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1. Introduction

The vision of the Texas A&M University Department of Marine and Coastal Environmental Science (MCES) is to provide excellence in teaching, research and service in marine science, with a distinct focus on the interaction of natural and social processes that affect the coastal environments and the communities living within them. The Department’s mission is to:

- Educate science-focused undergraduate students to understand both natural environmental processes (physical, chemical, geological, and biogeochemical) and social issues (policy, management, economics, etc.) relevant to the marine realm;
- Train graduate students to have the capacity and technical skills to become leaders in their chosen areas of academic specialization;
- Advance discovery and understanding through forward-looking, original scientific inquiry of natural and social processes operating from the watersheds to the ocean, particularly of their interactions in the coastal zone and associated impacts on human communities; and
- Provide service and advice to the college, university and other entities within the state, the nation, and the global community.

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 MCES department 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.

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

<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="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</td>
<td><a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines</td>
<td><a href="https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html">https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html</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.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Categories of performance can be found in Section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2 and TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html).

2.1 Faculty Tracks

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty with titles of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor are expected to achieve impactful performances in the three areas of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.

Academic Professional Track Faculty with titles of [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor and [Adjective] Assistant Professor are expected to achieve impactful performances in two of the following three areas: teaching, service, and research/scholarly activity. Academic Professional Track Faculty, particularly Instructional Faculty, are expected to support as a priority the teaching mission of the MCES department. Most are likely to contribute to the service activities as the second dimension of their responsibilities. In rare cases and with the approval of the department head and CAO, an exception to the service requirement may be made for those Academic Professional Track faculty assigned to conduct research/scholarly activities.

Faculty with titles of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer are expected to achieve impactful performances in the area of teaching.

2.2 Faculty Ranks

Expectations for different ranks are described in Section 2.4.3.1 for Assistant Professors, Section 2.4.3.2 for Associate Professors, and Section 2.4.3.3 for Professors of the University Guidelines to Faculty titles.

“Assistant” as a qualifier in the faculty titles indicates a relative novice stature in academia, but “Assistant” [Adjective] Professors are still expected to demonstrate credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas required by their appointment of teaching, research/scholarly activity (when applicable), and service.

“Associate” as a qualifier in the faculty titles indicates experience in academia or substantial contributions to the field. “Associate” [Adjective] Professors are expected to demonstrate an exemplary level of accomplishment, as measured against the contributions of others in the field and professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University. In addition, for tenure-track faculty and Academic Professional Track Faculty who choose research as their second dimension, “Associate” [Adjective] Professors are expected to demonstrate a research area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority, and evidence indicating a commitment to maintain the level of competence in research expected of a tenured faculty member.

The title of Professor with no other qualifier indicates substantial experience in academia and evidence of significant impact on the professions of college faculty and on the field in which the faculty member will teach.
In addition, [Adjective] Professors are expected to have demonstrated all of the required attributes listed above for “Associate” [Adjective] Professors.

3. **Areas of Faculty Performance** *(Reference [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 and/or scholarly activity; and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the department head and dean (Chief Academic Officer, CAO, at TAMUG). Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 **Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the University, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. Examples of the criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are described in Section 4.1.

3.2 **Research and/or scholarly activity**

Research/scholarly activity is also central to the mission of the University, and effectiveness in research is required of all tenure-track faculty. For the faculty at the MCES department, this category involves original scientific research and publication of the results of such research. In all cases, it consists of creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities.

Evaluation of research, therefore, largely focuses on external funding to support the faculty’s research activities and peer-reviewed publication of the outcome of research activities. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) citations; 2) invited seminars and presentations; 3) participation at research meetings of professional societies; 4) presentation of seminars and invited lectures; and 5) reviewing of journal articles and research proposals. Examples of the criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research/scholarly activity performance are described in Section 4.2.

