Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.

--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:

--Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit

The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
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1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Libraries is to be the indispensable hub of discovery, learning & creativity at Texas A&M University. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Texas A&M University Libraries for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. For the purposes of promotion or promotion and tenure in the University Libraries, librarianship is considered the equivalent of teaching. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. (UR 12.01.99.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 University Libraries; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general University Libraries 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 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion) and University Guidelines to Faculty titles. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

2.1 Tenure-track or Tenured Faculty

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

The tenure-track is designated for individuals whose responsibilities are the practice of librarianship and its advancement through research and professional service.

2.2 Academic Professional Track Faculty

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

The Lecturer track is designated for individuals whose responsibilities are solely the practice of librarianship.

[Adjective] Assistant Professor, [Adjective] Associate Professor, [Adjective] Professor

The [Adjective] faculty track is designated for individuals whose responsibilities are the practice of librarianship and its advancement through either professional service or research.

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 (librarianship, research, scholarly activity and/or creative work; service, and administration). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1 Librarianship

Texas A&M University Libraries faculty members’ librarianship focuses on recurring and specialized assigned responsibilities that support the mission and goals of Texas A&M University as well as reflect the vision and shared values of the University Libraries. Based on each faculty member’s expertise, library faculty work individually and collaboratively to enhance the education and research of students, faculty, and the global community by providing quality services and managing a distinguished collection of information resources. The roles and responsibilities of the faculty are reflected in individual position descriptions. See Section 4.1
and 4.2 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in librarianship. See Section 6.4.1 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating librarianship performance.

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

Texas A&M University Libraries faculty members’ research and publication activities are defined as the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Faculty produce original scholarship, which is disseminated in a variety of formats including print, digital works, creative works, conference presentations, and other emerging formats. These publications and presentations further knowledge to improve local, national, and international library practice. Faculty also conduct research and produce publications and presentations in other academic disciplines related to their areas of specialization, and these are seen as equally representative of scholarship. The library profession by its nature is very collaborative and co-authored publications are common, however, solo and lead authorship of publications are highly valued as indicative of independence and initiative in scholarship. Establishing a research focus early on is highly recommended and encouraged, however, it is also acceptable to have a research portfolio that evolves with the changing of one’s position responsibilities. The faculty member is expected to be able to articulate how the focus is achieved. See Section 4.3 and 4.4 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in research. See Section 6.4.2 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance.

3.3 **Service**

Service extends the reach of the librarian in sharing their professional role into the local, regional, national, and international communities. Library faculty engage in service in order to enhance their professional discipline, participate in decision-making processes of the library and the academy, support colleagues in their research, and create favorable impressions of the academy in the community. By engaging in professional outreach and participation in their communities, librarians advance the role of the library and its reputation. See Section 4.5 and 4.6 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in service. See Section 6.4.3 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance.

3.4 **Administration**

Texas A&M University Libraries’ administrative appointments are defined as those associated with the internal, operational title of Associate Dean that are appointed with Provost’s approval and include a financial stipend associated with the term of the appointment. Administrative appointments support the mission and goals of Texas A&M University as well as reflect the vision and shared values of the University Libraries. Associate Deans are leaders within the Libraries as well as on-campus and are expected to provide support and direction for innovation, service development, collaboration, compliance, growth, and decision-making. The roles and responsibilities of the administrator are reflected in individual position descriptions. See Section 4.7 and Section 4.8 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in administration.

Unless otherwise specified in the Faculty Bylaws, Associate Deans retain all rights and privileges associated with their current academic rank and tenure status within the University Libraries as part of their appointment. For purposes of faculty governance and promotion review, Associate Deans participate and vote in the same manner as non-administrative members of the faculty (i.e., no separate vote or recommendation). As engaged faculty members, Associate Deans are expected to demonstrate continued engagement in research/scholarship activities through publications and/or presentations and/or professional service, as relevant to their track and appointment.
The Dean of University Libraries reports directly to the Provost and is appointed by them with input from the Libraries faculty. The terms of appointment and expectations of the position are the responsibility of the Provost in consultation with the Dean. See Section 4.7 and 4.8 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness in administration. See Section 6.4.4 for criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating administration performance.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The University Libraries 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 Librarianship include, but are not limited to:

