Assistant Head for APT Faculty Affairs who then writes a one-page report of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential as an Instructional Assistant Professor. This report, and all of the candidate’s documents, are submitted for further review to all ranks of the instructional faculty and all ranks of the tenure-track faculty, and these groups will provide feedback to the Head on the candidate’s suitability for transition. After considering the Assistant Head’s report, feedback from the faculty, and the documents submitted to the Assistant Head by the candidate, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. The recommendations and reports shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head.

5.8.3 Procedures for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor
In cases involving promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee I&T, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee I&T comprises all Associate Professors and Professors in the Department, excluding the Head (Committee P&T), along with all Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors in the Department (Committee I), with the exception of any individuals who will serve as an evaluator of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions, the Dean of Faculties, the Provost and the President), should those people hold appointments in Mathematics, visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee I or Committee T. Although the Head is not a member of Committee I&T, the chair of Committee I&T has the discretion to
invite the Head to attend Committee I&T meetings. Committee I&T shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee I&T) comprising the four members of Subcommittee P&T, along with two faculty members holding the rank of Instructional Associate Professor or Instructional Professor. Each year, before March 1, Committee I&T shall elect one of its APT members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: two or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee I&T. Each APT member will serve a two-year term.

Duties of Subcommittee I&T include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee I&T, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee I&T will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Instructional Assistant Professor in the Department and will present to Committee I&T a list of candidates recommended for promotion. In addition, any member of Committee I&T can suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee, I&T are complete, Subcommittee I&T shall poll the members of Committee I&T in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Instructional Assistant Professor for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.

Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, http://dof.tamu.edu/. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated in the categories of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, with the following items in mind.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's teaching folder; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; visiting a candidate's classes; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's service shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's performance in assigned leadership duties such as course coordination, week-in- reviews, make-up exam coordination, and help session oversight; evaluating a candidate's contributions in curriculum development; service on Departmental or University committees; service as a Department advisor; service as a faculty advisor for a student organization; participation in outreach activities; awards for service.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's scholarly/creative activities shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's record in activities such as publication of scholarly articles, publication of books, conference presentations; textbook reviews; consulting; and leadership in professional organizations.

Subcommittee I&T will select the names of three or more suitable references for each candidate and contact these references for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of references, Subcommittee I&T will compile an internal list of candidates, possibly in consultation with other members of the broader Committee I&T and will also invite the candidate to submit a list of proposed references. The candidate may suggest at most three references and
may also suggest persons who should not be consulted. However, the final choice of references should include at least two individuals from Subcommittee I&T's internal list. Letters are allowed from members of Committee I&T, and members of Committee I&T who write letters on behalf of the promotion candidate are allowed to vote on the candidate's promotion. It is the responsibility of Subcommittee I&T to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner. A total of at least three letters will be required for each candidate, and at least two letters should address teaching or pedagogy, either by directly addressing the teaching or pedagogy of the candidate or by addressing impact the candidate has had on teaching or pedagogy.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching, research (if applicable), and service (limited to 3 pages total); a curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and instruction of extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies that lead to improved student learning or students’ educational experience; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University’s rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, http://dof.tamu.edu/.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:

1. Departmental Reports evaluating the teaching, research (if applicable), service and other activities, written by Subcommittee I&T (revised, as appropriate, after Committee I&T deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of teaching. A list of all references contacted should be provided, along with a copy of the solicitation letter; references suggested by the candidate should be designated as such and reference qualifications should also be included.

2. The Overall Departmental Report, written by Subcommittee I&T after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate's promotion case; the Department Head Recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitting materials, a candidate for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This presentation should include techniques or aspects used while in the rank of Instructional Assistant Professor. Candidates may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students’ understanding of the mathematical content they teach; (b) improve their students’ outlook about doing and learning mathematics; (c) inspire or encourage their students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level; (d) encourage their students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers; and (e) broaden their students’ understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee I&T shall submit a preliminary report to Committee I&T on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee I&T shall meet and discuss the reports and the candidates' cases. After the deliberations of Committee, I&T are complete, Subcommittee I&T shall poll the members of Committee I&T in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee I&T not to promote.
Subcommittee I&T shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee I&T. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee I&T. Members of Committee I&T will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee I&T. Any member of Committee I&T who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee I&T may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee I&T on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of the positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

5.8.4 Procedures for Promotion to Instructional Professor
In cases involving promotion to Instructional Professor, the Dean will receive the advice of the faculty in the form of a vote and report from Committee P&IP, as well as a separate recommendation and report from the Head. Committee P&IP comprises all Professors in the Department, excluding the Head (Committee P), along with all Instructional Professors in the Department (Committee IP), with the exception of any individuals who will serve as an evaluator of the candidate at a level beyond the Department (e.g., a voting member of the College of Science committee on promotions, the Dean of Faculties, the Provost and the President), should those people hold appointments in Mathematics, visiting faculty of all ranks, and faculty in other Departments whose courtesy or joint appointments in Mathematics were given without the vote of Committee P or Committee IP. Although the Head is not a member of Committee P&IP, the chair of Committee P&IP has the discretion to invite the Head to attend Committee P&IP meetings. Committee P&IP shall have a Subcommittee on Promotion (Subcommittee P&IP) comprising the four members of Subcommittee P, along with two faculty members holding the rank of Instructional Professor. Each year, before March 1, Committee P&IP shall elect one of its APT members from a list of candidates nominated as follows: two or more of the candidates shall be nominated by the APTC; any number of additional candidates may be nominated at large by members of Committee P&IP. If the Department does not have at least two APT faculty members in the rank of Instructional Professor, then Subcommittee P&IP shall be allowed to consist of four or five members, rather than the full six. Each APT member will serve a two-year term.

Duties of Subcommittee P&IP include assisting in the identification of candidates meriting promotion to Instructional Professor, overseeing the discussions of promotion candidates in Committee P&IP, and documenting the promotion cases for candidates who are put forward. Each spring, after its new members have been determined, Subcommittee P&IP will evaluate the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity record of each Instructional Associate Professor in the Department and will present, to Committee P&IP, a list of candidates recommended for promotion. In addition, any member of Committee P&IP can suggest additional candidates for discussion. After the discussions of Committee P&IP are complete, Subcommittee P&IP shall poll the members of Committee P&IP in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to put the candidate forward for promotion is at least two-thirds the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP to put the candidate forward. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP not to put the candidate forward. In addition, any APT faculty member in the rank of Instruction Associate Professor for whom the Department did not develop promotion materials during the previous year must be considered for promotion upon request. Such requests must be made by the end of the spring semester. Consideration of faculty members for whom promotion materials were developed during the previous year is up to the discretion of the Dean of Faculties, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Head of the Department and will typically only be granted if substantial new evidence of excellence has been established in at least one area of faculty performance.
Necessary qualifications for a candidate's being promoted are described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), available from the Dean of Faculties web pages, http://dof.tamu.edu/. Consistent with these guidelines and the criteria described in Section 5, candidates will be evaluated in the categories of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, with the following items in mind.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's teaching shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's teaching folder; examining the student evaluations from a representative sample of a candidate's classes, and comparing them with both the candidate's grade distributions and the average grade distributions for the corresponding courses; visiting a candidate's classes; noting any awards for teaching the candidate may have received; reviewing any other pertinent information.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's service shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's performance in assigned leadership duties such as course coordination, week-in-reviews, make-up exam coordination, and help session oversight; evaluating a candidate's contributions in curriculum development; service on Departmental or University committees; service as a Department advisor; service as a faculty advisor for a student organization; participation in outreach activities; awards for service.

A thorough investigation of the quality of a candidate's scholarly/creative activities shall be conducted, including some of the following steps: examining a candidate's record in activities such as publication of scholarly articles; publication of books; presentations of scholarly work at conferences; textbook reviews; consulting; and leadership in professional organizations.

Subcommittee P&IP will select the names of three or more suitable references for each candidate and contact these references for letters of evaluation. In order to develop a balanced list of references, Subcommittee P&IP will both compile an internal list of candidates, possibly in consultation with other members of the broader Committee P&IP and will also invite the candidates to submit a list of proposed references. The candidate may suggest at most three references and may also suggest persons who should not be consulted. However, the final choice of references should include at least two individuals from Subcommittee P&IP's internal list. Letters are allowed from members of Committee P&IP, and members of Committee P&IP who write letters on behalf of the promotion candidate are allowed to vote on the candidate's promotion. It is the responsibility of Subcommittee P&IP to monitor the receipt of materials for each candidate's file in order to ascertain that the documents requested are being received in a timely manner. A total of at least three letters will be required for each candidate, and at least two letters should address teaching or pedagogy, either by directly addressing the teaching or pedagogy of the candidate or by addressing impact the candidate has had on teaching or pedagogy.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the candidate: Candidate's statement on teaching, research (if applicable) and service (limited to 3 pages total); A curriculum vitae that includes a list of courses taught, service activities, and scholarly/creative activities; a teaching portfolio, including samples of course materials such as syllabi, notes, assignments, and exams, along with documentation of any special teaching assignments such as weekly reviews and extremely large sections, and any teaching techniques or technologies that lead to improved student learning or students' educational experiences; any other relevant materials the faculty member wishes to provide; copies of all published work and preprints of manuscripts of submitted works (if applicable). Additional required documentation, as described in Texas A&M University's rules 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), is available from the Dean of Faculties website, http://dof.tamu.edu/.

When completed, a candidate's file shall contain the following items provided by the Department:
1. Departmental Reports evaluating the teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activities, written by Subcommittee P&IP (revised, as appropriate, after Committee P&IP deliberations and vote (see below)); the evaluation of teaching should include summaries of student evaluations and reports of mathematics faculty evaluation of
teaching. A list of all references contacted should be provided, along with a copy of the specific questions posed to the references; references suggested by the candidate should be designated as such; reference qualifications should also be included.

2. The Overall Departmental Report, written by Subcommittee P&IP after deliberations and vote (see below), along with an overall recommendation regarding the candidate’s promotion case; the Department Head Recommendation, written after deliberations and vote (see below).

In addition to submitted materials, a candidate for promotion to Instructional Professor will make a presentation to all faculty that addresses specific techniques or aspects of their teaching that showcase their efforts to extend student learning of and interest in mathematics. This presentation should include techniques or aspects used while in the rank of Instructional Associate Professor. Candidates may include techniques used to (a) deepen their students’ understanding of the mathematical content they teach; (b) improve their students’ outlook about doing and learning mathematics; (c) inspire or encourage their students to be curious and investigate mathematics at a deeper level; (d) encourage their students to engage in mathematical discussions with peers; and (e) broaden their students’ understanding of how mathematics is used in various industries and professions. The presentation should also address unique aspects of their teaching style, evidence of their overall impact on students they taught, and any other items related to teaching that may not be adequately captured within their teaching statement and curriculum vitae.

At the appropriate time in the fall, after due deliberation but no vote, Subcommittee P&IP shall submit a preliminary report to Committee P&IP on each candidate, presenting each case in an impartial manner. Committee P&IP shall meet and discuss the reports and the candidates’ cases. After the deliberations of Committee P&IP are complete, Subcommittee P&IP shall poll the members of Committee P&IP in an anonymous ballot, the results of which shall be promptly announced. If the number of votes to promote a candidate is at least two-thirds of the ballots cast for or against and at least half of the number of eligible voters in residence, then the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP to grant promotion. Otherwise, the vote is a recommendation by Committee P&IP not to promote.