3.3 **Service**

Another important mission of the University is service, which can be partitioned into: 1) intramural service to include participation in organized University activities other than teaching or research; 2) extramural service to administrative agencies and professional organizations in the faculty member’s discipline; and 3) community service to include public education and outreach activities. Examples of the criteria and indicators for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are described in Section 4.3.
4. **Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The MCES department 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. The sections that follow provide examples of representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area (more examples are provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)).

4.1 **Teaching**

Every faculty member is expected to teach at a consistently competent level. Evaluation of teaching will be based on a review of indicators such as student course evaluations and comments, evidence of course development, direction of graduate students, service on committees of graduate students, direction of individual studies, publications relating to teaching, receipt of grants for teaching/learning projects, faculty statements about their aims and methods, etc.

4.1.1 **Examples of indicators of excellence in teaching** are (but are not limited to):

- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level
- Invitations to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Outstanding direction of graduate student research or scholarly activity that is validated by peers and communicated appropriately
- Development of a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Chair of doctoral research committees
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Receipt of external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Publication of papers with teaching focus in top-tier refereed journals
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Teaching activities that are demonstrably synergistic with the faculty member’s research program
- Recognized activities with teaching-oriented groups at the national/international levels
- Significant contribution to the professional development of students (e.g., the University Honors or other programs for student mentoring)
- Recognition of outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor

4.1.2 **Examples of indicators of effectiveness in teaching** are (but are not limited to):

- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Demonstration of effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Demonstration of effective direction of graduate research or scholarly activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Coordination of multi-section courses
- Publication of papers with teaching focus in refereed journals
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
• Participation in the professional development of students (e.g., the University Honors or other programs for student mentoring)
• Receipt of competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
• Significant self-development of activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

4.2 Research/Scholarly Activity

All tenure-track/tenured faculty and academic professional track faculty, whose appointment or reappointment letter is research-oriented, are expected to be active in pursuing a research agenda that leads to regular publication of work in professionally recognized outlets. Factors that provide evidence of research and scholarly activity include, but are not limited to: journal publication, conference proceedings, funded research projects, proposals submitted for funded research projects, patents, the number and success of graduate students supervised, and professional interaction with industry and the private sector. Research productivity will not be judged by quantity alone but will take into account the quality of work performed, determined by such measures as: professional standing of journals, appropriateness of journals, citation of published papers, students graduated, funding received, patents granted, awards, and other evidence of positive impact in the discipline.

4.2.1 Examples of indicators of excellence in research are (but are not limited to):
• Publications in top-tier refereed journals as the lead scientist (e.g., first author)
• Receipt of a major fellowship or research award
• Frequent citation of publications
• Publication of scholarly books by reputable publishers
• Awards for, or publication of, peer-reviewed scholarly activities
• Receipt of significant peer reviewed national/international funding for research
• Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research
• Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
• An established reputation as verified through review by leading experts in the field

4.2.2 Examples of indicators of effectiveness in research are (but are not limited to):
• Publications in top-tier refereed journals as a co-author
• Publications in refereed journals
• Publication of scholarly books
• Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
• Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
• Editor of a scholarly book
• Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
• Presentation of papers at national/international meetings
• Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness
• Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
• Obtainment of extramural research support sufficient to maintain the faculty’s research program
• Receipt of interdisciplinary or multi-investigator funding resulting from collaborative effort with researchers in other fields

4.3 Service

Every faculty member is expected to participate constructively in the life of the department and in service to the profession. Such participation is normally demonstrated by regular attendance at meetings, constructive
participation in decision-making and other aspects of the functioning of the department, constructive colleagueship (i.e., mentoring or assistance of others in fulfilling their duties and maturing as scholars), and service on elected and/or appointed committees. It may also be demonstrated by service on the Faculty Senate or on College or University committees and service to the profession (i.e., reviewing papers for journals, chairing sessions at conferences, or serving as an officer of a professional society).