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

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

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

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

- Publication of scholarly book(s) of highest quality, including library reference works;
- Publication in leading refereed journals;
- Receiving major fellowship or research awards;
- Frequent citation of publications by others;
Significant self-development activities that earn membership in the Academy of Health Information Professionals at the Senior or Distinguished level (See Appendix for a detailed explanation of requirements for AHIP levels);
Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
Publication of peer-reviewed creative works;
Significant teaching activities, not tied to job responsibilities, such as course design, professional teaching activities, development of continuing education or credit courses, or invited lecturing at other institutions on a relevant topic;
Member of review panel for national research organization;
Presentation of invited papers at national and international meetings;
Design and development of new resources that support University education or library programs or scholarship, such as development of substantial media or development of computer programs or databases;
Substantive participation on externally funded grant programs;
Receiving significant external research funding.

4.4 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include, but are not limited to:
- Publications in refereed journals;
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research and/or professional organizations;
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
- Editor of a monograph or special issue;
- Presentation of papers at national, regional, and state meetings of appropriate disciplines;
- Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals;
- Preparation of grant proposals or authorship of funded grants;
- Creating or developing a computer program of value in education;
- Contributions to externally funded research activities;
- Significant self-development activities, such as those that earn membership in the Academy of Health Information Professionals, and such as receiving a Faculty Development Leave or selection as the Hoadley Professor which lead to increased research and publication effectiveness;
- Evaluative publications, such as book reviews, abstracts, and annotated bibliographies;
- Presentation of poster sessions at national, regional, or state meetings.

4.5 **Indicators of Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:
- Officer in a national professional organization;
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
- Administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University;
- 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.
4.6 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Committee chair of national professional associations;
- Officer in regional or state professional associations;
- Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting;
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate;
- Service on University, college, and Libraries committees and task forces;
- Service as a consultant to other libraries, businesses, or governmental agencies;
- Advisor to student organizations;
- Administrative roles within the Libraries;
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness;
- Committee membership and participation in international, national, regional, state, and local organizations.

4.7 **Indicators of Excellence in Administration** include, but are not limited to:

- Selection for a university, college, or professional society award;
- Evidence of outstanding leadership and performance at a rigorous and challenging level;
- Supporting and initiating work that anticipates user needs and devising solutions for user problems;
- Providing sound decision making that takes into consideration all needs and levels of the organization;
- Actively representing the Libraries needs and voice across campus through appropriate representative groups;
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials;
- Presentations and participation on panels at international/national conferences;
- Serving on boards;
- Outstanding performance evaluations;
- Development of innovative organizational methods and materials;
- Evidence of creative professional practice;
- Supporting and initiating internal and external collaboration;
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced performance.

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

- Evidence of accepting responsibility or assuming leadership;
- Development of services having a significant effect on the institutional program of TAMU;
- Initiating and supporting new ideas, innovative techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures;
- Providing an effective balance to units under their control between effective and clear decision making while also giving flexibility and freedom to in situ leaders for independent initiative;
- Leading in establishing objective and planning, organizing, and coordinating operations;
- Attending and participating in campus-level appropriate representative groups;
- Communicating and engaging in dialogue with active listening.

5. **Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Promotion and/or tenure at the University Libraries is evaluated and recommended by three committees.
The Committee on Appointment and Promotion of Professors (CAPPro) shall consist of all current members of the University Libraries Faculty at the rank of Professor (with tenure), excluding the Dean.

The Committee on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (CAPT) shall consist of nine elected tenured members at least one of whom shall be from the Medical Sciences Library. In addition, the immediate past chair and past secretary will be ex-officio members to be called upon as needed. Committee members on temporary leaves of absence will not be replaced. The Associate Dean for Administrative and Faculty Services shall serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member to coordinate administrative support for the promotion and tenure process, to advise on Dean of Faculties procedures for promotion and tenure to Associate Professor, to ensure compliance with University rules and guidelines, and to submit required documentation. The Associate Dean will not participate in any CAPT evaluative process of faculty, current or potential.