Subcommittee P&IP shall revise its report on each candidate in light of the deliberations and vote of Committee P&IP. The final reports shall be made available to the members of Committee P&IP. Members of Committee P&IP will be asked to verify, by signature, they agree the final report accurately reflects the deliberations of Committee P&IP. Any member of Committee P&IP who feels a report does not accurately reflect the deliberations of Committee P&IP may, in lieu of signing, append a letter to the report in question. These reports, any appended letters, and the results of the vote shall be transmitted to the Head.

After considering the vote, the reports, appended letters, and any other pertinent information, the Head shall formulate recommendations in each case and promptly announce them to the Department. These recommendations, the vote of Committee P&IP on each candidate, the reports, and any appended letters shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Head, unless the candidate makes a written request that the file be withdrawn. A candidate has the right, regardless of the positive or negative vote, to withdraw their dossier at any time in the promotion process.

All of the above procedures shall be scheduled to allow ample time to complete each in an orderly fashion.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are conducted in accordance with Section 2.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this section, the Department of Mathematics provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the Department.
All University-employed faculty members must have an annual written review.

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.

The department conducts its annual evaluations of tenure track and tenured faculty as peer evaluations by the department’s Executive Committee (EC), and of APT faculty as peer evaluations by the department’s APT Committee (APTC). The EC, chaired by the Head, consists of six tenured faculty members, four of whom are elected and two of whom are appointed by the Head. In addition, there are two ex officio members, the Head, and the Associate Head for Operations. Elected and appointed members serve two-year terms, with two elected by the Tenure Track faculty and one appointed by the Head each year. The APTC, chaired by the Assistant Head for APT Faculty, consists of four APT faculty members elected by APT faculty, each serving a two-year term, and one tenured professor appointed by the Head.

Many activities of faculty contribute to more than one area of performance. For example, direction of graduate student theses contributes to research, but also to graduate teaching. Organization of a major conference and membership on editorial boards are examples of service to the mathematical community but they are also indicators of respect of the faculty member’s research. The narrative explaining the evaluation will refer to all categories of performance. Where appropriate, evaluations of research, teaching, and service will incorporate interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborations, work that enhances diversity, and international activities. A summary written evaluation statement is given to each faculty member during the summer. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2. Annual reviews provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. A follow-up evaluation meeting with the Head is mandated for all Assistant Professors. The Head communicates the evaluation results including projected progress towards tenure and promotion. Follow-up meetings with other faculty are conducted upon request of the faculty member.

Visiting Assistant Professors in continuing appointments will be reviewed by the Head in consultation with the faculty member’s mentor. Service is not expected of such faculty and so the review centers mostly on progress in research and teaching.

6.1 Purpose

The annual review provides evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position. It provides developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved. It creates a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations. It provides feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. The annual review is part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which 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 serves as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

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 APT faculty, the annual review provides an evaluation of performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable. See Section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review

For the annual review, each tenure track faculty member is expected to submit a report by the end of January each year that details his or her accomplishments in research, teaching, and service over the previous three calendar years. Faculty research programs require long periods of time to develop and thus cannot be sufficiently evaluated by looking only at the previous year’s progress. Thus, the department strongly feels that a three-year window is best suited for the purpose of “annual reviews” of tenure track faculty. Each APT faculty member is expected to submit a report detailing accomplishments in the previous year.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation of performance, the faculty member is assigned an overall rating chosen from: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement”, “Meets Expectations/Satisfactory,” “Good”, and “Excellent” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence, with some finer gradations (i.e., + or -). This is determined by a careful consideration of the contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service, as appropriate for faculty track and rank. Greater emphasis is placed on research for tenure track faculty, and on teaching for APT faculty.

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

**Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

**Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have specific areas of teaching performance needing improvement.

**Meets Expectations/Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

**Good** - strong evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

**Excellent** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

As part of the annual evaluation of teaching, each tenure track faculty member’s student evaluations will be read by the Executive Committee and each APT faculty member’s student evaluations will be read by the APTC. If there are perceived deficiencies in teaching, the Teaching Committee may be asked for a further report.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. Committees evaluating faculty will have conversations about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to conduct evaluations fairly.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity are:

**Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.
6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in departmental service.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – adequate evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and assignment.

Good - strong evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service.

Excellent – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful service activities, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the components below in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities

The faculty member’s report of previous activities shall follow the template provided to faculty towards the end of the fall semester each year. The report will be focused on a three-year window in the case of tenure track faculty but will allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

The department head or supervisor will write an evaluation in a letter transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy and may 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 annual review and any related documents will be placed in the faculty member’s unit personnel file. Moreover, this annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service. This annual review will 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. Reviews of tenure track Assistant Professors will include a statement on progress towards tenure.

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 or supervisor and the faculty member
All Assistant Professors must meet with the Department Head to discuss their annual evaluation and expectations for the future. Each faculty member in a continuing appointment as a Visiting Assistant Professor must meet with the Head to discuss progress and determine that the faculty member is receiving proper guidance and mentoring. Follow up meetings with other faculty are conducted on request of the faculty member. 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 and service, as appropriate for the assignments, 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 as appropriate to track and rank (teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, or other assigned responsibilities, e.g., administration), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the established criteria (see Section 6.4). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8.2) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an “Unsatisfactory” peer review (see section 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance
If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), 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 & Mid-Term Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”
7. Mid-Term Review

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

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. It will mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; internal letters of recommendation are solicited from departmental experts in the assistant professor's research area, rather than external letters. The mid-term review is conducted by Subcommittee P&T, department head, the college P&T committee, and dean. This review will result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period. Expectations for service are minimal at this level.

7.2 Process
The mid-term review will be conducted between March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and December of the target year.

Dossiers for the mid-term review. Mid-term reviews are a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. Faculty members will be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by Subcommittee P&T. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations are included. A summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required by the College. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates overall judgment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

7.3 Feedback from Mid-Term review
Feedback is required for faculty members going through Mid-Term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head, 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 peer reviews (see Section 6) by the Executive Committee and the Head of the Department of Mathematics.

2) Periodic peer review by the Executive Committee and Department Head (see Section 8.2).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer review committee

Post-tenure review of all tenured faculty in the College of Science is required. In the Department of Mathematics, the Executive Committee serves as a peer review committee in conducting annual reviews of all tenured faculty members. These annual peer reviews will be augmented and informed periodically with a comprehensive review—Periodic Peer Review—from the Executive Committee on a faculty member's contributions in all areas. This will occur prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and at least once every six years thereafter. The Head will inform the faculty member prior to the Periodic Peer Review.

Periodic Peer Review is a more comprehensive review once every six years for tenured faculty members and consists of the following.

8.3 Process

The annual review of tenured faculty is an evaluation of the faculty member's scholarly productivity in teaching, research, and service in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as in Section 3. This annual review shall be used to determine the merit of the faculty member’s performance and accomplishments. An annual review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory performance rating shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria described above. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of the College of Science accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement.

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Executive Committee for Periodic Peer Review will include the curriculum vitae, student evaluations, and the annual activity reports for the previous four years submitted by the faculty member and any additional materials the faculty member may wish to provide.

8.3.2 The Executive Committee will review the submitted materials and provide an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings will follow the criteria established and 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 following an unsatisfactory annual evaluation and requested Periodic Peer Review, 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 these 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 and the faculty member.

8.3.7 By no later than May 31, the Department 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 member last underwent a review. The Executive 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 an “Unsatisfactory” annual review (see Section 6) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” 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.

8.4.2.1 The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

8.4.2.2 Once charged, the College of Science requires that the ad hoc Professional Development Review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

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.

- **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” 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).

8.8 Flexibility
Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching, and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

9.Granting Faculty Emeritus/Emerita 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/emerita 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/emerita status.
1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Science and the Department of Physics and Astronomy is to provide the highest quality science education to all Texas A&M majors, while leading in fundamental scientific research. The faculty of the College of Science and the Department of Physics and Astronomy deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of scientific leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment. The expectations of the College of Science Department of Physics and Astronomy for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University, the College, and the Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

In this document, the College of Science and the Department of Physics and Astronomy clarifies from its perspective the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding evaluation of all faculty positions in the College. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, the Department Head, Department evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Science. Evaluations of one’s colleagues are among the most
difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the College depends upon the quality of these reviews.

This document articulates general College of Science 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.

It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the college. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities and/or compensation.

These documents are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the College of Science Executive Committee, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties and by the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The department has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities, however, most focus on some combination of research and teaching. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the college recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the college, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable departmental evaluations. Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

I. Tenure Track
A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the university, college and the department in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual’s academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

**Tenure.** Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and citizenship and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from university, college, and departmental perspectives. The College of Science conducts formal college-level reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the department clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Dean of Faculties).

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor**, **Associate Professor** and **Professor**.

**II. Academic Professional Track**

The College of Science and the Department of Physics & Astronomy recognizes the vital contributions that all faculty members make to our mission and is committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation, and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members is essential. Decisions on promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the college and department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote, and retain APT faculty members, whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the college and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the College of Science for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching or research, and service or scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching requires both flexibility and freedom ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](https://example.com)). Departments may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic professional track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic professional track rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence to be used for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.
Research faculty members are also in the College of Science, Department of Physics & Astronomy academic professional track and are usually (but not always) under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the College of Science include the Professorial and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial track includes adjectival designations, such as “Instructional”, “Research” and “Visiting”. APT ranks in the College of Science, Department of Physics & Astronomy are the following modified titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Senior Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Assistant Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Associate Professor, Visiting or Adjunct Professor, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer.

**Instructional Track**

Appointment to APT instructional faculty rank generally requires, at a minimum, a PhD degree and evidence of superior teaching experience. APT faculty can, in some circumstances, be assigned to graduate courses. In such cases, the faculty member should have unique qualifications and be properly credentialed. Assignments to teach graduate courses should not be made without approval of the Department Head.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the related field. Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to engage in activities other than teaching. Most commonly instructional faculty will contribute to outreach and/or service, but they may also engage in scientific research. Additional activities will be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Instructional Associate Professor.** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make additional contributions in scholarship, outreach, or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the related field. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Teaching performance and additional contributions in scholarship, outreach and service shall be part of the annual evaluation. They are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Instructional Professor.** The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Such contributions shall be recognized broadly, inside and outside the TAMU community. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will hold a Ph.D. degree in the related field. Instructional Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials with evidence of recognition beyond TAMU community. Instructional Professors are not expected
to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Lecturer Track**

**Lecturer.** The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are neither required nor expected to make contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Lecturer title will normally hold a PhD degree in the related field and primarily be engaged in instruction. The standard teaching load for lecturer is nine credit hours per semester (six courses per academic year). Lecturers engaging in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities evaluated in annual reviews.

**Senior Lecturer.** The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title will normally hold a PhD degree in the related field and will be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. The standard teaching loads per semester is nine credit hours, or six courses per academic year. Senior Lecturers are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities may be considered in annual performance evaluation. Senior Lecturers engaging in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities evaluated in annual reviews.

**Progression between APT tracks.** The Department of Physics and Astronomy considers transition from Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor as a promotion based upon the evaluation criteria and evidence of teaching effectiveness and excellence described in this document. Transition from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor is considered a reclassification of title and not a promotion.

