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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Maritime Transportation Department is to provide maritime transportation students with a solid academic foundation on which to build their careers as a U.S. Coast Guard Unlimited License Deck Officer. Through the use of cutting-edge maritime technology, the utilization of maritime outreach opportunities, and specialized training required by specific segments of maritime industry, MART graduates will be able to successfully work into both sea-going and shore-side employment opportunities in the maritime industry. 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 Maritime Transportation Department faculty are to 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 Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence. Please also refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which supplements this document (https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html).

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.M2 and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Maritime Transportation Department faculty are traditionally Lecturer and Academic Professional Track (refer to TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines). Refer to section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2 for associated definition for each title.

2.1 Academic Professional Track Faculty (in alignment with Campus Guidelines)

Faculty with titles of [Adjective] Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor and [Adjective] Assistant Professor will be expected to achieve impactful performances in two of these three areas:

2.1.1 Teaching
2.1.2 Service

Academic Professional Track Faculty support as a priority the teaching mission of the university. Most will contribute to the service activities as the second dimension of their responsibilities.

2.2 Lecturers and Adjuncts

Faculty with titles of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers will be expected to achieve impactful performances in this area:

2.2.1 Teaching

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. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Since the Maritime Transportation Department is primarily APT faculty, the focus on performance is teaching, service, and administration unless otherwise specified in annual offer letter. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: G1/G2 annual review process, student, and peer feedback through formal review each semester (PICAs or equivalent), success rate of course, creative initiatives to engage students in learning, and evaluation of capstone license examination.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:
Not applicable for APT faculty at this time

3.3 Service
Service is central to the mission of the Maritime Transportation License Option Programs. As such, all faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to summer sea terms and license training; 2) participate in recruiting and retention; 3) engage in industry outreach to strengthen the learning environment for our students; 4) enhancement of the campus climate for working and education; and 4) Standards of Training, Watchkeeping, and Certification oversight. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are: participation in various committees in the department, on campus, and/or within the University, participate in New Student Conferences and recruiting endeavors, participate in industry organizations, and contribute adaptations to maintain Standards of Training, Watchkeeping, and Certification which engage students through high impact learning.

3.4 Administration, if applicable:
Administration requirements are primarily focused on the Department Head and Assistant Department Head faculty. Administration measurements are: 1) contribute to processes to improve student and faculty success; 2) facilitate management of department and campus policies; 3) develop processes for operations within the Maritime Transportation Department; and 4) liaison for industry, program, and department license option programs. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating administration performance are: engaging in campus and University committees which impact policy, liaison between the department and license option program requirement improving student success initiatives, along with time to degree, and monitoring department measurements to enhance all University goals for diversity, success, and accountability of operations.

3.5 Other, if applicable:
All Texas A&M University A&M employees should exhibit A&M Core Values. Other duties are optional through selfless service. If an opportunity to enhance the University, it should be discussed with the Department to determine the impact it may have upon the department. Once the impact is determined, the opportunity will be outlined in the prospectus for the faculty during the annual review. Such details will be reviewed in the G1 and G2 process.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness
The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
Participating, creating, and implementing various teaching techniques which lead the department in best practices for the Maritime Industry. Examples:

- Selection for a University, college, or professional society award;
- Development of transformational and/or high impact experiences offered to students;
- Recognized by students, employers/graduate advisors, peers, and professional organization;
- Evidence of outstanding performance at a rigorous and challenging level;
- Outstanding performance evaluations (evaluated through a potential combination of student, peer-reviews, etc.);
- Development of innovative organizational methods and materials;
- Evidence of creative professional practices;
Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced learning experience;
Participate in national and international development of International and National requirements for the Maritime Transportation License Option program.

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:
Maintain and modify various teaching techniques which improve the student learning environment. Examples:
- Development of practice having significant effect on the institutional program of TAMU and TAMUG;
- Development of innovative pedagogical practices;
- High achievements of students in certification exams;
- Placement in graduate/professional programs or career;
- Member of graduate student/leadership development of Corps of Cadets or other student advisory committee;
- 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 educational mission of university;
- Self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
Not applicable for APT faculty at this time

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:
Not applicable for APT faculty at this time

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:
Participate or hold leadership position in both campus committees and industry organizations. Examples:
- Officer in a national professional organization;
- Published knowledge in professional magazine;
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
- Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University;
- Program chair or similar chair at a national meeting;
- Officer of Faculty Senate;
- Chair of a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee.
- Outreach on behalf of department, college, university;
- Pro-bono expert services to internal and external organizations.

Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:
Participate in various campus committees and industry organizations. Examples:
- 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 Libraries committees and task forces;
- Service as a consultant to other universities, libraries, businesses, or governmental agencies;
- Advisor to student organizations;
- Administrative roles within academic departments or Libraries;
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness;
- Committee membership and participation in international, national, regional, state, and
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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. Currently, the Maritime Transportation Department is only APT and Lecturer levels of faculty. The criteria for the unit is as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Not applicable at this time.
5.1.2 Associate Professor: Not applicable at this time.
5.1.3 Professor: Not applicable at this time.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)
For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. The Maritime Transportation Department will follow the Texas A&M Galveston Faculty Evaluation Guidelines while implementing departmental specifics below:

5.2.1 Regular rank, non-tenure track faculty
These faculty levels of achievement parallel those for the tenured ranks but are recognized by a variety of methods. These faculty teach two or three courses per semester (at least 4 or 5 per year) as assigned by the Department Head.

5.2.1.1 Professor of the Practice of Marine Transportation

a. Criteria: Basic criteria for this rank include requirements for the Associate Professor level. In addition, Professors of the Practice demonstrate the academic preparation, advanced professional development, and activity necessary for their instructional duties in the Department. Advanced professional development generally consists of unlimited-tonnage licensure at the Master-level; and an advanced academic degree in a related field, or significant and routine scholarly contributions to the maritime field. They demonstrate continued professional development and leadership (in matters of curriculum development, methodological innovation, or scholarly contributions).

b. Appointment: Professor of the Practice will have annual appointments for at least the first three years. Once appointed, they shall receive 12 months’ notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time [12-month] appointments. Intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should either be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department Head, or after 12 months’ notice to the faculty member. Faculty holding the title of Professor of the
Practice may be considered for multi-year rolling appointments, particularly after they have served continuously in the position at TAMU for three years.

c. Promotion: Professor of the Practice will normally be considered for promotion after five years. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates shall be considered by the Department Head. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration.

5.2.1.2 Associate Professor of the Practice of Marine Transportation

a. Criteria: Basic criteria for this rank include requirements for the Assistant Professor level. In addition, candidates will have demonstrated excellence in teaching through dedication to improving teaching proficiency, effective use of teaching materials, and effective classroom management. They will have demonstrated continued professional development and leadership in the areas of curriculum development, methodological innovation, and scholarly contributions, beyond that expected of Assistant Professors of the Practice.

b. Appointment: Associate Professor of the Practice will have annual appointments for at least the first three years. Once appointed, they shall receive 12 months’ notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time appointments, but intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should either be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department Head, or after 12 months’ notice to the faculty member. Faculty holding the title of Associate Professor of the Practice may be considered for multi-year rolling appointments, particularly after they have served continuously in the position at TAMU for three years.

c. Promotion: Associate Professor of the Practice will normally be considered for promotion after three years. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates shall be considered. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration.

5.2.1.3 Assistant Professor of the Practice of Marine Transportation

a. Criteria: Assistant Professors of the Practice shall demonstrate the academic preparation, professional development, and activity necessary for their instructional duties in the Department. Professional development generally consists of unlimited-tonnage licensure at the management-level; or 1,600-ton licensure at the Master-level; or advanced academic degree in a related field. They demonstrate the likelihood that they will continue to engage in significant professional activity in the field.

b. Appointment: Assistant Professor of the Practice will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget. Faculty members who have continuously been in this position for five full-time-
equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period are entitled to 12 months’ notice if they will not be reappointed.

c. Promotion: Assistant Professors of the Practice will normally be considered for promotion after five years. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking a promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current position, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. Assistant Professors of the Practice may be considered for multi-year appointments, particularly after they have served continuously in the position at TAMU for five years.

5.2.1.4 Senior Lecturer

a. Criteria: Senior Lecturers shall demonstrate extensive experience in instructional techniques, advanced professional development, and preparation for their instructional duties in the Department. Extensive experience generally means five or more years’ experience in the maritime industry, and classroom teaching experience.

b. Appointment: Senior Lecturers will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

c. Promotion: Senior Lecturers may be considered for promotion on a rolling basis. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking a promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates shall be considered. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation shall address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current position, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion.