The Committee on Appointment and Promotion of Clinical and Instructional Faculty (CAPCIF) shall consist of five elected members from the Academic Professional Track at the rank of [Adjective] Associate Professor or above. The Chair of CAPT or their delegate shall serve as an ex-officio member to help maintain procedural consistency across tracks.

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. See Section 2 for definitions of ranks and tracks. 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. See Section 4 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness. The criteria for the University Libraries are as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor:
Emphasis will be on establishing a productive pattern of research and publication, in developing competence in Librarianship, and in initiating a record of service activities at the international, national, or state, levels. Service at the library and local levels may strengthen a case.

Promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure requires emphasis on high quality in research and publication and/or the instigation of an exceptional record of service. These contributions must be combined with a record of excellence in performance of Librarianship.

5.1.2 Associate Professor:
Associate Professors should exhibit a record of excellence in research and publication, consistent service contributions to the profession as well as to the university and the library, and meritorious performance in Librarianship. Research and publication must show evidence of accomplishments as a sustained effort. Service must demonstrate commitment to the institution and the profession.

Promotion to Professor requires continuing emphasis on outstanding research, publication at the highest levels, and/or a high degree of service. Those seeking promotion to Professor must also have continuous evidence of excellence in Librarianship.
5.1.3 Professor:
Professors should demonstrate accomplishment at the highest level. Their research, publication, and service accomplishments must attain national or international recognition. The performance of their librarianship must be at high levels.

Leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national or international prominence is expected from Professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways including continued major contributions to the body of knowledge, development of innovative services, and the mentoring of new faculty members.

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. See Section 4 for indicators of excellence and effectiveness.

5.2.1 Lecturer:
Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires the endorsement of the work administrator and Associate Dean for the area, a positive vote of the faculty as specified in Section 5.3.3, and approval by the Dean. Promotion for lecturers is considered at the same time as that for other faculty ranks. No outside peer review letters are required for lecturers. For lecturers there is no promotion beyond Senior Lecturer.

CAPCIF is not involved with the evaluation process for lecturers. CAPCIF will offer advice to lecturers who are interested in being considered for promotion to the Senior Lecturer level. In promotion decisions, a lecturer’s complete record of accomplishments is considered.

Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer include:
• A record of excellence in performance of professional assignment.
• Demonstrable growth in leadership in librarianship.

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

5.2.3 [Adjective] Associate Professor
• Continuous evidence of the highest levels of performance in professional assignment and a continuing emphasis and high degree of service which supports having achieved a national
reputation in a focused area of expertise. In those cases where research has been approved along with Librarianship, those seeking promotion to [Adjective] Professor must demonstrate the highest levels of achievement and impact of scholarship through research and dissemination of knowledge.

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

5.3 Process of Promotion or Promotion and Tenure

The following processes and procedures apply to all faculty seeking promotion or promotion and tenure. Exceptions for various ranks and tracks are noted. The annual promotion and tenure calendar is determined and published by CAPT, CAPPro, and CAPCIF, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Administrative and Faculty Services.

Cases of promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, of initial tenure, and of hiring at the level of Assistant Professor with tenure will be handled by CAPT. Cases of promotion from Associate Professor with tenure to Professor, and of hiring at the level of Professor with tenure, will be handled by CAPPro. Cases of promotion from [Adjective] Assistant Professor to [Adjective] Associate Professor and of hiring at the level of [Adjective] Associate Professor will be handled by CAPCIF. Cases of promotion from [Adjective] Associate Professor to [Adjective] Professor and of hiring at the level of [Adjective] Professor will be handled by a special committee of the [Adjective] Professors.

The relevant committee, in conjunction with the individual faculty member’s immediate supervisors, the Medical Sciences Library Director (as appropriate), and the Dean, will conduct annual evaluations of all faculty members. CAPT will conduct third year reviews and will provide input on each candidate’s progress toward tenure and promotion. In cases in which the committee sees insufficient progress towards promotion and tenure, the CAPT can recommend to the Dean that an untenured tenure track faculty member be given a terminal contract in accordance with University procedures, see http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf. A terminal contract can be recommended after any evaluation but is normally given only after the third-year review. CAPCIF does not provide a third-year review for [Adjective] Assistant Professors but will provide an evaluation of a candidate’s progress toward promotion on request.