4.3.1 Examples of indicators of **excellence** in service are (but are not limited to):
- Officer in a national or international professional organization
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Administrative leadership role at TAMUG/TAMU
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Member of review panel for national research organization
- Program chair or a similar position at a national/international meeting
- Officer in Faculty Senate
- Chair of a major standing or ad hoc TAMUG/TAMU committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large
- Service as an external reviewer for national labs or external academic units

4.3.2 Examples of indicators of **effectiveness** in service are (but are not limited to):
- Committee chair of national or international professional organization
- Session chair at national or international conferences
- Officer in regional or state professional organization
- Program chair or a similar position for regional or state professional meeting
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Service on University, college, and departmental committees and task forces
- Service as consultant to business or governmental agencies
- Advisor to student organizations
- Administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the MCES department is as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor

Reviews for Tenure-Track (TT) Assistant Professor will focus on performance relative to the progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

5.1.1.1 Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires evidence of superior performance in all three academic dimensions.

5.1.1.2 University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (Section 4.4.3) provides the University Criteria (i.e., minimum requirements) for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor:

• An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field;
• Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of TAMU;
• An area of specialization germane to the programs of TAMU, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
• Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

5.1.1.3 Additional questions to be considered when evaluating a faculty for the granting of tenure in the MCES department are:

• Do the candidate’s professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity measure up to the level desired by the Department and TAMU in comparison to peer institutions?
• Does the candidate’s record provide evidence of and expectation for continuing productivity and maintenance of competency?

5.1.1.4 Determination of the answers to these questions is, in large measure, subjective. Factors that may enter into tenure decisions include:

• Professional Competence: The faculty member may exhibit professional competence by academic degrees, experience, and performance during the probationary period. Important measures include publications in national and international top-tier peer-reviewed journals, particularly as the lead scientist (e.g., first author), frequent citation of published papers, and success in obtaining research funding through competitive grants.
• Area of Specialization: The faculty member is expected to exhibit expertise in an area of specialization not otherwise represented within the tenured faculty, or to provide desired reinforcement in an area of importance to the Department. The department head should inform the faculty of this matter in the annual reviews and mid-term review.
• Teaching: The faculty should be an effective teacher in both the formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom and through individual mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students in research.
• **Professional Integrity**: The faculty should be aware of the responsibilities associated with being a representative of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. The faculty must demonstrate professional integrity. The faculty’s professional goals must be compatible with the mission of the Department (as described in the Article I of the Department’s bylaws, which is repeated in Appendix A) and TAMUG/TAMU.

• **Collegiality**: The faculty should cooperate and be a good citizen of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. Respect and consideration for and by colleagues and others with whom the faculty has frequent contact is important.

5.1.2 Associate Professor

Reviews for *tenured Associate Professors* will focus on performance relative to departmental norms and identifying the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to Full Professor.

5.1.2.1 Appointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires evidence of **sustained superior performance** in teaching, research and service. In particular, the combination of the two principal academic functions of teaching and research, at a level of superiority and as appropriate to the appointment, is required of a Full Professor.

5.1.2.2 **University Rule 12.01.99.M2** (Section 4.4.3) provides the University Criteria, i.e., minimum requirements for promotion to Full Professor:

- Continuing accomplishment in teaching;
- Continuing accomplishment and some measure of national recognition in research; and
- Evidence of valuable professional service.

5.1.2.3 Additional questions to be considered when evaluating a faculty for promotion to Full Professor in the MCES department:

- Do the candidate’s professional experience and abilities, and standards of professional integrity compare favorably with Professors at TAMU and other peer institutions?
- Has the candidate made significant contributions to the Department and to the scientific community?
- Does the candidate’s record provide evidence for continued scholarship and academic leadership?

5.1.2.4 Determination of the answers to these questions is, in large measure, subjective. Factors that may enter into tenure decisions include:

- **Professional Excellence**: The faculty member shall exhibit professional excellence as recognized by peers at both the national and international levels. Important measures of excellence include continued publication in top-tier peer-reviewed journals, frequent citation of published papers, and success in maintaining research funding through competitive grants. Other indicators may include appointment to grant review panels, election to office in professional societies, meritorious awards from national/international societies (e.g., National Academy’s Awards & Honors), invited lectures at national/international meetings, and other forms of peer recognition.

