Faculty Evaluation Timeline

February 1: Faculty submit G1 to Department Head
April 1: DH has met with faculty to review
April 15: Dossier due for Cycle Evaluations (Promotion for APT, Mid-term Review for APT)
May 31: External reviewers solicited, if applicable
September 15: Department Review Committee submits reports
September 30: Department Head submits recommendation
October 31: College Review Committee submits report
November 30: CAO submits recommendation
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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University at Galveston Williams Library is to be the indispensable hub of discovery, learning & creativity at Texas A&M University at Galveston. 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 Texas A&M University at Galveston Williams Library 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. For the purposes of promotion or promotion and tenure in the Library, librarianship is considered the equivalent of teaching. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Library; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</td>
<td><a href="https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure">https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rule 12.01.99.M1 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

2.1 Professional Track Faculty Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Instructional Professor

The Instructional faculty track is designated for individuals whose responsibilities are the practice of librarianship and its advancement through either professional service and/or scholarship as described in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.
3. **Areas of Faculty Performance** (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on promotion and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member’s performance in the assigned categories of performance (librarianship, research, scholarly activity and/or creative work; service, and 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 Director. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 **Librarianship**

Texas A&M University at Galveston Williams Library faculty members’ librarianship focuses on recurring and specialized assigned responsibilities that support the mission and goals of Texas A&M University at Galveston as well as reflect the vision and shared values of the Library. Based on each faculty member’s expertise, library faculty work individually and collaboratively to enhance the education and research of students, faculty, and the global community by providing quality services and managing a distinguished collection of information resources. The roles and responsibilities of the faculty are reflected in individual position descriptions.

See Section 4.1 and 4.2 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in librarianship. See Section 6.4.1 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating librarianship performance.

3.2 **Research, scholarly activity, or creative work**

Texas A&M University at Galveston Williams Library faculty members’ research and publication activities are defined as the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Faculty produce original scholarship, which is disseminated in a variety of formats including print, digital works, creative works, conference presentations, and other emerging formats. These publications and presentations further knowledge to improve local, national, and international library practice. Faculty also conduct research and produce publications and presentations in other academic disciplines related to their areas of specialization, and these are seen as equally representative of scholarship. The library profession by its nature is very collaborative and co-authored publications are common, however, solo and lead authorship of publications are highly valued as indicative of independence and initiative in scholarship.

Section 4.3 and 4.4 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in research. See Section 6.4.2 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance.

3.3 **Service**

Service extends the reach of the librarian in sharing their professional role into the local, regional, national, and international communities. Library faculty engage in service in order to enhance their professional discipline, participate in decision-making processes of the library and the academy, support colleagues in their research, and create favorable impressions of the academy in the community. By engaging in professional outreach and participation in their communities, librarians advance the role of the library and its reputation.

See Section 4.5 and 4.6 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in service. See Section 6.4.3 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance.

3.4 **Administration**

Texas A&M University at Galveston Williams Library administrative appointments are defined as those associated with the internal, operational title of Associate Director are appointed with Chief Academic Officer’s approval and include a financial stipend associated with the term of the appointment. Administrative appointments support the
mission and goals of Texas A&M University at Galveston as well as reflect the vision and shared values of the Library. Associate Directors are leaders within the libraries as well as on-campus and are expected to provide support and direction for innovation, service development, collaboration, compliance, growth, and decision-making. The roles and responsibilities of the administrator are reflected in individual position descriptions.

See Section 4.7 and Section 4.8 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in administration.

Unless otherwise specified in the Faculty Bylaws, Library Administrators retain all rights and privileges associated with their current academic rank within the Library as part of their appointment. For purposes of faculty governance and promotion review, Library Administrators participate and vote in the same manner as non-administrative members of the faculty (i.e. no separate vote or recommendation). The Director of the Library reports directly to the Chief Academic Officer and is appointed by them with input from the Library faculty. The terms of appointment and expectations of the position are the responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer.