The relevant committee will be responsible for reviewing the documentation for each candidate for promotion or promotion and tenure and will reconcile questions, draw to the attention of the faculty member omissions in documentation, and assemble a portfolio for each faculty member under review. It may create a subcommittee to help fulfill this charge and may call on faculty outside the committee to serve on such subcommittees. The committee will also call a meeting of faculty at or above the rank aspired to by the candidate(s) to discuss the candidates for promotion and promotion and tenure and promotion and conduct the balloting on the candidates.
The relevant committee will advise the Dean and the Medical Sciences Library Director (as appropriate) in matters of appointment (including appointment with tenure in accordance with its procedure document), annually review governing documents, and act on behalf of the faculty in promotion or promotion and tenure review matters.

5.3.1 Documentation for Promotion or Promotion and Tenure

The documentation received by the relevant committee will be provided by the faculty member and will consist, in part, of a statement by the candidate in which they are to supply in concise form (three pages, single spaced, maximum) a statement on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out [their] professional responsibilities in the categories of librarianship, research and publication, and service, as appropriate to the track and rank. The purpose is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or promotion and tenure--it is to provide a context for review of the file at each level.

The faculty member’s comprehensive professional curriculum vitae and current position description must also be provided.

Preparation of the package for tenure-track and tenured faculty seeking promotion requires the candidate to submit a list of possible outside reviewers (with names, faculty ranks, addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses). Candidates may also submit a list of specific names not to be included on the final outside reviewer list. Most of the proposed outside reviewers should hold faculty status at a peer institution and have been granted tenure and have been promoted in academic rank. In the case of academic health sciences librarians, outside reviewers holding AHIP Senior or Distinguished status will be considered equivalent to tenured academic faculty. The relevant committee also prepares a separate list of possible outside reviewers and the final group of outside reviewers is compiled from both lists. A list of outside reviewers is not required for promotion of Academic Professional Track faculty. The annual calendar is determined and published by CAPT, CAPPro, and CAPCIF, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Administrative and Faculty Services.

In accordance with the instructions provided annually by the Dean of Faculties office at the Dean of Faculties web site, the following items are typically included in the packet prepared for each candidate for promotion, promotion, and tenure, and for promotion to professor:

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

Numbers 3-6 and 8 above are prepared by the relevant committee after a thorough examination of the documentation supplied by the candidate and the letters of the outside peer reviewers and a thorough discussion of the merits of each candidate by the appropriate voting faculty. Numbers 1-2, 11-12, and possibly 7, are the responsibility of the candidate. The relevant committee and the Dean’s office are responsible for putting the complete package together to send to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

The faculty member’s comprehensive professional curriculum vitae with a suggested list of peer reviewers to be contacted for peer review letters must be delivered to the chair of the relevant committee and the complete documentation must be presented to the committee upon the call of the chair of the committee. Documentation to support promotion in academic rank and tenure will include all work done during the faculty member’s professional career.

5.3.2 Responsibility of the Faculty Member
It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to be aware of the criteria and procedures by which they will be evaluated for promotion in academic rank and for tenure or continuing appointment, to be aware of the date they become eligible to be considered for tenure (if applicable), and to be aware of the calendar for promotion. It also is incumbent upon the faculty member to supply all supporting documentation as described above.

5.3.3 Procedure for Evaluation of Promotion or Promotion and Tenure Cases
1. The annual calendar is determined and published by CAPT, CAPPro, and CAPCIF, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Administrative and Faculty Services. Individuals wishing to be considered for promotion will submit a request to the relevant committee according to its annual calendar. The CAPT will identify all individuals subject to mandatory promotion and tenure review.

2. The relevant committee will make available the assembled documentation (including annual evaluations and peer review letters [peer-review letters are not required for non-research APT faculty cases]) for review by the voting faculty, convene a meeting of the voting faculty to discuss each candidate for tenure and promotion or for promotion, and conduct a vote of the
appropriate faculty by secret ballot. A positive vote by a majority of the appropriate faculty is recommended for a positive tenure or promotion recommendation. Abstentions and absences will be reported to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and will be explained if necessary. The committee will make every effort to assure participation of all appropriate faculty in the balloting.