- **Teaching**: The faculty should be committed to teaching in both the formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom and as a mentor to undergraduate and graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows. In addition to exhibiting the intellectual maturity of a senior faculty member, the faculty should be willing to develop new courses or modify existing ones in light of ongoing advances in the subject area as well as implementing new teaching technologies.
• **Professional Integrity**: The faculty must demonstrate the highest level of academic honesty and professional integrity. The faculty’s professional goals must be compatible with the mission of the Department (as described in the Article I of the Department’s bylaws, which is repeated in Appendix A) and TAMUG/TAMU. The faculty should take a leadership role within the Department, TAMU/TAMUG, and the scientific community.

• **Collegiality**: The faculty is expected to actively participate in the academic life of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. Respect and consideration for and by staff, students, and colleagues with whom the faculty has contact are important.

5.1.2.5 Three consecutive “unsatisfactory” annual reviews (Section 6) for a tenured Associate Professor will trigger a Professional Review (Section 8).

5.1.3 **Professor**

Reviews for *tenured Professors* should focus on the goal of development, by clarifying institutional goals, individual goals and programmatic directions, and by evaluating the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals.

5.1.3.1 The annual review of tenured Professors will be based on the same expectations for promotion to Full Professor (Section 5.1.2).

5.1.3.2 Three consecutive “unsatisfactory” annual reviews (Section 6) for a tenured Professor will trigger a Professional Review (Section 8).

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

Academic Professional Track Faculty with titles of [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor and [Adjective] Assistant Professor are expected to achieve impactful performances in two of the following three areas: teaching, service, and research/scholarly activity. For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The expectations for tenure-track faculty described in Sections 5.1.1 (teaching), 5.1.2 (research) and 5.1.3 (service) are equally applicable to the Academic Professional Track Faculty. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly activity (Section 5.1.2). For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. Promotion of Academic Professional Track Faculty (to Senior Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, or Instructional Full Professor) will be reviewed following the TAMUG Faculty Evaluatoin Guidelines (https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html).

5.3 **Process and Timeline**

5.3.1 Arrangement for consideration for candidacy for promotion and/or tenure is to be set up by the end of March for the candidate to be considered in the following fall. There are two ways to initiate the procedure:

- The department head notifies the candidate in writing (an email is acceptable) about the upcoming mandatory review (e.g., at the end of the mandatory probationary period for tenure, mid-term review, or post-tenure review) by the end of March.
- The faculty member seeking early tenure and/or promotion notifies in writing (an email is acceptable) the department head by the end of March.

5.3.2 The department head formulates the promotion and tenure (P&T) committee by the end of March.
• The P&T Committee of the MCES department is a committee of the eligible whole, i.e., a committee consisting of all eligible tenured faculty members (above the rank of the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure) in the department.
• In case of promotion of Academic Professional Track (e.g., Instructional) faculty, Academic Professional Track faculty members holding a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought will become the P&T Committee members.
• The department head, in consultation with the Chair of the departmental P&T Committee, may add an outside member in the candidate’s field of expertise.

5.3.3 The faculty candidate provides the department head with a list of ~10 external potential reviewers (see Section IV of the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the eligibility of external reviewers), no later than the end of April.
• The department head prepares a draft list of potential external reviewers, in consultation with the Chair of the departmental P&T Committee, and seeks approval of CAO by the end of May.

5.3.4 The faculty candidate submits curriculum vitae and the statement for teaching, research and service (see Section III.A and III.B of the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) to the department head by the end of May.

5.3.5 The department head contacts the external reviewers with the candidate’s curriculum vitae and the statement and shall produce 7+ external letters by the end of July.

5.3.6 The faculty candidate submits the remaining items for his/her dossier by the end of July (see Section III of the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines).