See Section 4.7 and 4.8 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in administration. See Section 6.4.4 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating administration performance.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

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

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

Selection for a university, college, or professional society award;
Evidence of outstanding performance at a rigorous and challenging level;
Understanding and anticipating user needs and devising solutions for user problems;
Experimenting with new ideas, innovative techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures;
Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials;
Outstanding performance evaluations;
Development of innovative organizational methods and materials;
Assuming leadership in state, national, or international organizations;
Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

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

Development of services having significant effect on the institutional program of TAMUG;
Development of innovative services;
Member of graduate student advisory committees;
Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and other instructional accomplishments;
Participation in establishing objectives and planning, organizing, and coordinating operations;
Accepting responsibility or assuming leadership in university, city, or regional organizations;
Self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:
Publication of scholarly book(s) of highest quality, including library reference works;
Publication in leading refereed journals; Receiving major fellowship or research awards;
Frequent citation of publications by others;
Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
Publication of peer-reviewed creative works;
Significant teaching activities, not tied to job responsibilities, such as course design, professional teaching activities, development of continuing education or credit courses, or invited lecturing at other institutions on a relevant topic;
Member of review panel for national research organization;
Presentation of invited papers at national and international meetings;
Design and development of new resources that support University education or library programs or scholarship, such as development of substantial media or development of computer programs or databases;
Substantive participation on externally funded grant programs;
Receiving significant external research funding.

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

Publications in refereed journals;
Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research and/or professional organizations;
Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
Editor of a monograph or special issue;
Presentation of papers at national, regional, and state meetings of appropriate disciplines;
Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals;
Preparation of grant proposals or authorship of funded grants;
Creating or developing a computer program of value in education;
Contributions to externally funded research activities;
Evaluative publications, such as book reviews, abstracts, and annotated bibliographies;
Presentation of poster sessions at national, regional, or state meetings.

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

Officer in a national professional organization;
Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University at Galveston;
Program chair or committee similar chair at a national professional organizations;
Officer of Faculty Senate; Chair of a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University at Galveston committee.

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service include, but are not limited to:

Committee chair of national professional associations;
Officer in regional or state professional associations;
Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting;
Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate;
Service on University, college, and Library committees and task forces;
Service as a consultant to other libraries, businesses, or governmental agencies;
Advisor to student organizations;

4.7 Indicators of Excellence in Administration include, but are not limited to:
Selection for a university, college, or professional society award;
Evidence of outstanding leadership and performance at a rigorous and challenging level;
Supporting and initiating work that anticipates user needs and devising solutions for user problems;
Providing sound decision making that takes into consideration all needs and levels of the organization;
Actively representing the Library needs and voice across campus through appropriate representative groups;
Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials;
Presentations and participation on panels at international/national conferences;
Serving on boards;
Development of innovative organizational methods and materials;
Evidence of creative professional practice; Supporting and initiating internal and external collaboration;
Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced performance;
Developing future librarian leadership through mentorship.

4.8 Indicators of Effectiveness in Administration include, but are not limited to:

Evidence of accepting responsibility or assuming leadership;
Development of services having a significant effect on the institutional program of TAMUG;
Initiating and supporting new ideas, innovative techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures;
Balancing independent decision-making and leadership initiative among library units;
Leading in establishing objective and planning, organizing, and coordinating operations;
Attending and participating in campus-level appropriate representative groups;
Communicating and engaging in dialogue with active listening

5. Criteria for Promotion

A Committee shall be appointed that shall consist of 5 members selected from the Texas A&M University at Galveston campus and from the Library at the main campus of Texas A&M University at the rank of Associate Professor or above. In preparing the documentation for cases for promotion, the Committee may seek assistance and advice from other Faculty to understand the area of expertise or specialization and summarize the case appropriately in the promotion dossier. The Committee will be responsible for reviewing the documentation for each candidate for promotion and will reconcile questions, draw to the attention of the faculty member omissions in documentation, and assist in assembling the portfolio for each faculty member under review. The Committee will also call a meeting of Faculty of the Instructional track who serve at or above the rank aspired to by the candidate(s) and whose appointments are in the same areas of responsibility to discuss the candidate’s eligibility for promotion, and to conduct the balloting on the candidate(s). The Committee will advise the Director in matters of appointment, annually review governing documents, and act on behalf of the Instructional Faculty in promotion review matters.

5.1 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. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. See Section 4 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness.

5.1.1 Instructional Assistant Professor

- A record of excellence in performance of professional assignment and a developing record of service with impact on the Libraries and indications of impact on the University and the profession.
- Growth in leadership in both librarianship and service should be demonstrable. In those cases where research has been approved along with Librarianship, emphasis on a sustained program of research and publication should be present.