**Research Track**

**Research Assistant Professor.** The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Assistant Professors are generally not expected to engage in teaching. However, such activities may take place based on the agreement between the department and the faculty. In such case they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Research Associate Professor.** The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make additional contributions in teaching, outreach, or service. Faculty members in the Research Associate Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. They are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

**Research Professor.** The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also make
additional contributions in outreach, teaching or service. Faculty members in the Research Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent scientific research and meritorious scholarly reputation at national or international level and appropriate service credentials. Research Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

The College of Science and Department of Physics and Astronomy uses other titles, such as Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, etc.). Additionally, titles such as Senior Professor and Executive Professor are used in a more limited manner. Appointments for such titles require Dean’s approval.

**Multi-year Instruction Track Appointments**

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 governing Fixed Term APT Faculty (https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/) does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore the following College of Science guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate’s qualifications, as per the criteria stated in departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments, unless justified by the Department Head and approved by the Dean.

Faculty members appointed to Instructional Associate Professor will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for five years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with Dean’s approval.

Upon promotion to Instructional Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with Dean’s approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accord with University standards (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

**3. Areas of Faculty Performance**

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; academic citizenship and service; and/or administration). 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 nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable college evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and academic citizenship and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in teaching (or research), but also in at least one additional area, either research/scholarly activity or academic citizenship/service.

Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the college. The value of a faculty member to the institution determines the degree to which the institution is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the institution of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the college, his or her department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the college, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable, from the College of Science perspective, for annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following sections.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). 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 easily to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but are not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Departments shall develop guidelines for the evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching, including specific assessment methods and measures. These shall include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) student learning and 5) comparison of student DFQ rates. Additional relevant information on DFQ rates of a particular course or section may be provided for fuller context.
Essential qualifications for College of Science instructors include the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished science teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used for assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development is an important measure of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a college, university, or professional society outstanding teacher award.

With regard to teaching evaluation, a Teaching Evaluation Table should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BIOL112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>BIOL111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units and that additional information or columns included by departments are acceptable. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 **Teaching quality.** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one’s discipline.

3.1.2 **Essential pedagogy.** The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.1.3 **Educational innovation.** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are, taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

3.1.4 **Teaching professionalism.** Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation, and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students’ classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.
3.1.5 Impact upon students. A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility. The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to college teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

3.1.7 Promotion of active, high-impact learning. Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, as possible.

3.1.8 Education contributions. Educating the next generation of scientific leaders and researchers is one of the main missions of the department. Faculty contribution to effective supervision of research activities of undergraduate and graduate students and Postdocs is an important metric.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity
High-quality research and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful scholarly activity is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. For purposes of the department, research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration (whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective), scholarly application, invention or innovation, or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, preferably, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated science, published work or production of patents. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking, and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT faculty titles may require scholarly work beyond teaching. Scholarship is broadly defined here as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers, and communicated. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge,
as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching. Physics Education Research (PER) is one particular example of teaching scholarship. It will be evaluated based on peer reviewed publications record, external and internal funding, record of presentations at regional, national, and international meetings.

The department expects that all faculty members will demonstrate a significant level of scholarship, particularly those presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. The relevant criteria considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 **Intellectual curiosity.** The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.
3.2.2 **Scientific communication.** Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.
3.2.3 **Research funding.** Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.
3.2.4 **Collaborative approach.** Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued by the College of Science.
3.2.5 **Acknowledgments of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgments of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.
3.2.6. **Generation of patents.** Inventive or innovative activities resulting in the production of patents are considered evidence of scientific impact.

3.3 **Academic Citizenship and Service**
The department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution that a faculty member may make through his or her citizenship and by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, College, and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Academic citizenship** is defined as a measure of one’s commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the department, college, university, and profession through service. The key dimensions of academic citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other’s abilities to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and service. Collegiality is used here in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation among colleagues. It should be noted that collegiality, if used in faculty evaluation inappropriately, can lead to practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm and may also threaten academic freedom.
The College of Science will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

**Academic Service** contributes to the departmental mission of advancing science locally, in the State and Nation. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the department, college, and the university. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve at-large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the department.

The scope of departmental activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional development programs. The College of Science also expects its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty titles may require service to the unit beyond teaching. The contribution that an APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, the College, and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career development.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

3.3.1 **Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member’s collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

3.3.2 **Professional communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators and must work toward solutions of problems.

3.3.3 **Departmental engagement.** Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one’s academic rank.

3.3.4 **Colleague/Student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.
3.3.5 **Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees, or administrative roles (e.g., section chief, assistant/associate department head, or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 **Service to the field.** Academic citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, performing reviews for journals and funding agencies that benefit science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

### 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Most obviously, the indicators of excellence and effectiveness of performance may vary among faculty on academic professional tracks and those on tenure track. Indicators of excellence and effectiveness will differ for faculty whose roles are primarily in the area of research, as opposed to teaching. Additionally, performance and its 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. Rather, it provides guidelines for the development and implementation of departmental faculty evaluation processes. Nonetheless, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations of teaching, research/scholarly activity, academic citizenship, and service. Documentation of excellence and effectiveness during faculty evaluation is best provided by peer review.

#### 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

can include, but are not limited to:

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by department head, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for department, college, university, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- contribution to new instructional program development, such as development of new courses or major revision of existing courses,
- serving as a chair, co-chair, or member of numerous graduate advisory committees,
- publications with authorship by trainees (i.e., undergraduate research publications),
- successful curriculum development grants, and
- obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development,
- authoring of textbooks or other instructional material, and
- excellence in coordination of multi-section courses.

#### 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

can include, but are not limited to:

- positive evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by department head, peers, or external evaluators,
- positive evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading (i.e., DFQ rates that meet departmental expectations),
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
- direction of independent student research,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- development of innovative pedagogical materials or strategies for active learning.
4.3 Indicators of *Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity* can include, but are not limited to:

- successful obtainment of extramural funding for research activities,
- prolific publication of research for which the faculty member was a major contributor in peer reviewed journals, publication in top tier peer reviewed journals or publication of particularly important, foundational results in the field.
- invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings,
- recognition from peers by obtaining awards in the field
- invitations to present at national or international meetings,
- authorship of review articles,
- authorship of monographs, books, textbooks, and book chapters,
- evidence of leadership of or significant contributions to successful team research/scholarly activities,
- evidence of leadership of or significant contributions to successful team efforts at the interface of academic disciplines,
- national attention, as demonstrated by special recognition,
- key participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
- key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
- creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
- significant intellectual publication in patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements.

4.4 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity* can include, but are not limited to:

- obtainment or pursuit of extramural funding for research activities,
- publication of research for which the faculty member was a major contributor in peer reviewed journals,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings by mentees,
- publication of papers of original research in proceedings of professional meetings,
- effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project,
- patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements,

4.5 Indicators of *Excellence in Academic Citizenship and Service*, can include, but are not limited to:

- engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
- making personal contributions to the public mission of the university to forward its programs for the public good,
- engaging in activities that foster diversity, inclusion, and a culture of respect,
- excellent serve as a member of a committee within the department, college, or university,
- excellent serve as a chair of a committee within the department, college, or university,
- serving as an officer or board member in a local, state, or national professional organization in one’s discipline,
- effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
- attraction of significant development support,
- consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
- selection for department, College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards,
- service as an editor or associate editor of a publication in one’s discipline, and
• service as a grant/contract reviewer and/or panelist for research organizations, institutions, or foundations,
• preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science.

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Academic Citizenship and Service, can include, but are not limited to:

• recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs,
• striving to achieve departmental and college goals and mandates,
• engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,
• making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group,
• engaging in the creation of a university culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance,
• serving on departmental, college, and university committees and task forces,
• contributing to the promotion of unit diversity, inclusion, and climate,
• serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,
• contributing to external developmental efforts,
• serving on a mentoring committee for early career faculty,
• promoting significant teaching, research, or service experiences for students,
• promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
• serving as an advisor to student organizations,
• serve as reviewer for professional journals,
• serving in other administrator roles (e.g., section chief, assistant department head, or director title) within the department, college, or university,
• participating in K-12 or other public outreach.

4.7 Collegiality in Academic Citizenship and Service

Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues united in a common purpose. Supportive colleagues are important in the practice of good academic citizenship. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the university, college, and department. Evidence of an undermining lack of collegiality might necessitate an unsatisfactory evaluation of a faculty member.

4.7.1 Indicators of Unsatisfactory Academic Citizenship and Service, can include, but are not limited to:

• persistent pattern of unprofessional behavior
• persistent pattern of engaging in activities that impede the achievement of organizational goals and mandates,
• persistent pattern of engaging in personal attacks on others,
• persistent pattern of bullying or intimidating others, and
• persistent pattern of engaging in activities that discourage interaction among students, staff and faculty colleagues from different cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same timeline for all promotions.
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, academic citizenship, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the College of Science are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor. Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, research, and scholarship, with attention to academic citizenship and service. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and sustainable research support, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities.

5.1.2 Associate Professor. Emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the College and indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual’s specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

5.1.3 Professor. Continued excellence and national/international recognition are required. Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence are required of professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge; contribution to the development of junior faculty; evidence of academic citizenship and collegiality; and excellence in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of professors, sustained excellence in scholarship is expected for the tenured Professor.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in Section 4.4.3.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

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 activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.
The promotion process for APT faculty is unique in the several ways, as stated in the Dean of Faculties guidelines (https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines). Importantly, the university does not require support letters for APT faculty promotions. However, The College of Science does require, at a minimum, three internal letters of support for promotions to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. External letters are encouraged, but not required for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor at the department of Physics & Astronomy. Since evidence of recognition beyond TAMU community is anticipated for Instructional Professor, at least two external letters are required for this promotion. No letters are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Research track faculty are expected to demonstrate evidence for rigorous research program and significant contribution to the field. This can be best evaluated by peer reviews. For promotion to Research Associate Professor a minimum of five support letters are required, of which at least two should be external letters from “arm’s length” reviewers. For promotion to Research Professor a minimum of five support letters are required, of which at least four should be external letters from the “arm’s length” reviewers.

Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by a department committee, department head, college committee and dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the dean of faculty, for approval by the provost and president.

Annual evaluation and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the quality, significance, and impact of the teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments (where applicable) areas follows:

5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as a lecturer (or equivalent),
- excellent annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an instructional assistant professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
• participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
• supervision of program activities,
• program leadership, and
• evidence of scholarly activities or research,
• evidence of outreach and service activities.

5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor, can include, but are not limited to:

• experience as an instructional associate professor (or equivalent),
• excellent teaching performance,
• professional growth in teaching,
• expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
• excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
• collegiality and professionalism,
• other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
• participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
• supervision of program activities,
• program leadership,
• evidence of scholarly activities or service, as applicable,
• internal/external grant funding to support teaching or scholarly activities,
• invitations to teach at domestic or international institutions,
• state, national or international outstanding teaching awards,
• placement of students in academic or professional positions,
• significant service to the College, University, or community, and
• significant service to state, national or international organizations.

5.3 Timing of Promotion and Tenure Review

The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by University regulations that define the procedures for the mandatory (penultimate year) review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required. The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows: Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of the tenure consideration year. Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: leave taken without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary
care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate’s control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters, and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, approximately the first day of November.