5.3.7 The departmental P&T Committee produces a report by the end of September, and the department head produces a report by mid-October, a due date set by TAMUG.

5.3.8 The process for promotion of Academic Professional Track faculty is identical except the external letters are optional (not required).

5.4 The Dossier

5.4.1 The faculty candidate shall submit a complete dossier as explained in the Section III of DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
• Appendix B lists the elements that should be included in the candidate’s curriculum vitae, at minimum.

5.4.2 The ultimate responsibility for presenting valid information in the formats that will help facilitate the review process lies with the candidate.
• It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit all materials specified in the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
• It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide materials in clear and explanatory formats so that they would assist the reviewers in assessing the candidate’s achievements.
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). 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). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

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

6.1 Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - See University Rule 12.01.99.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

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.

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year. However, for the faculty who shows indicator(s) of “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement” performance in research (Section 6.4.2) for the review
year, his/her research records over the past three years (review year plus the preceding two years) will be collectively considered to draw a final rating for research.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4), based on evidence of effectiveness and excellence, will be rated on five categories: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious”. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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

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

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development. Examples of this evidence are listed in Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Examples of this evidence are listed in Section 4.1.2.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching. Indicators of teaching that needs improvement include, but not limited to: a few repeated negative student evaluations; unresolved student complaints; presentation of some out-of-date or incorrect information; inattention to university requirements, including timely posting of current course syllabi, curriculum vitae, and student grades; refusal to teach courses; lack of progress to degree on the part of graduate students being mentored; and unwillingness to mentor graduate students.

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Indicators of teaching that is unsatisfactory include, but not limited to: persistent negative student evaluations; regular and unresolved student complaints; presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information; disorganized presentation of course materials and poor communication of course requirements; persistent inattention to university requirements including timely posting of course syllabi, curriculum vitae, and student grades; routine refusal to teach courses central to the department mission; excessive cancellation of class; persistent lack of progress to degree on the part of graduate students being mentored; and persistent unwillingness to mentor graduate students.

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

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

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the Most Meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.
6.5 Required Components

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Additional examples of this evidence are listed in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.

- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors. Examples of this evidence are listed in Section 4.2.2.

- **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, lack of publications in peer-reviewed journals; limited extramural research support; limited participation in the preparation of proposals; and limited other forms of scholarly activity (e.g., presentation at scientific meetings, review of manuscripts and proposals; and involvement in research promotion).

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Indicators of unsatisfactory research performance include, but are not limited to: lack of publications in peer-reviewed journals; lack of extramural research support; lack of participation in the preparation of proposals; and absence of other forms of scholarly activity (e.g., presentation at scientific meetings, review of manuscripts and proposals; and involvement in research promotion).

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

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

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical. Examples of this evidence are listed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of effectiveness in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment. Examples of this evidence are listed in Section 4.3.2.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the Department and an absence of extra-departmental service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member. Indicators of service that needs improvement include, but is not limited to: limited professional development activities; limited professional society activity other than membership; limited contributions to as a member of department, college, or institutional committees; and evidence of insensitive comments and/or actions toward individuals or groups that are limited in frequency and severity.

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of evidence of effectiveness in service. Indicators of unsatisfactory service include, but are not limited to: lack of professional development activities; lack of professional society activity other than membership; lack of contributions as a member of department, college, or institutional committees; and evidence of highly insensitive or potentially discriminatory comments and/or actions toward individuals or groups that are severe and persistent.
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 member’s report of previous activities

6.5.1.1 The faculty member submits the following materials to the department head no later than the end of February following the review calendar year.
- Annual Performance Report (G1)
  - The department head provides the G1 to all faculty members no later than the end of January, following the review calendar year.
  - The G1 should report annual activities in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service during the previous calendar year. Additionally, the faculty should point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
  - Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives in G1.
- Updated curriculum vitae of the faculty
- Additional materials, if any (e.g., teaching portfolios including new/updated course syllabi and teaching innovations)

6.5.2 Annual Review Evaluation (G2) by the department head

6.5.2.1 The department head prepares the G2 based on the information submitted by the faculty (Section 6.5.1).

6.5.2.2 The department head, in consultation with the faculty member, determines time allocation for teaching, research/scholarly activities, and service, and states it at the beginning of the G2. The weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual faculty’s appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

6.5.2.3 The evaluation should include performance evaluation for each academic dimension that applies to the faculty type (teaching, research, and service). The rating for each category should be conducted in consideration of the time allocation presented in the G2.