5.2.1.5 Lecturer

a. Criteria: Lecturers demonstrate extensive experience in instructional techniques, advanced professional development, and preparation for their instructional duties in the Department. Areas of expertise should include maritime industry, and classroom teaching experience.

b. Appointment: Senior Lecturers will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

c. Promotion: Senior Lecturers may be considered for promotion on a rolling basis. However, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking a promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates shall be considered. Each annual faculty-performance evaluation shall address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current position, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion.
2. Faculty with the word Visiting or Adjunct in their TAMU faculty titles are always given annual or semester appointments. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

5.2.2 Non-regular rank faculty

1. Criteria: These faculty, whether paid or unpaid, are appointed by the Department Head in consultation with the regular rank faculty. The criteria for rank parallel those for regular rank faculty. The Department Head uses the following guidelines to assign the appropriate titles to non-regular rank faculty:

a. Adjunct Assistant/Associate/Professor: This title designates those who hold a primary administrative appointment at Texas A&M University, who hold a primary academic appointment at another university, or other individuals, such as independent scholars or practicing professionals, who contribute intermittently to the instructional program of the department.

b. Visiting Assistant/Associate/Professor or Instructor: This title designates individuals on leave from another institution or who teach in the Department on a short-term basis.

c. Scholar in Residence: This title designates non-University scholars who are affiliated with the Department on a short-term basis.

5.2.3 Privileges and restrictions: Non-regular rank faculty may attend faculty meetings dealing with programmatic issues at the invitation of the chair, they enjoy no departmental voting privileges, they may serve in an advisory capacity on departmental committees, and they may advise undergraduate majors.

5.3 The Promotion and Tenure Process

Refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines sections 5.3 - 5.12 for more complete details regarding the promotion and tenure process.

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

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

6.1 Purpose
   ● Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member’s performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual’s faculty position.
   ● Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member’s contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
   ● Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
     ○ See University Rule 12.01.99.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 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3 Time Period of Review
   Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar. Each faculty member must submit an annual evaluation report to the Department Head each year. The report will normally be due by January 31 for the preceding calendar year. The Department Head will notify faculty members each year of the due date.

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

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

6.4.2 Even though Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work is not applicable, it is left in for APT and Lecturers to reference. **Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. 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.

6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:
- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.5 Required Components

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the multiple missions of Texas A&M University, in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member. Typically, the report will address the following activities (found in G1 form):

Section A. Teaching  
Section B. Research, Scholarly or Creative Activities (Note: This section is in the Campus form and left blank)  
Section C. Service  
Section D. Department Specific Activities  
Section E. Prospectus  
Section F. Evaluation

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

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit’s practice, but should allow a faculty
member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.

- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:
- **Components found in the G1 form should be filled out by the faculty**
- **Position and Committees of participation**
- **Initiatives for next year and plan for next five years**

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

The Prospectus section of the G1/G2 provides the opportunity for each faculty member to reflect on her/his accomplishments over the preceding year; present a candid self-assessment of their performance in each of the areas of teaching; research, scholarly or creative activity; and service; and discuss goals for the coming year and beyond. Goals in each of the areas of teaching; research, scholarly or creative activity; and service are required. Faculty members should be able to explain the quality, productivity over time, and impact of their teaching; research, scholarly or creative work; and service accomplishments and provide evidence to substantiate progress on their stated goals, so that performance against these goals can be assessed. At the annual evaluation session with the Department Head, these goals may be amended, deleted, or new goals added.

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

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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.
Signatures by the faculty member and the Department Head at the end of the Annual Evaluation Form (e.g., G2) signify that the annual evaluation process took place. The faculty member’s signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. The Department Head will complete a written evaluation in each area as well as an overall evaluation and return a copy to the faculty member on or before May 31st of that academic year.

Additionally, and consistent with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, the annual evaluation process will vary by title and rank (see sections 2.4.2). For academic professional track faculty, the annual review process will serve primarily as an evaluation focusing on performance and potential for reappointment and promotion. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual review must take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three-to-five-year horizon may be necessary for the accurate evaluation of scholarly progress. Furthermore, an annual review process should be conducted differently depending upon the different stages of a faculty member’s career.