5.1.2 Instructional Associate Professor
Continuous evidence of the highest levels of performance in professional assignment and a continuing emphasis and high degree of service in a focused area of expertise. In those cases where research has been approved along with Librarianship, those seeking promotion to Instructional Professor must demonstrate the highest levels of achievement and impact of scholarship through research and dissemination of knowledge at a national, regional, or state level.

5.1.3 Instructional Professors should demonstrate accomplishment at the highest level.

- Their service, or research, when approved, accomplishments should have achieved a measure of national or international recognition. Their performance should be at the highest level.
- Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national or international prominence is expected. Leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, although significant heterogeneity can be anticipated in the nature of the contributions of the Instructional Professors, continued excellence in one or more areas is expected.

5.2 Documentation

The documentation received by the Committee will be provided by the faculty member and will consist, in part, of a statement by the candidate in which he or she “is to supply in concise form (three pages, single spaced, maximum) a statement on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the three categories of performance: librarianship, service, and research and publication. The purpose is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion --it is to provide a context for review of the file at each level. See the Dean of Faculties Tenure and Promotion Package Submission Guidelines document, updated annually and found at the Dean of Faculties web site http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tp-guidelines In accordance with the instructions provided annually by the Dean of Faculties office, the following items are typically included in the packet prepared for each candidate for promotion:

1. Candidate’s statement on Librarianship, service, and scholarship;
2. Candidate’s curriculum vitae including the candidate’s attestation of correctness;
3. Statement on quality of Librarianship;
4. Statement on quality of service;
5. Statement on quality of research;
6. Statement on quality of other activities, if any, relevant to the missions of the university (this would include exemplary activities that have influenced the Librarianship, service, research, or service mission of Texas A&M University at Galveston);
8. Complete committee report and recommendations;
9. Recommendation of the Director;
10. Other materials and documentation as desired, including candidate’s acknowledgment of the contents of the P&T dossier as submitted to the Committee;
11. A brief personal biography of no more than 250 words, to include candidate’s name, terminal degree, institution where earned, year earned, year they joined the Texas A&M University at Galveston faculty, area(s) of specialty, a brief outline of the contribution to the department in the areas of teaching, service and research that exemplify to the public the quality of our faculty and contributions they are making, and any notable awards or honors.

Numbers 3-6 and 8 above are prepared by the Committee after a thorough examination of the documentation supplied by the candidate and the letters of the peer reviewers and a thorough discussion of the merits of each candidate by the appropriate tenured faculty. Numbers 1-2, 10-11, and possibly 7, are the responsibility of the candidate. The Committee and the Director are responsible for putting the complete package together. The faculty member’s comprehensive professional curriculum vitae with a suggested list of peer reviewers to be
contacted for peer review letters must be delivered to the chair of the Committee and the complete documentation must be presented to the committee upon the call of the chair of the Committee. Documentation to support promotion in academic rank will include all work done during the faculty member's professional career.

5.2.1 Responsibility of the Faculty member

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to be aware of the criteria and procedures by which he or she will be evaluated for promotion in academic rank, and to provide names and addresses for peer review. It also is incumbent upon the faculty member to supply all supporting documentation as described above.

5.2.2 Disposition of Recommendations

A. To the Director

1. The Committee communicates to the Director, with justifications including the vote, both positive and negative recommendations for promotion and tenure.

2. The Director informs the chair of the Committee of his or her recommendations on promotion for each candidate prior to the transmittal of these recommendations to the Chief Academic Officer.

3. The Committee may, when a recommendation of the Director is in opposition to the Committee’s recommendation, attach to the report to the Chief Academic Officer an addendum addressing the difference in recommendations.

B. To Each Eligible Faculty Member

1. The Director informs each faculty member reviewed for promotion and/or tenure of the nature of the recommendation on his or her case prior to transmittal to the Chief Academic Officer.

2. The faculty member may request a meeting with the Committee and/or the Director to review the recommendation.

3. The written recommendations of the Committee and the Director will be made available to the individual faculty member upon request to the Director.

4. Upon receiving notification, the Director informs each faculty member reviewed for promotion or tenure about recommendations made by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President of the university, and the Board of Regents.