6.5.2.4 The G2 shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.

6.5.2.5 The G2 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 G2 Form 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
6.5.3.1 The department head meet with the faculty member to discuss the G2 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 or faculty member.

6.5.3.2 The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the G2.
   ● A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the G2 will be noted in the G2.

6.5.3.3 The faculty member will be allowed to provide written comments for the G2 if they so choose.

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

6.6.1.1 An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service, or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

6.6.1.2 An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the established criteria (Section 6.4).

6.6.1.3 Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to CAO.
   ● The report to CAO 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 for near-term improvement commensurate with the faculty’s rank and seniority and the facilities and resources available to him/her at TAMUG.

6.6.1.4 If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a Periodic Peer Review in Post-Tenure Review (Section 8) of the faculty member.

6.6.1.5 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 shall be subject to a professional development review (Section 8), as provided for by University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

6.6.2.1 If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (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), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully.

6.6.2.2 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”.
6.6.2.3 The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 Time-Line

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

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to CAO of the college with a copy to the DOF. The CAO will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The CAO’s decision may be appealed to the DOF (section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review (Section 2.4.3.6 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2).
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 midpoint of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the department rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the departmental P&T committee, department head, the college P&T committee, and CAO.
- 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.
- 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.

| Hired Calendar Year 2019 | Probationary Period 7 years | Mid-Term Review will occur between March – December 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023) |

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 CAO, department head, and departmental P&T committee.
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.

8.1 Purpose

- Assess whether the individual faculty 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 Post-Tenure Review Components

1) Annual performance reviews (Section 6) conducted by the department head
2) Periodic peer review by a committee of peers (Section 8.3)

8.3 Periodic Peer Review

8.3.1 The department head notifies the faculty in writing (an email is acceptable) about the upcoming post-tenure review by the end of March for the candidate to be considered in the following fall.

8.3.2 The department head appoints an ad hoc Periodic Peer Review Committee consisting of 3-5 members of tenured faculty. The department head, if deemed necessary, may invite and appoint an outside committee member from the TAMU or TAMUG programs in the candidate’s field of expertise.

8.3.3 The faculty candidate submits the review dossier materials including, at minimum, curriculum vitae and the statement for teaching, research and service (see Section III.A & III.B of the DOF Promotion & Tenure Guidelines) to the department head by the end of July.
   - The ultimate responsibility for presenting valid information in the formats that will help facilitate the review process lies with the faculty candidate.
   - Section III.B (also see Appendix B) lists the elements that should be included in the candidate’s curriculum vitae, at minimum.
   - Appendix II of the DOF Tenure and Promotion Guidelines provides details on what should be included in the statement for teaching, research, and service.
   - No external review letters are required.

8.3.4 The department head provides the candidate’s dossier materials and annual G2 reports to the Peer Review Committee in early August.

8.3.5 The Peer Review Committee submits its review report to the department head by the end of August, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of teaching, research, and service as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in Section 6.4 to be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.6 If all of the three review categories (teaching, research, and service) as well as an overall evaluation are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, whichever is earlier.
8.3.7 Review outcomes that require action

8.3.7.1 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in Sections 4, 5, and 6. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.7.2 A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in Sections 4, 5, and 6. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.7.3 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.

8.3.8 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.