For all faculty below the rank of Full Professor (tenure-track or non-tenure track), the annual review process must also provide an explicit indication as to progress toward tenure and/or promotion (see University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 4.3.5). 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 evaluation should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals as well as 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 evaluation shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

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

The Department Head will invite each faculty member to schedule an in-person conference to review the materials submitted, discuss performance, and agree on goals for the next year. The full review (including, if necessary, needs for improvements and mitigation plan) will be completed by May 31st of the academic year.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.
In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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.

If the department uses peer evaluations of performance, the departmental process will clearly state who performs the evaluations, how and when the evaluations are performed, and how these evaluations are incorporated in the annual evaluation. For example, departments may have peer committees to advise the Department Head in the annual evaluation process. Departments may also use in class peer-review of teaching effectiveness. How these processes are applied, and the rubrics of evaluation need to be defined at the departmental level.
Annual evaluations should include an informed judgment by the Department Head of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and guidelines. No faculty member may receive an overall meets expectation rating and merit raises, if she or he is out of compliance with System Regulation 33.05.02, which addresses required training. Furthermore, faculty who supervise employees must have completed the annual evaluations of their direct reports by May 31 each year to be eligible for merit.

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

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

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

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

If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single category, he or she must work with his or her Department Head immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as such as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.

Although each plan for near term improvement is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will include the following:
• specific deficiencies to be addressed;
• specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies with an identified and clear timeline to achieve these outcomes (one year for teaching, no more than 2 years for service, up to 3 years for research, scholarly or creative activities to complete successfully);
• meets expectations outcomes for the following annual evaluation cycle.

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the following annual evaluation cycle has ended, the Department Head shall make a final report to the faculty member and the CAO. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed.

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

The annual evaluation is performed by the Department Head and the process must be completed to support her/his recommendations of merit pay increases for faculty. Merit raises will only be considered for faculty who received a satisfactory or higher rating in at least one area of performance and who will have completed all their System mandated training (System Regulation 33.05.02). In addition, faculty who supervise employees must have completed the annual evaluation of their direct reports by May 31st each year to be eligible for merit.

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:
A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of University SAP 12.01.99.M2.

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.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. The Maritime Transportation Department does not require Mid-Term Reviews and will follow these regulations, along with Texas A&M Galveston Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, if it becomes required.

7.1 Purpose

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. Post-Tenure Review

The Maritime Transportation Department does not require Post Tenure Reviews and will follow these regulations, along with Texas A&M Galveston Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, if it becomes required.

---

1 Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.
In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

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

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

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

Not applicable at this time and will be modified if the occasion should change for the Maritime Transportation Department.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Example 1 – To be given if when applicable
- Example 2 – To be given if when applicable
- Example 3 – To be given if when applicable

8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.

8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.

8.3.4 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that
finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

8.3.6. A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

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

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be

---

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report.

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4. 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

University Rule 31.08.01.M2 states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Dean of Faculties website for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

To be consistent with the DOF recommendation, the faculty member should retire in good standing in order to be positively recommended by the department head.

10. Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Appointments

The adjective modifier of Academic Professional Track Faculty includes the words Executive, Instructional, Of the Practice, Research, and Senior. Faculty in these non-tenure-track appointments will be expected to make
significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of service or the area of scholarly research or creative work.

- Faculty with “Instructional” will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to teaching and must contribute to service as well.
- Faculty with “Executive” in the title have had an executive position in industry or the public sector and will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to teaching and must contribute to service as well.
- Faculty with “of the Practice” in the title have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia.
- Faculty with “Research” in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well.

10.1 APT Faculty Appointments

In accordance with Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles:

10.1.1 Newly hired faculty members appointed to Executive Professor, Professor of the Practice, Instructional Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Instructional Associate Professor, and Senior Lecturer (exclusive of the adjectives research, visiting, or adjunct) will have annual appointments for at least the first three years, but will always receive 12-months’ notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time appointments, but intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should either be by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Department, or after 12 months’ notice to the faculty member. (Section 3.4 of Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

10.1.2 Newly hired faculty members appointed to Assistant Professor of the Practice, Instructional Assistant Professor, and Lecturer (excluding the adjectives research, visiting, and adjunct) will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget. Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period are entitled to 12- months’ notice if they will not be reappointed. (Section 3.5 of Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

10.1.3 Faculty with the word “Visiting” or “Adjunct” in their faculty title are always given annual or semester appointments. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

10.2 Promotion and Multi-Year Fixed Term Appointments for APT Faculty at the Associate and Full Professor Ranks

10.2.1 APT faculty members will normally be considered for promotion for these ranks after five years of service. However, unless ‘time in rank’ is one of the criteria for promotion, nothing shall prevent a faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. A clear argument will need to be made by the Department Head that the APT faculty has made substantial progress towards the expectations of the next rank. TO that end, each annual evaluation must address the extent to
which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. (Section 3.4 & 3.5 of Texas A&M University’s Guidelines to Faculty Titles). Lecturers and Senior Lecturers can be laterally reclassified to an Academic Professional Track professorial title if their appointment responsibilities are expanded beyond solely teaching. Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration at the current rank.