5. A faculty member denied promotion or given a terminal contract before being considered for promotion may appeal the decision if he or she believes that decision was not based on an adequate consideration of his or her record and/or in violation of his/her First Amendment rights or on basis of illegal discrimination. The procedures for appeals are described in the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

6. Annual Review

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

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.
In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative, 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.

TAMUG Library faculty are reviewed on an annual calendar basis with a timeline outlined in detail on the Faculty Evaluation Schedule, which is updated annually. Faculty members submit the form which is modeled after a candidate statement for promotion intended to elaborate on areas of impact and significance and an updated annotated Curriculum Vitae. The Faculty member is reviewed in context of the past calendar year. The process incorporates advisory feedback on a faculty member’s performance from the Director and Department Head. All faculty are reviewed in research/scholarship and professional service for progress toward promotion as appropriate to their University academic title, track, and rank. This includes administrators or other faculty who may have negotiated adjusted merit percentages to represent an atypical balance in their portfolio of library responsibilities. Actual expectations in research and service are based on current faculty rank and track and are not adjusted to correlate with a shifted merit percentage adjustment. The Director receives and reviews the evaluations and assigns a rating in Librarianship. The annual review an overall rating in context of progress toward promotion (or in the case of Professors, continuing progress toward rank appropriate roles). A Needs Development or Unsatisfactory rating in any one area will carry more weight in the overall rating as it represents a serious deficiency and impediment to making progress toward achieving promotion.

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - See University Rule 12.01.99.M1. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus
The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual’s career at the time of the review. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

6.2.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Librarianship are:

Unsatisfactory
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in the performance of most areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Customer Service: Does not follow up on customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Disengaged in the development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Is not involved in team-based activities; and/or, when a member of team is not an effective member (e.g., does not make contributions to team projects, misses team meetings and is generally uninvolved in team-based projects)
- Communication: Does not engage in dialogue with active listening and escalates conflict through destructive communication methods/styles/techniques
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates a lack of awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
- Professional Development: Shows no evidence of self-reflection and does not pursue professional development opportunities

Needs Development
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in performing some areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Customer Service: Not open to and/or effectively responding to customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Minimal development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Attendance, participation, and contributions to teams and work groups is inconsistent
- Communication: Demonstrates unprofessional communication methods/styles/techniques or regularly fails to respond to colleagues and customers
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates minimal awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
● Professional Development: Demonstrates little interest or activity in sustained professional development

**Achieves Expected Results**

● Performance: Demonstrates proficiencies in the performance of primary assigned responsibilities
● Customer Service: Open to and/or effectively responds to customer needs
● Skills and Knowledge Development: Develops knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
● Teamwork: Effectively contributes to teams and workgroups through regular attendance and participation in meetings and follow-up activities
● Communication: Engages with colleagues and customers using supportive, collaborative, and effective communication methods/styles/techniques
● Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
● Professional Development: Sustains professional development through participation in activities such as continuing education, reading of professional literature, and monitoring relevant discussion lists

**Achieves Significant Results**

● Performance: Demonstrates expertise in key area/s of primary assigned responsibilities
● Customer Service: Assesses and monitors trends in order to anticipate and proactively meet customer needs
● Skills and Knowledge Development: Enhances and applies knowledge and skills to exceed customer expectations
● Teamwork: Enhances the accomplishment and results of teamwork through demonstrated leadership, creative suggestions, and support of team members
● Communication: Fosters an atmosphere of open communication and receptiveness to suggestions and feedback
● Strategic Awareness: Makes informed decisions and engages based on awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
● Professional Development: Shares and applies professional development insights

**Achieves Outstanding Results**

● Performance: Demonstrates expertise in all areas of primary assigned responsibilities
● Skills and Knowledge Development: Mentors and develops others within the local institution or more broadly within the profession
● Teamwork: Sponsors and develops working groups/teams that improve customer service, solve recognized problems, or address other strategic priorities of the library
● Communication: Engages in effective communication and dialog that supports a culture of respect, builds positive relationships, and manages conflict
● Strategic Awareness: Engages at appropriate levels and uses appropriate techniques to influence the position of the library within the university and broader communities
● Professional Development: Synthesizes material learned through professional development into new perspectives and approaches

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s librarianship assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.
6.2.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:

For Instructional faculty, this applies only to those who have Librarianship/Research appointments.