8.3.9 By no later than May 31st in the following year, each department will provide to the CAO and the DOF, 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.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (Section 6) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (Section 8.3.7) or upon request of the faculty member (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 CAO 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 CAO. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professioal Development Plan” (Section 8.5) acceptable to the CAO.

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 CAO, 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.

---

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 and a statement on teaching, research and service.

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 (e.g., annual reviews and peer-review report). 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 CAO 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 CAO to better inform the near term improvement plan described in Section 8.3.7.3); or

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 CAO. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (Section 8.4) acceptable to CAO.

8.5 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against the criteria described stipulated for their respective rank of Associate or Full Professor in Sections 4, 5, and 6) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the CAO, 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).

8.5.1 Assessment of the Plan

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly (e.g., via annual review) to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report that may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the Professional Development Plan will be forwarded to the review committee and the CAO.

8.5.2 Completion of the Plan
● When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and the CAO.
● The successful completion of the plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects success for the entire University community.
● After consulting with the review committee, if the department head and the CAO agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

8.6 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 DOF and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and CAO, the decision of the DOF 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 CAO, 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 CAO, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the DOF 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).
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 DOF website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

To be consistent with the DOF recommendation (https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-Universal/Recommendation_for_Emeritus_Status-2-27-20.pdf), the faculty member should retire in good standing in order to be positively recommended by the department head.
Appendix A: Mission of the Department (Article I of the Bylaws of the MCES department)

The mission of the Department of Marine and Coastal Environmental Science (hereinafter, Department) at Texas A&M University at Galveston (TAMUG) is:

- To provide undergraduate students in the Department an opportunity to concentrate on the physical, chemical, geological, and biogeochemical aspects of the marine, estuarine, and coastal environments through majors in Marine Sciences (MARS) and Coastal Environmental Science and Society (CESS), as well as minor in CESS.

- To provide undergraduate students in other departments at TAMUG a sound education in the physical sciences, particularly chemistry, physics, geology, oceanography, and atmospheric sciences.

- To provide graduate students in the Master of Marine Resources Management (MARM) and a Ph.D. program in Marine and Coastal Management and Science (MCMS) with the tools and understanding to effectively address complex problems such as anthropogenic and natural stressors in coastal and marine environments.

- To support students in a diversity of undergraduate and graduate degrees on our campus such as the Interdisciplinary Program in Marine Biology (MARB-IDP) and programs in conjunction with the departments at Texas A&M University (TAMU).

- To carry out original research and to advance discovery and understanding in the various fields of knowledge found within the Department.

- To provide research experiences for students in the above noted programs as well as related programs at TAMU.

- To promote an academic community for whom common goals and a spirit of cooperation are important while bringing order by defining the rights and duties of the members of the Department.
Appendix B: Faculty Dossier for Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Term Review, and Post-Tenure Review

B.1 The faculty candidate submits his/her dossier to the department head by the last business day of April.

- A candidate for tenure or mid-term review may include materials produced throughout an academic career, with a clear distinction made between materials produced before and during the probationary period.
- A candidate for promotion or post-tenure review may include materials produced throughout an academic career, with a clear distinction made between materials produced before and after the last promotion/post-tenure review.

B.2 The ultimate responsibility for presenting valid information in the formats that will help facilitate the review process lies with the candidate.

- It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit all materials specified in the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (see Section III).
- It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide materials in clear and explanatory formats so that they would assist the reviewers in assessing the candidate’s achievements.

B.3 In case of tenure and/or promotion of tenure-track faculty, a list of ~10 potential external reviewers and a brief description of the candidate’s relationship with each reviewer needs to be submitted to the department head by the last business day of March.

- The department head seeks approval of the dean for the final list of external reviewers (Section IV of the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines).

B.4 Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service is a required item in the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (see Appendix II).