5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers
The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate’s personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided before May 31st, so that it may be included with requests for outside letters that are typically submitted in June. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers (and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers). The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee may also request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier includes all elements required by University regulations. No additional documentation is required by the College of Science and the Department.

Dossiers for promotion and tenure review. Of the two, formal college-level reviews (mid-term and promotion and tenure), the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. Still, there is an important connection between the midterm review and the tenure review. The promotion and tenure review will take into consideration, in part, whether or not the faculty member’s post-midterm activities incorporated the feedback, recommendations and requests at the midterm review. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate’s tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion and departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the vote.

Candidate’s curriculum vitae and statements. The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member’s entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate. Publications and other scholarly contributions are differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statements clearly articulate the accomplishments of the faculty member and provide context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts are defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities is clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service are clearly represented with an indication of their importance.
**Outside letters of evaluation.** To enhance the effectiveness of the candidate's dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. Along with the candidate, the Department Head and departmental PTA committee provide recommendations on reviewers, with the Department Head selecting the individuals who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate. Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. **All letters for P&T candidates must be “arm’s length”**. Letters from previous recent collaborators (last 5 years), former supervisors, recent coworkers (last 5 years), domestic partners or family members such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative, or other colleagues who are not arm’s-length will not be considered. In some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate (e.g., being part of a large research consortium, which published together). In such a case, the department head must first consult with and get approval from the dean. If approved by the dean, the justification and approval by the dean must be included in the dossier. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity.

**5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate’s dossier is correctly assembled lies with the Departmental Promotion, Tenure and Appointments (PTA) Committee. The PTA committee shall consist of six tenured faculty members who serve staggered three-year terms, with three members elected at-large by the faculty and three appointed by the head. Terms will be staggered so that each academic year one elected and one appointed term will expire. It is expected that the head will use the appointed members to achieve a balanced representation of the faculty in the committee. A copy of the departmental information is available for distribution to the faculty.

When reviewing the dossier, the departmental committee is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the PTA shall undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams. The PTA shall compile and submit a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table with their recommendation, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). This table will contain the following information for all years (or last 5 years) since the previous promotion: a listing by semester and year of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the required Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

**Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table (Template)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

College of Science Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
The Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member’s teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

**Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.** The departmental bylaws outline the procedure and voting process. The PTA is responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on credentials of outside referees. The PTA committee also prepares individual reports evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research and service and conducts the committee-wide vote. Following the PTA’s discussion and vote, a faculty meeting is held where a discussion and eligible faculty-wide vote is conducted anonymously (i.e., Yes, No, Absent or Abstain/Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.

**Recommendation of the Departmental P&T Committee.** The candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the Department Head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member’s promotion/tenure recommendation packet.

The Department of Physics and Astronomy will have the entire tenured departmental faculty provide the official P&T vote as a “committee of the whole” for the record. The departmental bylaws define the voting procedure.

**Recommendation of the Department Head.** The Department Head prepares and submits an independent recommendation to the Dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to the College of Science. The department head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under consideration. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. Each faculty member shall be informed, through the department head, of the recommendations at each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process and this information shall be transmitted in writing.

**5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review**

After receipt of the candidate’s dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example, the Departmental PTA Committee’s teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of evaluation information (student evaluation scores for individual courses, narratives based on peer review, etc.), the dossier is returned to the Department Head for further action by the
departmental committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the departmental review committee evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

**College of Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The Dean of the College of Science, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee consisting of five full professors, one representing each academic department. Each member is appointed for a staggered, three-year term. This college committee reviews dossiers and departmental recommendations for all faculty members undergoing mid-term review and promotion and/or tenure considerations. There is no chair of this review committee, but rather dossiers are distributed equally among the members.

**Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.** College-level reviews are thorough and objective, recognizing that all cases have strengths and weaknesses to be discussed and addressed in final reports, including the quality of the research, teaching contributions, and to a more limited extent, involvement in service. Key objectives of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee are to ensure equitable review across college units and evaluate cases without departmental advocacy. Departmental representatives present their units promotion cases and participate in discussions, as they are positioned to provide the greatest insight into departmental contexts and requirements. To avoid potential conflict of interest, however, departmental representatives are recused from voting on the cases from their own departments. Thus, four committee members vote on each faculty member’s dossier. Individuals associated, in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03), with the faculty being considered for promotion and tenure or promotion to full professor may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or votes on that case. In accordance with University recommendations, the Dean will not attend the meetings of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Associate Dean responsible for faculty matters attends the meeting to hear discussions and answer questions, as appropriate. Committee deliberations are conducted in the strictest confidence. Promotion and tenure reviews occur in the fall semester.

In the case of mid-term reviews, the College P&T Advisory Committee is responsible for review and discussion of each packet. No vote is conducted, and no documents go forward from the College. Thus, no recusal of departmental representatives is required. Recommendations are passed from the committee to the Department Head for preparation of a letter to the candidate, signed by the Head and Dean. Mid-term reviews occur in the summer semester.

**Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The committee shall make a clear recommendation on each promotion and tenure case in a memorandum to the Dean. The committee summarizes the general achievements under consideration and explains their perspective on the faculty members’ strengths and weaknesses for promotion and/or tenure. The memorandum for each candidate is limited to one page in length.

**Recommendation of the Dean.** The Dean shall make use of College-level reviews in their deliberation and inform the Department Head of the vote of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Dean is responsible for preparing a recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost. When the Dean does not concur with a recommendation, the Dean should inform the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for that decision. Importantly, it is the responsibility of the Dean of Science to ensure that the granting of tenure to
a non-tenured faculty member is based on the individual's professional performance and that the denial of tenure shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

5.7 Promotion to Professor
The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor. However, the review committee composition may be different in the case where the Department T&P Committee includes members who are Associate Professors. Associate Professors may not participate in a review for promotion to Full Professor. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and Departmental T&P Committee should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate’s international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see sections 3.1 and 5.5 above). For promotions to full professor, the Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years (whichever is shorter).

5.8 Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors
Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

5.9 Joint Appointments
Joint appointments in cases where a scholar’s expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the College of Science. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the College of Science affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with university, college and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the department must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty.

5.10 Appeals
University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.
6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this document, the Department of Physics & Astronomy provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department Head, department evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Head. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the college depends upon the quality of these reviews.

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 head will need to collaborate with the head of the appropriate unit to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads 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 and PRC/RAS with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

College of Science annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member's career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The annual review procedure document must include the following elements: purpose of annual review, period of evaluation, aspects of performance to be evaluated, annual activity report format and content, basis for evaluation, timeline and procedures for evaluation, and complaint procedures. The elements are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The exact form of the annual review may differ from department to department, but must include the following components: faculty member's report of annual activities, a written document stating
the department head’s evaluation and expectations, annual opportunity for a meeting between faculty member and Department Head to discuss the written review and expectations, and a performance assessment. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

The College of Science requires that APT faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with college and university policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. However, contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities. Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, including APT faculty, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads are responsible. For annual reviews of APT 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 an APT faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities, such as teaching, 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 members with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head and PRC with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. APT faculty members should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1 Purpose

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

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

- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  
  o See University Rule 12.01.99.M2. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

- The purpose of the annual APT faculty review is to provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position. Reviews also provide developmental feedback regarding
areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved. Finally, such feedback is critical for the faculty member’s progress toward promotion.

Annual reviews by the Department Head are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. Annual evaluations are conducted in an honest and judicious manner. Although University rules do not require the department head to consult members of the department’s faculty in conducting annual faculty evaluations. However, at the Department of Physics & Astronomy annual reviews are conducted by the Peer Review Committee that provides recommendations to the department head regarding annual evaluations.

Annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the APT faculty member and department/program. 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. Departments shall create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year and their level of progress toward tenure is reported to them in a timely manner. In this regard, Department Heads write a specific annual evaluation to probationary faculty members. This memorandum reports the results of the annual evaluation and states whether they concur with the review committee’s evaluation. If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to qualify for tenure, the person should be given a notice in writing of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual faculty review, evaluation in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3 above) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets expectations/Satisfactory,” and “Exceeds Expectations,” based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas of teaching performance needing improvement.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators and can be evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

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

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity are:

Unsatisfactory – the absence of 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.

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

Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Annual evaluations should be focused on recent recognitions and achievements, rather than the life-time accomplishments. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship and service.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship and service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in unit service.

Meets Expectations/Satisfactory – evidence of effectiveness in academic citizenship and service. Those in this category will be involved in local service and service to the broader community appropriate for their career stage and assignment.

Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in academic citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities and service to the broader community, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

6.5 Required Components
The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty members report of previous activities

The exact form of the faculty member’s report must include the following:
• The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.

• The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service as appropriate.

• Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

The following items are expected in the report:

• **Research and Other Scholarly Activity**
  - Publications
    - Papers published in refereed journals during the past calendar year
    - Papers submitted to refereed journals during the past calendar year, but not published during that time
    - Contributions to national and international conference proceedings that were published during the past calendar year
    - Contributions to national and international conference proceedings that were submitted during the past calendar year, but not published during that time
    - Other publications, such as books, book chapters, etc.
  - Patents, and patent applications.
  - Presentations at National or International meetings
  - Seminars and colloquiums
  - Other research / scholarly related activities and accomplishments

• Project Funding
  - Active funded projects during the past calendar year. Include title, sponsor, PIs and CoPIs, total amount, amount associated with the reporting faculty (estimate), account number, start and end dates, and personnel supported by the project.
  - Proposals submitted but rejected or not yet decided

• Research Projects not currently funded

• Teaching
  - Courses taught. Include title and course number, level, semester, number of students and number of sections taught.
  - Comments on classroom teaching
  - New courses, laboratories and Instructional Materials Developed
  - Research supervision
    - Undergraduate research
    - Graduate research
    - Postdoc research
    - Other teaching activities

• Service
  - Service on committees. Include committee name, type, your role (chair or not), number of meetings per year, hours spent in calendar year, percentage of committee work done by you
  - Administrative duties
  - Graduate and Undergraduate recruitment
• Other services, such as service as an officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organizations; reviewer for refereed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations; editor or member of editorial board of a major journal; member of review panel for a national research organization; service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies; service on a major governmental commission task force or board; advisor to student organizations, etc.

Other Activities

Graduate Student Support
Undergraduate Student Support

Summary of Accomplishments. Describe in free form what you consider to be your most significant accomplishments during the past calendar years and provide the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. State your short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

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

The department head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head 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 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. Note that all written annual reviews are available to the person being reviewed upon request.
6.5.4 Performance Assessment
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, scholarly activity and service, as appropriate for the assignments, 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 6.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8.2.) 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 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance
If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8), they must work with their department head 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.”

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

7.1 Purpose
● A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
● This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
● This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
● This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s PTA committee, department head, 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, 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 an example of the mid-term review of faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hired Calendar Year</th>
<th>Probationary Period</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dossiers for the mid-term review. The mid-term reviews are considered to be a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary
Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications. Mid-term department level reviews are conducted by the PTA and department head.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the department’s PTA. The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate’s contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

7.3 Feedback form midterm review
Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head, and departmental PTA.

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, Peer Review Committee (PRC) and Research Assessment sub-Committee (RAS).
2) Periodic review by PRC and RAS (see Section 8.2.).

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer review committees

The Peer Review Committee (PRC) performs annual reviews and periodic reviews of all faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The PRC shall consist of five tenured faculty elected at-large. Each member will serve a two-year term, and terms will be staggered.