As with the tenure track, the evaluation of Instructional assistant professors for whom research is the second area of concentration varies with their time in rank. First year assistant professors are not expected to be comparable with those with more years in rank. For example, in the first year “evidence of continuing progress” may focus on identifying a research topic and developing a methodology to bring to completion over the next year. As a faculty member moves through their years as Assistant, the standards for activity within the previous three years rise accordingly. As Instructional assistant professors move through their employment, the standards for activity within the previous three years rise accordingly. Instructional assistant professors do not have a defined period within which they must apply for promotion to Associate rank. Nevertheless, evidence of continuous high-quality research and publication is expected for positive annual evaluation, continued appointment, and promotion. In addition to these, for Instructional associate professors, evidence of working toward a national reputation, and for Instructional professors, evidence of engagement and a national reputation is expected.

Unsatisfactory
Assistant Professors
No evidence of progress towards research or publication

Associate Professors/Professors
No evidence of progress towards research or publication within the previous three years

Needs Development
Assistant Professors
Minimal progress since previous evaluation, no evidence of accepted presentations or publications.

Associate Professors/Professors
Minimal progress within the previous three years; little evidence of continued research activity.

Achieves Expected Results
Assistant/Associate/Professors
Provides evidence of research activity and shows evidence of continuing progress.
Within the previous three years, publishes and/or presents in appropriate venues.

Achieves Significant Results
Assistant/Associate/Professors
Building on past research activity to create a body of work; shows evidence of impact and quality.
Within the previous three years, publishes and presents in appropriate venues, including national and international settings for Professors.

Achieves Outstanding Results
Assistant/Associate/Professors
Demonstrates significant impact of research and publications.
Within the previous three years, publishes and presents in appropriate venues, including national and international settings for Professors.

6.2.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:
**Instructional Assistant Professors**

While the Library expects Instructional Assistant Professors to begin a program of service, extensive service detracting from one’s librarianship in their first year is not encouraged. Emphasis will be on development of professional assignment while initiating a record of service activities at the state, regional, national, or international levels. Individuals should explain the role or goal of the endeavor and the individual’s level and quality of contribution. Exception: in an individual’s first evaluation cycle there may not have been enough time to start any service activity and so may receive “Achieves Expected Results” even though there is little, or no service listed.

**Unsatisfactory**

Minimal service activity or all activity requires minimal involvement or effort. The individual cannot demonstrate the impact of the activity itself or cannot demonstrate the impact of their contributions.

**Needs Development**

Minimal service activity or all activity requires minimal involvement or effort. The individual cannot demonstrate the impact of the activity itself or cannot describe their contributions. The individual has a few activities listed but cannot demonstrate substantive impact or cannot demonstrate the impact of their contributions for most of them.

**Achieves Expected Results [Activity-based]**

The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of a few activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

**OR [Impact-based]**

The individual demonstrates some impact of several activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth. In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research.

**Achieves Significant Results [Activity-based]**

The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of a few activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

**OR [Impact-based]**

The individual effectively demonstrates the impact of several activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth. In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research. The activities should show a pattern of professional growth and increasing impact.

**Achieves Outstanding Results**

The individual has detailed both continuous activity and significant impact, indicating leadership and reputation at a national or international level. Their role is articulated as are the specific contributions of their service. They have significant roles in service, which may take the form of an officer position in a professional or scholarly organization or other leadership roles including founding a national initiative or leadership in interdisciplinary programs. National reputation as indicated by membership on editorial or governing boards, national/international awards, or formal
acknowledgement. There is documentation of leadership roles in library or university service, balanced with those in national/international service.

**Instructional Associate Professor**
The expectation of an Instructional Associate Professor is that they will increase their service activity and begin a record of consistent service contributions to the profession, as well as to the university and the library. Associates are expected to grow in leadership roles, share knowledge and experience to both the organization and profession, and continue emphasis of service that begins and maintains a national reputation.

**Unsatisfactory**
There is no evidence of professional or scholarly service activity; or, for what little activity is described, there is a documentation that the individual made little to no contribution or had negative impact.