- The candidate’s statement is a personal and individual discussion of one’s philosophical positions, goals, strategies, and emphases in carrying out one’s professional responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research/scholarly activities, and service. It is intended to reflect quality, productivity over time, and the impact of their teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments. The statement should be concise (single spaced, 10 to 12 point type size, 1-inch margin, three pages maximum), organized with these three areas as subheadings.
- The statement on teaching should include what the candidate perceives as strengths and weaknesses in the classroom and in working with students. The statement should also include a short statement of one’s teaching philosophy and goals.
- The statement on research should include a summary of research activities and must address impact over time in addition to quality and productivity. The candidate should indicate the area or areas in which he/she has engaged in sustained research and professional activity. The candidate should also indicate what his/her major and original contributions have been in these areas and what he/she hopes to achieve in the future.
- The statement on service activity should include a summary of the candidate’s service to the department, college, university, and the community. The candidate should indicate if the service is professional or non-professional, and if any offices are held.

B.5 Curriculum vitae is another required item in the DOF Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The candidate is encouraged to submit a very detailed curriculum vitae that will help facilitate the review process. The candidate’s curriculum vitae should include, at minimum, the following:

(1) Biographical information
● Dates of appointments at TAMUG through current rank
● List of all academic appointments, chronologically, at institutions of higher learning beginning with current academic appointment
● Educational credentials
  o Baccalaureate degree earned, date conferred, granting institution, with area of specialization
  o Master degree earned, date conferred, granting institution, with area of specialization
  o Doctorate degree earned, date conferred, granting institution, with area of specialization
● List of the professional designations/licenses
● List of other credit-earning higher education courses completed
● List of other courses attended for professional development including course title, date completed, organization/institution conducting course, etc.

(2) Teaching
● List of all courses taught at TAMUG/TAMU including, at minimum, the following:
  o Course title and number
  o Year/semester the course was taught
  o Credit hours and enrollment
● Summarize the results of student evaluations for all courses taught at TAMUG/TAMU using both a narrative format and graphs/tables
● List of all courses taught (both credit and non-credit) for other institutions indicating title, academic level, and year/semester taught
● List of new courses or new academic programs developed or substantially changed while at TAMUG/TAMU
● List of the innovative teaching methods devised or utilized
● List of the audio-visual and/or online materials developed or utilized
● List of the laboratory or field experience/experiments devised, revised, or utilized
● List of the academic advising assignments/activities
● List of the supervised research such as Directed Studies, Honor’s theses, Master’s theses, and Ph.D. dissertations
● List of the guest lecturer presentations or performances with their dates and locations
● List of other teaching related activities not mentioned previously

(3) Research
● List of the peer-reviewed publications
  o Include full bibliographic citations
  o Distinguish among journal articles, book chapters, books, and others
  o Indicate student or post-doc author(s) of the candidate at the time of research
  o Provide impact factors of the journals
  o Provide citation counts of the publications
● List of non-peer-reviewed publications
● List of the manuscripts submitted for publication and currently under review
● List of the grants and contracts, and pending or unfunded proposals
  o Include full bibliographic citations (e.g., names of investigators, title, duration, funding agency, and total and individual budgets)
  o Indicate the role of the candidate (e.g., PI or co-PI)
  o List pending proposals separately
  o List unfunded proposals separately
● List of the paper/poster presentations giving dates, places, and organization
● List of other research activities (e.g., works in progress including stage of progress)
● List of the participation in professional organizations (offices held, sessions chaired, etc.)
  o Indicate international, national, regional, state or local organizations and dates of service
● List of the activities as professional advisor, consultant, editor, workshop leaders, etc.
● List of the honors and awards earned for professional publications, etc.
● List of the participation in short courses, seminars, workshops, etc.
● List of any research activities not mentioned previously

(4) Service
● List of the service activity on Departmental-level committees
● List of the service activity on TAMUG committees
● List of the service activity on TAMU committees
● List of the service activity on System committee
● List of the university-related extracurricular activity such as student organization advisor
● List of the community service activity which involves the candidate’s field of expertise such as adjudication, advisory boards, career guidance, expert testimony, mediation, etc.
● List of any service activity not mentioned previously