The Research Assessment Sub-Committee (RAS) is charged with providing assistance to the PRC in evaluating research performance of all faculty. The RAS will report the results of its
assessments to the PRC in a timely fashion. If the PRC has reservations about the RAS assessment of any faculty members it will meet with the RAS to resolve these differences. The committee shall consist of three tenured faculty elected at-large, and three tenured faculty appointed by the head. All appointments are for two-year term, and terms will be staggered so that only three terms expire in any given year. It is expected that the head will use the appointed members to achieve a balanced representation of the faculty in the committee.

8.3 Process

The periodic review of tenured faculty will evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly productivity in teaching, research and academic citizenship and service over the period of six years in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and shall be reported as either Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee will include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports for six previous years. Research and teaching statements may be requested by the PRC during the periodic peer review process if clarifications are necessary.

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 (meet expectations), 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 PRC/RAS and the department head.

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 will share the report with the other department head of the secondary unit.

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

8.4 Professional Development Review
A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.6). 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 8.5) 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.

8.4.2.1 The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

8.4.2.2 Once charged, the College of Science requires that the ad hoc Professional Development Review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

---

1 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
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. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 8.5 below) acceptable to the dean.

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 8.5 below) 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, 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, 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, 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 (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

8.8 Flexibility
Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

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.
GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Approved by the Department of Statistics Steering Committee: October 27, 2020.

Approved by College of Science: November 20, 2020
1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Statistics is to function as a leading international center for statistical research, education, and service. Faculty members in the Department contribute to a broad spectrum of research in statistical theory, methodology and application. Additionally, the Department takes its responsibility for statistical education very seriously, with programs for undergraduate, M.S. and Ph.D. students as well as an extensive set of service courses for both undergraduates and graduates. A major extension of the mission has been to provide students with the opportunity to obtain graduate education remotely. Faculty members in the Department also have major roles in service to the Department, the College, the University, the larger statistics discipline, and the scientific community in general. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Statistics 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. Each faculty member has a responsibility to further the academic goals of the Department and to maintain its excellence. The nature of academic endeavor and scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of Texas A&M University, the College of Science, and the Department of Statistics; and these guidelines and criteria are to be used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

In this document, the Department of Statistics clarifies from its perspective the procedures and general expectations and responsibilities regarding evaluation of all faculty positions in the Department. These procedural guidelines are intended to help individual faculty members, Department Heads, Department and College evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Head of Statistics. The evaluation of faculty in the Department of Statistics is the responsibility of the Department Head, who will solicit advice and recommendations from departmental committees. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the Department depends upon the quality of these reviews.
It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the Department. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities and/or compensation.

This document articulates general Department of Statistics 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 (which are referred to within this document):

<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>Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I</td>
<td></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 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. This document and those listed above are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the Department of Statistics, the College of Science, the Texas A&M University Dean of Faculties, and the Provost.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

The Department has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities. Most focus on some combination of research and teaching, while others may combine teaching and service. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the Department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the Department are tenure track faculty with an unmodified title and non-tenure track (academic professional track) faculty with a modified title. The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify formulas (such as percentages) for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable Department evaluations. Definitions of faculty ranks, and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty Titles.

2.1 Tenure Track

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; tenure is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities, and reflects continued worth to the University, College and Department in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted
only after a rigorous review of an individual’s academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

**Tenure** means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching and academic citizenship and service, and who have demonstrated over time they will likely continue to be especially productive. The expectations of the Department of Statistics for tenure-track and tenured faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their research, teaching and service. The nature of academic endeavor and scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities.

Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from University, College and Department perspectives. The Department of Statistics conducts formal college-level reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In later sections of this document, the Department of Statistics clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Dean of Faculties). This document provides a general, rather than rigid, set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence to be used for tenure-track and tenured faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Appointment to a tenure track faculty rank generally requires a Ph.D. in Statistics or a related field and a commitment to superior research and teaching.

2.1.1 **Assistant Professor.** The position of Assistant Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members who take responsibility for scientific research, excellence in teaching and service. Assistant Professors are generally not tenured. They are expected to maintain a consistent record of research and other scholarly activities, to teach courses at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels and to participate in the function of the Department. Assistant Professors shall have their performance in each of scholarship, teaching and service evaluated in annual reviews.

2.1.2 **Associate Professor.** The position of Associate Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members who take responsibility for scientific research, excellence in teaching and service. The rank of Associate Professor is usually attained simultaneously with tenure. Associate Professors are expected to maintain a consistent record of excellent research and other scholarly activities, to teach courses excellently and effectively at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels and to participate in the function of the Department and/or College. Scholarly and service activities may be inside or outside the TAMU community. Associate Professors shall have their performance in each of scholarship, teaching and service evaluated in annual reviews.

2.1.3 **Professor.** The position of Professor is a tenure track appointment for faculty members who take responsibility for scientific research, excellence in teaching and service. Professors are expected to maintain a consistent record of exemplary research and other scholarly activities, to teach courses excellently and effectively at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels and to participate in the function of the Department and/or College, including administration in some cases. Scholarly and service activities will generally be both inside and outside the TAMU community. Professors shall have their performance in each of scholarship, teaching and service evaluated in annual reviews.
2.2 Academic Professional Track

The Department of Statistics recognizes the vital contributions that all faculty members make to its mission and is committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation, and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members is essential. Decisions on promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the College and Department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote, and retain APT faculty members whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the Department and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the Department of Statistics for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching or research, and additional service or scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching and scholarly activity requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2). The Department may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic professional track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic professional track rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. This document provides a general, rather than rigid, set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence to be used for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Research faculty members are also in the Department of Statistics academic professional track and are usually under the direction of a tenure-track faculty supervisor. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided from the Dean of Faculties in the document Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the Department of Statistics include the Professorial and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial Track includes adjectival designations, such as Instructional, Research, Senior, Visiting or Adjunct. The Lecturer Track ranks are Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

Appointment to an APT faculty rank generally requires, at a minimum, a master’s degree in Statistics or a related field.

Lecturer Track

Appointment to a Lecturer Track faculty rank generally requires a master’s degree or Ph.D. in Statistics or a related field and a commitment to superior teaching. Faculty members in the lecturer track will primarily be engaged in instruction. They are not normally expected to engage in scientific research. The standard teaching loads are set according to the bylaws of the Department of Statistics.

2.2.1 Lecturer. The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to make contributions in scholarship or service. Lecturers shall have their teaching performance evaluated in annual reviews. Lecturers who engage in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities considered in annual reviews.

2.2.2 Senior Lecturer. The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to make substantial contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title may be expected to engage in some minimal service or administrative activities, as is required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. Senior Lecturers shall have their teaching performance evaluated in annual reviews. Senior Lecturers who engage in scholarly activity or service shall have their performance in these activities considered in annual reviews.
Instructional Track
Appointment to an APT instructional faculty rank generally requires a master’s degree or a Ph.D. in Statistics or a related field, or another appropriate terminal degree. Instructional faculty are also expected to have evidence of superior teaching experience. Their primary responsibility is teaching, but they should also make additional contributions in scholarly activity or service. Scholarly activity may include supervising undergraduate research, curriculum development, mentoring graduate instructors, supervising MS projects, consulting activities and of course publication of research. Instructional faculty can, in some circumstances, be assigned to teach graduate courses. In such cases, the faculty member should have unique qualifications and be properly credentialed. Assignments to teach graduate courses should not be made without approval of the Department Head. The standard teaching loads are set according to the bylaws of the Department.

2.2.3 Instructional Assistant Professor. The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make additional contributions in scholarly activity or service. They are not expected to engage in scientific research but may be active in other forms of scholarly activity as described above. In addition to their teaching performance, Instructional Assistant Professors shall have their performance in scholarly activity or service evaluated in annual reviews.

2.2.4 Instructional Associate Professor. The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Service will generally be within the Department or the TAMU community. They are not expected to engage in scientific research but may be active in other forms of scholarly activity as described above. Teaching performance and additional contributions in scholarship and service shall be part of the annual evaluation. Although not expected activities in scientific research shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

2.2.5 Instructional Professor. The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Such contributions shall be recognized broadly, inside or outside the TAMU community. Instructional Professors are expected to have a sustained record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials. Teaching performance and additional contributions in scholarship and service shall be part of the annual evaluation. Instructional Professors are not expected to engage in scientific research, but such activities shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

The Department of Statistics also uses other instructional titles (e.g., Senior Associate Professor, Senior Professor, Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor). Additionally, titles such as Executive Professor are used in a more limited manner. Credentials and responsibilities for these titles are department-specific and appointments require the Dean’s approval.

Research Track
Appointment to a research faculty rank generally requires a Ph.D. in Statistics or a related field and a commitment to superior research. Research faculty are not normally expected to teach but may occasionally do so. Service obligations are generally related to their scholarly activity and otherwise should be kept to a minimum.

2.2.6 Research Assistant Professor. The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research. Research Assistant Professors shall have their performance in research and other scholarly activity evaluated in
annual reviews. Research Assistant Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

2.2.7 Research Associate Professor. The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also may make additional contributions in teaching or service. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. Research Associate Professors shall have their performance in research and other scholarly activity evaluated in annual reviews. They are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

2.2.8 Research Professor. The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but also may make additional contributions in teaching or service. Research Professors are expected to have a sustained record of effective and excellent scientific research and meritorious scholarly reputation and appropriate service credentials. Research Professors shall have their performance in research, other scholarly activity and related service evaluated in annual reviews. Research Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in annual performance evaluation.

Transition Between APT Tracks
The College of Science allows flexibility in how departments handle transfer of faculty members between APT tracks, the most usual being between the lecturer and instructional tracks. For the Department of Statistics, the transition from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor should be considered a reclassification of title and not a promotion, subject to the added commitment to scholarly activity or service, as well as evidence of teaching effectiveness and excellence as described in this document. On the other hand, a transfer from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Associate Professor, bypassing Instructional Assistant Professor, should be considered a promotion. In general, the Department must be consistent in its transition processes, and articulate them clearly to faculty members as they progress through their careers.

Multi-year Instructional Track Appointments
The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 governing Fixed Term APT Faculty (https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/) does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty, therefore the following Department of Statistics guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed term appointments will be made by the Department Head with input from the Statistics P&T Committee. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

- APT faculty members appointed at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Instructional Assistant Professor levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments.
- Faculty members appointed to Instructional Associate Professor will have annual appointments. After serving for five academic years, Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval.
- Upon promotion to Instructional Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the Department and College. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed
term appointment shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accordance with University standards (University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned areas of responsibility (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; academic citizenship and service; and/or administration). Descriptions are presented below of the general expectations for these areas and of the criteria by which they may be assessed. (Please see Section 4 for indicators and measures of assessment.) 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 the Dean of Science. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

The nature of a faculty member’s contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula or percentages for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable Department evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, and academic citizenship and service. Lecturer track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in teaching. Instructional track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in teaching, but also in at least one additional area, either research/scholarly activity or academic citizenship/service. Research track faculty are expected to make contributions primarily in research but may contribute to teaching and/or service.

Criteria for Review

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, at least once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the Department. The value of a faculty member to the institution determines the degree to which the institution is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the institution of a faculty member is of vital importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the Department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the Department, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable, from the Department of Statistics perspective, for annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following subsections.