**Needs Development**
Service activity is sparse or shows minimal involvement or effort. Service does not show engagement outside the libraries; there is little or no evidence of scholarly or professional service outside the university beyond association membership. Leadership roles are not in evidence. Impact is not documented.

**Achieves Expected Results [Activity-based]**
Evidence of service activity at regional, national, or international levels. With a lot of activity indicated, the impact of some of the activities or their contributions is not clearly described. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

**OR [Impact-based]**
Fewer activities may be listed but they effectively demonstrate the impact of the activities and of their contributions. There is evidence of increasing leadership positions and growth for either local or national service. There may also be indicators of reputation such as invitations for accreditation review or nominations to serve.

**Achieves Significant Results [Activity-based]**
Service activity is continuous and demonstrates leadership at a national or international level, which may be demonstrated as editor or editorial board member of major peer reviewed journals or scholarly presses in the profession, peer reviewer for national and international professional organizations, external reviewer for accreditation or certification programs, planning national meetings. There is a notable quantity of services activity on organizational taskforces and university committees.

**OR [Impact-based]**
The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of fewer activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact. In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research. The activities should show a pattern of professional growth and increasing impact.

**Achieves Outstanding Results**
Service record is sustained and at consistently high levels, with a lot of activity both in national/international and local organizational (university or library) efforts. In addition to traditional service activities, there is marked evidence of service to a broader higher education audience or professional practice, addressing disciplinary and interdisciplinary goals. Leadership is
demonstrated in both titled (officer) positions in professional and scholarly organizations and through founding or coordination of innovations and initiatives that promise (and deliver) high impact.

**Instructional Professor**
The expectation of an Instructional Professor is that they show a continuing emphasis and high degree of service that supports having achieved a national and/or international reputation in a focused area of expertise. Instructional Professors should demonstrate accomplishments that show consistent impact at the highest level with leadership roles in the pursuit of excellence. While service activities are defined broadly, considering the evolution of the profession, they should have some relationship with the libraries or Texas A&M University locally, the profession at large, or higher education.

**Unsatisfactory**
There is no evidence or sparse evidence of professional or scholarly service activity; or, for what little activity is described, there is documentation that the individual made no contribution or had negative impact. Leadership roles are not in evidence.

**Needs Development**
There is service activity that may be at local or university levels. With a lot of activity indicated, the impact of some of the activities or their contributions is not clearly described. Or few activities are listed with little to no professional impact. Any leadership roles are either local and/or narrow in scope.

**Achieves Expected Results [Activity-based]**
Service activity is continuous and demonstrates some leadership at a national or international level. There is a notable quantity of service activity on organizational taskforces and university committees.

**OR [Impact-based]**
Individual shows continuous service activity and increasing leadership which may be demonstrated as serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board, peer reviewer for national and international professional organizations, external reviewer for promotion and/or tenure at peer institutions, planning national meetings or other similar activities. The role in activity and the impact on the profession is well substantiated.

**Achieves Significant Results**
Service activities are continuous and demonstrates leadership at a national or international level which may be demonstrated as serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting or serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate. There is a notable quantity of services activity on organizational taskforces and university committees and leadership roles. The role in activity and the impact on the profession is well documented and prominence of the faculty member has been established within their professional community.

**Achieves Outstanding Results**
Service record and leadership roles are sustained and at consistently high levels, with high qualitative and quantitative activity both in national/international and local organizational (university or library) efforts. In addition to traditional service activities, there is marked evidence of service to a broader higher education audience or professional practice, addressing disciplinary and interdisciplinary goals. Excellent leadership is demonstrated in both titled (officer) positions in
professional and scholarly organizations and through founding or coordination of innovations and initiatives that promise (and deliver) high impact.