10.2.2 Upon hiring, APT Faculty will be offered a 3-year probationary period, with a possibility of multi-year fixed term appointment for senior faculty ranks (Associate and above) at the end of the 3 years.

10.2.3 Granting of multi-year fixed term appointments will be made through the recommendation of the Department Head and an affirmative decision by the CAO. The Department Head will generate a memo with a justification for the request based upon the faculty member’s qualifications and achievements, as per the criteria stated in 10.2.5. The request should include past annual evaluations showing consistent achievements over the period of review.

10.2.4 Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed term appointments will be decided, in the penultimate year of a multi-year term appointment, through the recommendation of the Department Head and an affirmative decision by the CAO. The Department Head will generate a memo with a justification for the request based upon the faculty member’s qualifications and achievements, as per the criteria stated in 10.2.5. The request should include past annual evaluations showing consistent achievements over the period of review.

10.2.5 Criteria for granting and renewing multi-year fixed term appointment may include but are not limited to:

- 10.2.5.1. annual evaluations of performance
- 10.2.5.2. professional growth
- 10.2.5.3. extent of professional qualifications (including licenses and/or certifications required for the position)
- 10.2.5.4. excellence in assigned responsibilities
- 10.2.5.5. professionalism
- 10.2.5.6. contribution to the mission of the department or program
- 10.2.5.7. staffing needs
- 10.2.5.8. funding source alternatives, and
- 10.2.5.9. continuing program considerations

10.2.6 The multi-year fixed term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded and renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with programmatic needs of the department and college. Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed term appointment cannot be appealed.

10.2.7 Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed term appointment, will be given in writing in accordance with the standards listed in section 2.2.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 “University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion”. 

---
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10.2.8 Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

10.2.9 Guideline for multi-year term appointments for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty
- Faculty members appointed at Lecturer or [Adjective] Assistant Professor will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed term appointments.
- Faculty members appointed to Senior Lecturer and [Adjective] Associate Professor may be eligible for a three-year fixed term appointment. [Adjective] Professors may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment.
- Upon promotion to Senior Lecturer and [Adjective] Associate Professor, faculty may be eligible for a three-year fixed term appointment. Similarly, upon promotion to [Adjective] Professor, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed term appointment.
- In the event of a bona fide financial exigency or the reduction or discontinuance of institutional programs at TAMUG, faculty multi-year appointment terminations will be carried out in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 7 “Reduction or Discontinuance of Institutional Programs”.

10.3 Non-Reappointment of APT Faculty
10.3.1 Lecturers and Assistant APT Faculty: An unsatisfactory annual evaluation in any one year may lead to a non-reappointment for the following academic year or a 12-months’ notice of non-reappointment for faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period. If a Lecturer and Assistant APT faculty with an unsatisfactory annual evaluation is reappointed, a report of unsatisfactory performance will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for near term improvement established by the faculty and the Department Head (see following sections).

10.3.2 Associate and Full APT Faculty: An unsatisfactory annual evaluation in any one year will lead to a report of unsatisfactory performance to be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for near term improvement established by the faculty member and the Department Head.

10.3.3 If within a five-year period, a faculty member received two annual evaluations with an overall unsatisfactory rating (does not meet expectations) after being placed on a near term improvement plan, the faculty member will be notified that her/his appointment will not be renewed and will be given a notice of non-reappointment, following TAMU’s established guidelines which state:

“A decision not to renew the appointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member shall be based upon adequate consideration (see University Rule 31.08.01.M2 section 4.5.2) of the individual’s professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.”

The appeal procedures to be followed are outlined in Section 8 of University Rule 31.08.01.M2.
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Maritime Transportation Department Office of Capt./Dr. Augusta D. Roth, e-mail rotha@tamug.edu