3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the Department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). All such faculty members are expected to contribute to instruction and student development; to continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and to promote, develop and diversify the Department’s instructional programs. Accomplishments in teaching, particularly their effectiveness and excellence, are central to decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself easily to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but are not sufficient to evaluate teaching. The Department of Statistics also may use other specific assessment methods and measures. These include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) student learning outcomes (such as exam scores) and 5) student DFQ rates. Additional relevant information on DFQ rates of a particular course or section may be provided for fuller context.
Essential qualifications for Department of Statistics instructors include the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used for assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development is an important measure of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a College, University, or professional society outstanding teacher award.

A **Teaching Evaluation Table** should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale) and the percentages of D, F (or A, B, C, if preferred) and Q grades. A template of the Teaching Evaluation Table is provided below. Note: The department, college, and university favor holistic reviews of teaching and not evaluations based strictly on numerical evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>% Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>STAT 211</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>STAT 302</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained shall be provided. Additional information or columns can be included by the Department.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

3.1.1 **Teaching quality.** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one's discipline.

3.1.2 **Essential pedagogy.** Pedagogy includes the use of appropriate methods of instruction, effective planning, and organization, written, oral, and visual presentation clarity, effective questioning and group facilitation skills, and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

3.1.3 **Educational innovation.** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness, developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

3.1.4 **Teaching professionalism.** Mentoring students and using appropriate methods of evaluation and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students' classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also examples of professionalism.

3.1.5 **Impact upon students.** A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

3.1.6 **Degree of teaching responsibility.** The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to Department teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.
3.1.7 *Promotion of active, high-impact learning.* Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, when possible.

3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality *research* and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful *scholarly activity* is defined as intellectual work that is validated by peers as contributing, as a statistician, to the advancement of knowledge and is communicated in an effective manner. For purposes of the Department, research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration, scholarly application, invention or innovation, or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching) where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the originality, quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, preferably, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated science, published work or production of patents. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking, and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be an essential measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT instructional faculty may perform scholarly work beyond teaching. For APT faculty, scholarship is broadly defined as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers, and communicated. In addition to individual original research, scholarly activity may include supervising undergraduate research, curriculum development, mentoring graduate instructors, supervising MS projects and consulting activities. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge, as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching.

The Department of Statistics expects that scholarship will be demonstrated at a significant level, particularly for those faculty presenting as candidates for tenure or promotion. The relevant criteria considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

3.2.1 *Intellectual curiosity.* The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.

3.2.2 *Scientific communication.* Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communicated at a scientific conference.

3.2.3 *Research funding.* Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.

3.2.4 *Collaborative approach.* Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued.
3.2.5 **Education contributions and mentoring.** Educating and advising the next generation of scientific leaders and researchers is an important mission.

3.2.6 **Contributions to the field.** Scholarly activities, such as board membership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

3.2.7 **Acknowledgments of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgments of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.

3.2.8. **Generation of patents.** Inventive or innovative activities resulting in the production of patents are considered evidence of scientific impact.

3.3 **Academic Citizenship and Service**

Faculty academic citizenship and service are central to the mission of the Department of Statistics. The Department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution that a faculty member may make through his or her academic citizenship and by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the Department and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member’s service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual’s skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Academic citizenship** is defined as one’s commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the Department, College, University, and the statistics profession. The key dimensions of academic citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other’s abilities to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research, and service. Collegiality is used here in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation among colleagues. It should be noted that collegiality, if used in faculty evaluation inappropriately, can lead to practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm and may also threaten academic freedom.

The Department of Statistics will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks, respecting all persons, and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.3.2 states that “professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University” is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

**Academic Service** contributes to the Department of Statistics mission of advancing statistics locally, in the state and nation, and internationally. Faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the Department, College, and the University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession, and the continuing education of the public at-large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve at-large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the Department of Statistics.

The scope of departmental endeavors makes it necessary and appropriate for faculty members to engage in a variety of activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional development programs. The Department of Statistics also encourages its faculty members
to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to possess a broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the statistical and scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty may perform academic service beyond teaching. The contributions that an APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, the College, and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career development.

**Administration** concerns the oversight and day-to-day operations of the Department; it is an extended form of service. Administration involves leadership, management, strategic thinking, and the ability to work effectively with faculty, staff, and other administrators. Administrators who report to and operate at the direction of the Department Head (Assistant/Associate Department Heads and Program Directors) are evaluated accordingly for their service. The Department Head and faculty who are Assistant/Associate Deans are evaluated by the Dean or his/her designee.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

3.3.1 **Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member's collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues and staff.

3.3.2 **Professional communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues, administrators, and staff, and must work toward resolutions of problems.

3.3.3 **Departmental engagement.** Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one’s academic rank is necessary.

3.3.4 **Colleague/Student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.

3.3.5 **Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees or in administrative roles (Assistant/Associate Department Head, Program Director, Assistant/Associate Dean) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

3.3.6 **Service to the field.** Academic citizenship and service activities outside of the University, such as society leadership, editorial boards, or policy panel memberships, that benefit science and statistics in particular, are important criteria for evaluation.

4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The previous section identified the areas of faculty responsibility and key criteria by which they may be assessed. This section lists the indicators to be considered for such assessment.

The Department of Statistics recognizes that there are multiple indicators of performance at various levels. Most obviously, the expectations for excellence and effectiveness of performance may vary among faculty on academic professional tracks and those on tenure track. How faculty achieve excellence and effectiveness will differ for faculty whose roles are primarily in the area of research, as opposed to teaching. Additionally, performance and its respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. The Department of Statistics does not utilize a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. Rather, this document provides guidelines for the development and implementation of departmental faculty evaluation processes. Nonetheless, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations of teaching, research/scholarly activity, academic citizenship, and service.
The following lists outline many, if not all, of the indicators that the Department may employ in the evaluation and promotion of faculty. Documentation of excellence and effectiveness during faculty evaluation is best provided by peer review. Indicators of excellence are of course also indicators of effectiveness.

4.1 Indicators for Teaching
4.1.1 *Indicators of Excellence* shall include, but are not limited to:
- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by the Department Head, Associate Department Head, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- state, national or international outstanding teaching awards,
- selection for Department, College, University, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- serving as a chair or co-chair of one or more Ph.D. graduate advisory committees,
- member of numerous graduate advisory committees,
- publications resulting from supervision of students,
- publication of widely adopted or acclaimed educational material,
- development of a new course, Honors course, or major revision of an existing course,
- development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials,
- teaching courses at multiple levels (lower/upper division undergraduate and M.S./Ph.D. graduate),
- dissemination of teaching materials at local, state, or national workshops,
- invitations to present or teach at domestic or international institutions,
- mentoring colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality, and
- obtaining grant support for curriculum or course development, or for classroom pedagogy.

4.1.2 *Additional Indicators of Effectiveness* shall include, but are not limited to:
- evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level,
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading,
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
- management of multi-section courses,
- coordination of multi-disciplinary courses,
- participating in curriculum development/revision,
- serving as supervisor of one or more M.S. students,
- direction of independent undergraduate student research,
- member of graduate advisory committees,
- placement of students in academic or professional positions,
- adoption of innovative and communicated pedagogical methodologies by others,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- submission of grants for curriculum or course development, or for classroom pedagogy.

4.2 Indicators for Research/Scholarly Activity
4.2.1 *Indicators of Excellence* shall include, but are not limited to:
- publication in leading journals of statistics or related fields,
- authorship of a textbook, monograph, scholarly book, or book chapter,
- creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others,
- favorable citation index listing of research publications,
- obtaining competitive external funding for scholarship activities,
- recognition from peers in the field for significant research (e.g., awards, honors),
- active participation in a very prominent area of research or signature program,
- leadership or exceptional contribution to successful team research/scholarly activities,
• leadership in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
• key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
• coordination of or participation in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary investigations and projects,
• invitations to present at national or international meetings, and
• invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.

4.2.2 *Additional Indicators of Effectiveness* shall include, but are not limited to:
• publication of peer-reviewed scientific articles, technical reports, or monographs,
• publication of papers of original research in proceedings of regional professional meetings,
• authorship of review articles,
• publications/funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields,
• patents, copyrights, or royalty/licensing agreements,
• obtaining funding for scholarship activities,
• presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings,
• preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs,
• contribution of area of expertise to scholarship of others,
• active participation in research within an interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary University Center or Institute,
• participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,
• contribution to successful team research/scholarly activities,
• active participation in a University-centered scholarly or creative activity,
• contribution of expertise to the scholarship/education of others, and
• significant self-development activities that lead to increased scholarship.

4.3 *Indicators for Service*

4.3.1 *Indicators of Excellence* shall include, but are not limited to:
• officer in a national or international professional organization of statistics or related field,
• effective service on a major government commission, task force or board,
• officer or committee chair in faculty senate,
• leadership of the Statistical Collaboration Center,
• obtaining positive state, regional or national recognition for the department,
• engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
• making personal contributions to the public mission of the University to forward its programs for the public good,
• leadership in fostering diversity, inclusion, and a culture of respect,
• serving in an administrative role (Department Head, Associate Head, Associate/Assistant Dean),
• serving as a chair of a committee within the Department, College, or University,
• effective service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
• organizing a departmental research workshop,
• attraction of significant development support,
• selection for department, College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards,
• service as an editor or associate editor of a publication in statistics or related field, and
• service as a grant/contract reviewer for research organizations, institutions, or foundations.

4.3.2 *Additional Indicators of Effectiveness* shall include, but are not limited to:
• serving as an effective member of a committee within the department, College, or University,
• officer in a local or state professional organization,
• service as reviewer for refereed journals,
• organizer of a session at a regional, national, or international meeting,
• service on Department, College, and University committees and task forces,
• serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,
• contributing to external developmental efforts,
• serving on a mentoring committee for early career faculty,
• serving as consultant to business or government agencies,
• promoting significant teaching, research, or service experiences for students,
• promoting national and/or international experiences for students,
• serving as an advisor to student organizations,
• participating in the department’s continuing education, K-12, or other public outreach activities,
• presentations for the purpose of increasing public awareness of statistics and data science,
• contribution of expertise to scholarship of others,
• participation in the Statistical Collaboration Center.

4.4 Collegiality in Academic Citizenship and Service
Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues united in a common purpose. Supportive colleagues are important in the practice of good academic citizenship and service. Personal qualities such as integrity, leadership, objectivity, candor, fairness, accountability, and willingness to cooperate are vital. Collegiality, if used in faculty evaluation inappropriately, can lead to practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm. However, consistent behavior that undermines academic citizenship interferes with the mission of the University, College and Department. Evidence of an undermining lack of collegiality might necessitate an unsatisfactory evaluation of a faculty member.

4.4.1 Indicators of Exceptional Collegiality in Academic Citizenship and Service shall include, but are not limited to:
• recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department,
• assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs,
• contributing to the promotion of diversity, inclusion and climate and a culture of respect,
• striving to achieve departmental and College goals and mandates,
• engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,
• making adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the Department, and
• engaging in the creation of a University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

4.4.2 Indicators of Unsatisfactory Collegiality in Academic Citizenship shall include, but are not limited to:
• engaging in activities that impede the achievement of departmental goals and mandates,
• engaging in personal attacks, harassment, or assault on others,
• bullying or intimidating others, and
• engaging in activities that discourage interaction among students, staff and faculty colleagues from different cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.

5. Promotion and/or Tenure
For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same annual timeline for all promotions. This section describes the general principles that can be used for promotions to different ranks/titles.