6.2.4 **Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Administration are:**

**Unsatisfactory**
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in the performance of most areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Leadership: Consistently disregards or ineffectively provides direction, compliance, development, and decision-making
- Customer Service: Does not follow up on customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Disengaged in the development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Is not involved in team-based activities; and/or, when a member of team is not an effective member (e.g., does not make contributions to team projects, misses team meetings and is generally uninvolved in team-based projects)
- Communication: Does not engage in dialogue with active listening and escalates conflict through destructive communication methods/styles/techniques
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates a lack of awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
- Professional Development: Shows no evidence of self-reflection and does not pursue professional development opportunities

**Needs Development**
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in performing some areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Leadership: Often ineffectively provides direction, compliance, development, and decision making
- Customer Service: Not open to and/or effectively responding to customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Minimal development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Attendance, participation, and contributions to teams and workgroups is inconsistent
- Communication: Demonstrates unprofessional communication methods/styles/techniques or regularly fails to respond to colleagues and customers
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates minimal awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
- Professional Development: Demonstrates little interest or activity in sustained professional development

**Achieves Expected Results**
- Performance: Demonstrates proficiencies in performance of primary assigned responsibilities
- Leadership: Provides direction, compliance, development, and decision-making for the Libraries and specific units/teams
- Customer Service: Open to and/or effectively responds to customer needs
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Develops knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
● Teamwork: Effectively contributes to teams and workgroups through regular attendance and participation in meetings and follow-up activities
● Communication: Engages with colleagues and customers using supportive, collaborative, and effective communication methods/styles/techniques
● Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
● Professional Development: Sustains professional development through participation in activities such as continuing education, reading of professional literature, and monitoring relevant discussion lists

Achieves Significant Results
● Performance: Demonstrates expertise in key area/s of primary assigned responsibilities
● Leadership: Provides strategic and innovative direction, compliance, development, and decision-making which benefits the entire Libraries
● Customer Service: Assesses and monitors trends to anticipate and proactively meet customer needs
● Skills and Knowledge Development: Enhances and applies knowledge and skills to exceed customer expectations
● Teamwork: Enhances the accomplishment and results of teamwork through demonstrated leadership, creative suggestions, and support of team members
● Communication: Fosters an atmosphere of open communication and receptiveness to suggestions and feedback
● Strategic Awareness: Makes informed decisions and engages based on awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
● Professional Development: Shares and applies professional development insights

Achieves Outstanding Results
● Performance: Demonstrates expertise in all areas of primary assigned responsibilities
● Leadership: Provides strategic and innovative direction, compliance, development, and decision-making which benefits the University and the Libraries and advances the reputation and accomplishment of the University Libraries nationally and internationally
● Skills and Knowledge Development: Mentors and develops others within the local institution or more broadly within the profession
● Teamwork: Sponsors and develops working groups/teams that improve customer service, solve recognized problems, or address other strategic priorities of the library
● Communication: Engages in effective communication and dialog that supports a culture of respect, builds positive relationships, and manages conflict
● Strategic Awareness: Engages at appropriate levels and uses appropriate techniques to influence the position of the library within the university and broader communities
● Professional Development: Synthesizes material learned through professional development into new perspectives and approaches

6.3 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).

6.3.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities.
● Narrative report, maximum length 3 pages, single-spaced formatting with minimum 11pt font and 1-inch margins; no prescribed length for any specific section
● Use of bullets, subheadings, or other formatting to improve organization and readability is encouraged.
● Report should address relevant sections/dimensions as they are defined by your position and tenure-track/tenured or APT status (e.g., Librarianship / Research and Scholarship / Service).
● Librarianship should focus on the most recent year, but research and service sections should be in context of a 3-year window
● Include under Librarianship any committee service where one is appointed solely or primarily because of position description or serves in an ex-officio role
● Librarianship should explore aspects of position responsibilities or developments over the past year
● Progress being made on multi-year initiatives in any area should be addressed as needed
● Statements/comments should focus on impact, outcomes, results, and context rather than reporting a linear record of tasks and activities
● Include metrics or measurable data whenever possible and appropriate
● Statements should relate to the university and library priorities as appropriate, including enhancing diversity initiatives, fostering inter- and multi-disciplinary endeavors, and other aspects of leadership

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

6.3.2 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.

6.3.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

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

6.4 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:

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

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

6.4.2 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.

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

6.6 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1.

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M1

Internally, faculty members are encouraged to meet with any party involved with the disputed review if they have questions about their ratings and may submit a written rebuttal. If a rebuttal is written it is shared with the appropriate parties (depending on what category it is in response to) and attached to the evaluation in the personnel file. If an evaluation is revised based on information raised in the rebuttal, the faculty member
will have the option of retaining the original evaluation and rebuttal in their file or replacing both with the revised evaluation.