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, academic citizenship, 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, including annual evaluations and mid-term reviews. The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Statistics are described below. Also see Section 4.4.3 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2. Indicators of excellence and effectiveness for these criteria are in the previous section.

5.1.1 **Assistant Professor.** The Department of Statistics gives the rank of Assistant Professor only to new hires who have gone through the usual hiring process. This includes APT faculty who have obtained a Ph.D. in statistics or a related field and who wish to become tenure-track faculty. Thus, there are no criteria as such for promotion to Assistant Professor.

5.1.2 **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.** The primary emphasis for the tenure-track individual should be achieving excellence in teaching, research, and scholarship, with attention to academic citizenship and service. Assistant Professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and sustainable research support, improving their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities. Tenure-track individuals must also demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the criteria can include, but are not limited to:

- an area of specialization in statistics and related fields, which may be one not currently represented on the tenured faculty or one that provides reinforcement in an area of priority,
- an exemplary level of scholarly accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others of similar rank in related areas of specialization,
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities, including evidence from evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity,
- evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member, and
- other contributions to the research and teaching missions of the Department.

5.1.3 **Promotion to Professor.** Overall, personal, and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments. A sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity and national/international recognition are required of Associate Professors desiring promotion. Associate Professors are expected to maintain continued excellence and growth in teaching abilities. They also will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities. Associate Professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must also document their effectiveness in instruction, as well as in research and service.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria can include, but are not limited to:

- sustained and exemplary scholarly accomplishments and expertise in areas of specialization,
- national and international recognition in areas of specialization,
- continued and sustained excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- evidence of valuable professional service, typically among multiple levels or agencies,
- evidence of leadership in various roles,
- professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity,
- evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the competence in teaching and research expected of a senior faculty member, and
- other contributions to the research and teaching missions of the Department.
5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track, faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Instructional or Lecturer in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching and related activities. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. See University Rule 12.07 Fixed Term Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Annual evaluations and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the quality, significance and impact of the teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments (where applicable) are as follows:

**5.2.1 Promotion to Senior Lecturer.** The role of a Lecturer is almost exclusively teaching, with possible service or administrative roles associated with teaching. In addition to consistent and sustained excellence in teaching, promotion to Senior Lecturer will take into consideration a faculty member’s willingness to take on additional responsibilities and contributions to the overall teaching mission of the Department.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer the criteria, can include, but are not limited to:
- experience as a Lecturer (or equivalent),
- evidence of excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching, including expansion of teaching qualifications,
- increased responsibilities such as management of multi-section courses, revision of courses and teaching higher level courses,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

**5.2.2 Instructional Assistant Professor.** Like the rank of Assistant Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor is an entry-level rank and has no criteria for promotion as such. Transitions from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor (and vice versa) are considered to be lateral and depend on the nature of the role(s) that the faculty member chooses to take on. Such transitions must be approved by the Department Head.

**5.2.3 Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor.** An Instructional Assistant Professor aspiring to promotion to Instructional Associate Professor will have demonstrated sustained and consistent excellence not only in teaching but also in service and/or administrative efforts and/or research activities. These efforts should be documented and subject to peer-review.

For promotion to Instructional Associate Professor the criteria can include, but are not limited to:
- experience as an Instructional Assistant Professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching, including expansion of teaching qualifications,
- excellence at teaching higher level courses, including graduate courses,
- participation in activities that enhance the teaching program (such as curriculum development/revision, management of multi-section courses, member of a program committee)
- professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program, and
- evidence of scholarly activities or research, as applicable.
5.2.4 Promotion to Instructional Professor. In addition to continued excellence and professional growth, recognized leadership is expected for promotion to Instructional Professor. Associate Instructional Professors aspiring to the rank of Instructional Professor also will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities. They must also document their effectiveness in each area of responsibility: instruction, service and/or research.

For promotion to Instructional Professor the criteria can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an Instructional Associate Professor (or equivalent),
- sustained excellence in teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching, including expansion of teaching qualifications,
- significant participation in activities that enhance the teaching program (such as curriculum development/revision, management of multi-section courses, member of a program committee)
- evidence of leadership in various roles,
- evidence of recognition of excellence (grants, awards, honors, invitations),
- significant service to the College, University, or community, or to state, national or international organizations
- evidence of scholarly activities or research, as applicable,
- professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity,
- evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the competence in teaching and service or research expected of a senior faculty member, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

5.3 Timing of Tenure and Promotion Reviews
The timing of tenure and promotion reviews are mandated by University regulations for both tenure track and academic track faculty. Specifically, for tenure, the mandatory year for a tenure review is determined as follows: the calendar year hired plus the probationary period and minus 2 years. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the tenure review process, doing so during the mandatory review year also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the Provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: leave taken without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate’s control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean and the Provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which the Department Head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

For promotion to full professor and for APT promotions, there are no mandatory review years nor minimum probationary periods. Promotion is case-by-case based on the merits of the faculty member’s experience and accomplishments.
For all promotions, complete promotion, and tenure packets, including dossiers, external/internal letters, and departmental recommendations, are due to the Head of the Department of Statistics and then to the Dean of the College of Science in late fall each year, approximately November 1.

5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers
The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate’s personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided in early summer, approximately June 1, so that it may be included with requests for letters (external for tenure track, external or internal for academic track). The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers (and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers). The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may also request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier includes all elements required by University regulations. No additional documentation is required by the Department of Statistics.

Of the two formal reviews for faculty seeking tenure, the promotion with tenure review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the mid-term review in the third year. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate’s tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential.

The promotion process for APT faculty differs from that for TT faculty in several ways, as stated in the Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The Department of Statistics requires, at a minimum, three letters (internal or external) of support for promotions to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. No letters are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

For all promotion cases, candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion. Departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports should be prepared by the P&T Committee rather than the Department Head. They must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the Department’s vote. Promotion dossiers will be evaluated by the Department P&T Committee, the Department Head, the College P&T Advisory Committee, and the Dean. The dossiers will then be forwarded to the Dean of Faculties, for approval by the Provost and President.

5.4.1 Candidate’s curriculum vitae and statements. The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member’s entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate. The following are best practices. Publications and other scholarly contributions are differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statements clearly articulate the accomplishments of the faculty member and provide context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts are defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities is clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service are clearly represented with an indication of their importance.

5.4.2 Letters of evaluation. In the case of tenure track faculty, to enhance the effectiveness of the candidate’s dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate’s area of expertise. Along with the candidate, the Department Head and P&T Committee will provide recommendations on reviewers, with the Department Head selecting the individuals who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate. Reviewers must be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions; exceptions require approval of the Dean. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. All
letters for tenured and tenure-track candidates must be “at arm’s length”. Letters from previous collaborators, former supervisors or other colleagues who are not at arm’s-length will not be considered. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity. There must be a minimum of five letters received, three of which are from the Department’s list. See Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for specific requirements.

In the case of instructional track faculty, the candidate may select up to three reviewers, with the approval of the Department Head and P&T Committee, who may select others. These can be either external or internal reviewers. There must be a minimum of three letters received. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate’s areas of responsibility. These letters do not have to be “at arm’s length”.

5.4.3 Teaching Evaluation Table. The P&T Committee shall compile and submit a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table with their recommendation, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for mid-term reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). See Section 3.1 for an explanation and example of this table. The Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member’s teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall also contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews
The Department P&T Committee oversees all aspects of promotion and tenure reviews with the Department and advises the Department Head on promotion and tenure decisions. The P&T committee shall consist of three full professors elected by full professors, one associate professor elected by tenured faculty, and two full professors and one associate professor appointed by the Department Head. The Bylaws of the Department of Statistics shall indicate the specifics of their review process.

5.5.1 Compiling Review Materials. The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate’s dossier is correctly assembled lies with the P&T Committee. When reviewing the dossier, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams.

5.5.2 Evaluation Process and Recommendation of the Department P&T Committee. The P&T Committee is responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on credentials of outside referees. The committee also prepares individual reports evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. Following a confidential committee-wide discussion, the P&T Committee conducts an anonymous vote (i.e., Yes, No, Absent or Abstain/Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.

The candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the Department Head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member’s promotion/tenure recommendation packet.

5.5.3 Department Voting Procedure. Following the recommendation of the P&T Committee, all departmental faculty at rank-level or higher will vote as a “committee of the whole” for the record which is supplementary to that of the P&T Committee. This additional vote also becomes a part of the faculty member's promotion packet.
5.5.5 Recommendation of the Department Head. The Department Head prepares and submits an
independent recommendation to the Dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to
the College of Science. The Department Head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the
achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the
department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in
length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under
consideration.

The candidate shall be informed in writing, through the Department Head, of the recommendations at
each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process.

In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written
statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision.

5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review
After receipt of the candidate’s dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary
documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example if the Department Promotion and Tenure
Committee’s teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of
evaluation information, the dossier is returned to the Department Head for further action by the
Department P&T Committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary
documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the Department P&T Committee
evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is
responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

5.6.1 College of Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Dean of the College of
Science, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College Promotion and Tenure
Advisory Committee consisting of five full professors, one representing each academic department.
Each member is appointed for a staggered, three-year term. This College P&T Advisory Committee
reviews dossiers and Department recommendations for all faculty members undergoing mid-term
review and promotion and/or tenure considerations. There is no chair of this review committee, but
rather dossiers are distributed equally among the members.

5.6.2 Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures. College-level reviews are thorough and objective,
recognizing that all cases have strengths and weaknesses to be discussed and addressed in final
reports, including the quality of the research, teaching contributions, and to a more limited extent,
involvement in service. Key objectives of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee are
to ensure equitable review across College units and evaluate cases without departmental advocacy.
Departmental representatives present their units promotion cases and participate in discussions, as
they are positioned to provide the greatest insight into departmental contexts and requirements. To
avoid potential conflict of interest, however, departmental representatives are excused from voting on
the cases from their own departments. Thus, four committee members vote on each faculty member’s
dossier. Individuals associated, in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03), with the
faculty being considered for promotion and tenure or promotion to full professor may not participate in
either departmental or college-level discussions or votes on that case. In accordance with University
recommendations, the Dean will not attend the meetings of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory
Committee. The Associate Dean responsible for faculty matters attends the meeting to hear
discussions and answer questions, as appropriate. Committee deliberations are conducted in the
strictest confidence. Promotion and tenure reviews occur in the fall semester.

In the case of mid-term reviews, the College P&T Advisory Committee is responsible for review and
discussion of each packet. No vote is conducted, and no documents go forward from the College.
Thus, no recusal of departmental representatives is required. Recommendations are passed from the
committee to the Department Head for preparation of a letter to the candidate, signed by the Head and Dean. Mid-term reviews occur in the summer semester.

5.6.3 **Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The committee shall make a clear recommendation on each promotion and tenure case in a memorandum to the Dean. The committee summarizes the general achievements under consideration and explains their perspective on the faculty members’ strengths and weaknesses for promotion and/or tenure. The memorandum for each candidate is limited to one page in length.

5.6.4 **Recommendation of the Dean.** The Dean shall make use of College-level reviews in their deliberation and inform the Department Head of the vote of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Dean is responsible for preparing a recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost. When the Dean does not concur with a recommendation, the Dean should inform the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for that decision. Importantly, it is the responsibility of the Dean of Science to ensure that the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member is based on the individual’s professional performance and that the denial of tenure shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

5.7 **Promotion to Professor**
The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor. However, the review committee shall be composed only of members of the Department P&T Committee who are Full Professors. Associate Professors and Academic Professional Track faculty may not participate in a review for promotion to Full Professor. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and the Department P&T Committee should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate’s international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see sections 3.1 and 5.5 above). For promotions to Full Professor, the Candidate’s Teaching Evaluation Chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years (whichever is shorter).

5.8 **Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors**
Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and the Dean of Faculties.

5.9 **Joint Appointments**
Joint appointments in cases where a scholar’s expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the Department of Statistics. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the Department of Statistics affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with University, College and Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the Department of Statistics must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty.
5.10 Appeals
University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.2 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual’s professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

6. Annual Review

In this document, the Department of Statistics provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the Department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department Heads, the Department P&T Committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Department Head. Evaluations of one’s colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the Department depends upon the quality of these reviews.

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 addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for all faculty. APT faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. Additionally, contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities.

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in an honest and judicious manner, in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2. In addition, the Department of Statistics believes it is a good and critical practice for the Department Head to consult members of the department’s faculty. Accordingly, the Department P&T committee shall provide summaries of each faculty member’s performance to the Department Head. Participation of a faculty committee is required as well, by University regulation, to participate in the mid-term evaluations of faculty considered for promotion and tenure and for promotion to full (see Department of Statistics Promotion and Tenure Guidelines). And, at least once every six (6) years, faculty peer evaluation must be part of the post-tenure review process (see section 8.2 below).

Department of Statistics annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member’s career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The annual review must, at a minimum, include the following components: faculty member’s report of annual activities, a written document stating the department head’s evaluation and expectations, annual opportunity for a meeting between faculty member and Department Head to discuss the written review and expectations, and a performance assessment. The components are defined in University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

For annual reviews of faculty with budgeted joint appointments, respective department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). It is recommended that heads, directors, and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.
For annual reviews of 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 Purposes
Annual reviews have multiple uses and objectives. In particular, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases. The following are specific purposes for annual reviews.

- To provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and departmental leadership.
- To provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- To provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- To provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
- To provide clarification of both institutional and individual goals, as well as programmatic directions. Emphasis on the overall goals of the Department is especially relevant for senior faculty.
- To provide a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year and their level of progress toward tenure is reported to them in a timely manner. In this regard, the Department Head will write a specific annual evaluation to probationary faculty members. This memorandum shall report the results of the annual evaluation and states whether the Department Head concurs with the review committee’s evaluation. Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year appointments, if it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is very unlikely to qualify for tenure, the person should be given a notice in writing of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint. Such a decision is only made with great care and only in compelling circumstances and requires approval of the Dean.

6.3 Time Period of Review
Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period.

6.4 Rating Faculty Performance
During an annual review, faculty performance in each area (see Section 3 above) will be based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence (see section 4 above). The five ratings categories are
“Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory/Meets Expectations”, “Superior/Exceeds Expectations” and “Exemplary/Most Meritorious”. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

Regardless of the faculty member’s rank, roles or areas of responsibility, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. In order to evaluate the members of the Department fairly, the Department should regularly have a conversation about what constitutes sufficient and appropriate evidence, and by implication, what are minimal and strong evidence. This applies to evaluations of both APT faculty and tenure-track faculty. However, it should be noted that specific expectations of APT and TT faculty need not be the same to obtain the same rating. The following are general guidelines, not formulas.

6.4.1 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching.

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in teaching.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching, such as achieving fewer than two indicators of effectiveness. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas of teaching performance needing improvement.

Satisfactory/Meets Expectations – evidence of effectiveness in teaching, such as achieving two or more indicators of effectiveness or excellence. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

Superior/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching, achieving multiple indicators of which more than two are indicators of excellence. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators and can be evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

Exemplary/Most Meritorious – evidence of effectiveness and excellence in teaching that is far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary. This rating should be reserved for faculty who have been truly outstanding compared to all their peers.

6.4.2 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity.

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

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity, such as achieving fewer than two indicators of effectiveness. 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/Meets Expectations – evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity, such as achieving two or more indicators of effectiveness or excellence. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Superior/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity, achieving multiple indicators of which more than two are indicators of excellence. 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.
Exemplary/Most Meritorious – evidence of effectiveness and excellence in research that is far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary. This rating should be reserved for faculty who have been truly outstanding compared to all their peers.

6.4.3 **Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Academic Citizenship and Service.**

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service and/or evidence of unsatisfactory academic citizenship.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service, such as achieving fewer than two indicators of effectiveness. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in departmental service.

Satisfactory/Meets Expectations – evidence of effectiveness in citizenship and service, such as achieving two or more indicators of effectiveness or excellence. Those in this category will be involved in local service appropriate for their career stage and assignment.

Superior/Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in citizenship and service, achieving multiple indicators of which more than two are indicators of excellence. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

Exemplary/Most Meritorious – evidence of effectiveness and excellence in service that is far beyond meeting expectations, where faculty performance is exemplary. This rating should be reserved for faculty who have been truly outstanding compared to all their peers.

6.5 **Required Components**

The annual review must contain the components below in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

6.5.1 **Annual Report of Previous Activities.** The faculty member will self-report activities of the previous calendar year in a form determined by the College and Department. This should be delivered to the Department Head, along with an updated current curriculum vitae no later than **February 15**. It must satisfy the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, but also should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives. For examples, see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

6.5.2 **The Department Head’s Evaluation and Expectations.** The Department Head (or, in some cases, another director or supervisor) will write an evaluation for the year in an annual review document transmitted as a memorandum to the faculty member. The faculty member shall acknowledge 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. The annual review and any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, this document may also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.

The annual review shall also notify faculty members who have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). A faculty member who has been notified of a mandatory training requirement but has not completed it by the end of the evaluation period, shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy the
requirement the following must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the Department Head’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 and the Faculty Member. The Department Head (or, in some cases, some other director or supervisor) may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and any expectations for the coming year. The meeting might include another member of the Department or College, such as an Associate Head. This meeting will occur at the request of the faculty member, except the meeting shall be required for all probationary members. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the Department Head or faculty member. Note that all written annual reviews are available to the person being reviewed upon request.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment. In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, scholarly activity and service, as appropriate for the assignments, 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 Requiring Action
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, service, and other assigned responsibilities (such as administration), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with established criteria (see Section 6.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Dean of Science. 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 the Department Head for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head (and/or other supervisor) may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8.2) 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 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance. A tenured faculty member who receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 8) must work with the Department Head (and/or other 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), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The annual rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the next rating should be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating will be changed to “Satisfactory” when the predetermined milestones have been 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 & Mid-term Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.”
7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

The Department of Statistics considers mid-term reviews to be a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

- 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 Department P&T Committee, the Department Head, and the Dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review will take place concurrently with and in addition to the annual faculty performance 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 academic year at the midpoint of the probationary period and December of that year. For example, if the midpoint year is the academic year 2023-2024 then the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2023 and December 2023. See below an example of the mid-term review of faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

| Hired Calendar Year 2020 | Probationary Period 7 years | Mid-Term Review will occur between Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024) |

**Dossiers for the mid-term review.** Candidates’ dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the Department’s P&T Committee.
The teaching documentation contains evaluation of the candidate’s contributions to the educational mission of the Department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

7.3 Feedback from Mid-term Review
Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. This feedback to the faculty member should include summaries of the reports and recommendations from the Dean, the Department Head, and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review (also called periodic peer 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 with input from the P&T Committee.
2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2), the Department Post-Tenure Review Committee. This review is in addition to the annual reviews.

8.1 Purposes
The purposes of post-tenure review are

- to promote excellence in the performance of the Statistics faculty,
- to assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member,
- to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development,
- to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives, and
- to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

8.2 Post-Tenure Review Committee
Once every six years, an evaluation of each tenured faculty member in the Department of Statistics shall be conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. In addition, if a faculty member receives an overall Unsatisfactory rating in their annual review, the Department Head may request a periodic peer review, also conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. There may be no more than one peer review in any academic year.

The membership of the committee shall consist of three elected members, with Full Professor rank, by vote of the Department’s Full Professors. Every two years, the members of the committee will select one of its members to remain on the committee and Department’s Full Professors will vote on the replacement of the other two committee members. The Department Head and Associate Head for Operations will serve as ex officio members.

8.3 Process
The periodic peer review will be based primarily on current and recent annual reviews and supporting documents, plus additional material supplied by the faculty member for context, if desired. The principal outcome is a performance rating in accordance with the ratings in Section 6.

8.3.1 Review Materials. Materials to be reviewed by Post-Tenure Review Committee will, at a minimum, include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports, and associated evaluations,
and all documentation typically required by the Department for annual reviews. The faculty member may supplement these with other relevant material.

8.3.2 Evaluation. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the areas of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The specific ratings and their criteria shall follow the guidelines established in the sections above and should be consistent with annual evaluations. Ratings will be decided by a vote of the five members of the committee, including the Department Head and the Associate Head for Operations.

8.3.3 Satisfactory Performance. If all of the relevant review categories are “Satisfactory” or better, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer or following three consecutive Unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the Department Head, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4 Unsatisfactory Performance. A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described above. An “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see Section 8.4).

8.3.5 Overall Performance Needs Improvement. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described above. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see Section 8.4).

8.3.6 Performance Needs Improvement. 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 and the faculty member.

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

8.3.8 Report. By no later than May 31, the Department will provide the following to the Dean and the Dean of Faculties: the list of those faculty who underwent periodic peer review, the outcome of each review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Post-Tenure Review Committee’s written evaluation and the post-tenure review documents will be placed in each tenured 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 6.6) or an “Unsatisfactory” peer review (see Section 8.3) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a professional development review and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the Department Head and approval of the Dean when substantive mitigating circumstances exist (such as serious illness). 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 Post-Tenure Review Committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean. The faculty member, the review committee and the Department Head shall then work together to draw up a Professional Development Plan (see Section 8.5) acceptable to the Dean.
8.4.1 **Purposes.** The purposes of Professional Development Review are:

- to identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance,
- to develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and
- to monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2 **Review Committee.** The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Head and the faculty member to be reviewed, unless the faculty member requests that the review be conducted solely by the Department Head.

- The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review Committee. If the faculty member does not request for the review to be conducted by the Department Head, the committee will consist of three faculty members at rank or higher than the faculty member. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
- Once charged, the Professional Development Review Committee shall meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

8.4.3 **Review Dossier.** 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 **Additional Documentation.** 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 **Review Report.** The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The review will result in one of three possible outcomes, as indicated below.

- No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, the Department Head and the Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.
- 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.
- If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean. The faculty member, review committee and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a Professional Development Plan (see section 8.5 below) 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 (according to the criteria in these guidelines) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head, and the Dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the Department, 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, the Department Head 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, the Department Head, and the 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 (section 6, University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01).

8.8 Flexibility
Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. Application of the criteria described in these guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

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 the Recommendation for emeritus Status Form for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

The Department of Statistics, at the recommendation of the P&T Committee and approval of the Department Head, will grant emeritus status to eligible faculty requesting it when the following criteria are met.

- The faculty member was in good standing with the Department at the time of separation or retirement.
- The faculty member receives a majority of yes votes in a poll of tenured faculty (if tenured) or of all faculty (otherwise).