3. The voting faculty consist of all faculty in the relevant track at or above the rank being sought. Appropriate voting faculty for [Adjective] Faculty are defined as [Adjective] Faculty at or above the rank being sought and whose appointments are in the same areas of responsibility as the candidate (e.g., Librarianship and Service or Librarianship and Research). Members of the [Adjective] Faculty who had been tenured Faculty at Texas A&M are eligible to vote in all areas of responsibility. The voting faculty for promotion to Senior Lecturer is defined as existing Senior Lecturers and all [Adjective] Faculty.

5.3.4 Disposition of Recommendations

5.3.4.1 To the Dean

1. The relevant committee communicates to the Dean, with justifications including the vote and both positive and negative recommendations for promotion or promotion and tenure

2. The Dean informs the chair of the relevant committee of their recommendations on promotion or promotion and tenure for each candidate prior to the transmittal of these recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. The relevant committee may, when a recommendation of the Dean is in opposition to the committee's recommendation, attach to the report to the Provost an addendum addressing the difference in recommendations.

5.3.4.2 To Each Eligible Faculty Member

1. The Dean informs each faculty member reviewed for promotion and/or tenure of the nature of the recommendation on their case prior to transmittal to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. The faculty member may request a meeting with the relevant committee and/or the Dean to review the recommendation.

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

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

5. Faculty members may ask to review the peer review letters by submitting a formal open records request following university procedures.

6. A tenure-track faculty member denied tenure or given a terminal contract before being considered for tenure may appeal the decision if they believe that decision was not based on an adequate consideration of their record and/or in violation of their First Amendment rights or on basis of illegal discrimination. The procedures for appeals are described in the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. As there is no University recourse for non-reappointment for APT faculty, appeals of non-reappointment of APT faculty are handled in internal Libraries procedures.

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 collaborateto 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.

University Library faculty are reviewed on an annual calendar basis with a timeline outlined in detail on the Faculty Evaluation Schedule, which is updated annually. Faculty members submit the form which is modeled after a candidate statement for promotion intended to elaborate on areas of impact and significance and an updated annotated Curriculum Vitae. Because of the high variability in the actual activities associated with the different
areas encompassed by Librarianship, past efforts to create a college-level Librarianship equivalent to a formal Teaching Portfolio have not been successful.

The category of Librarianship is reviewed in context of the past calendar year. Research/Scholarship and Service are reviewed on a sliding window of the past three calendar years. This allows for recognition that some research initiatives take longer than one year to come to fruition. It also recognizes that professional service can be cyclical because of terms and reappointment term limits.

It is the current practice in the University Libraries to give minimal recognition to stated “in-progress” research/scholarly efforts unless there is documentable evidence of milestones (such as collected data sets, interim presentations/poster sessions, book contracts based on having submitted detailed outlines/sample chapters).

The process incorporates advisory feedback on a faculty member’s performance in Librarianship from their Work Administrator (providing a library operational, personal observation activity report perspective) and optional advisory feedback from the Associate Dean for the area (discussing unique circumstances and providing consistency and strategic perspective). It also includes feedback and recommended ratings in the areas of service and/or research from the appropriate faculty appointment and promotion committee. This is provided by CAPCIF for all Academic Professional Track faculty and Lecturers, CAPT for Tenure-Track faculty, and CAPPro for Tenured faculty.

With the exception of the Dean of the University Libraries, all faculty are reviewed in research/scholarship and professional service for progress toward promotion as appropriate to their University academic title, track, and rank. This includes administrators or other faculty who may have negotiated adjusted merit percentages to represent an atypical balance in their portfolio of library responsibilities (see section below on Associate Deans). Actual expectations in research and service are based on current faculty rank and track and are not adjusted to correlate with a shifted merit percentage adjustment.

The Dean receives and reviews the evaluations and assigns a rating in Librarianship. If the Dean has questions about the advisory comments or the recommended committee ratings, they follow up on them with the appropriate individuals or groups. At the conclusion of the annual review process, a cover sheet is added to the annual review that provides an overall rating in context of progress toward promotion (or in the case of Professors, continuing progress toward rank appropriate roles.) The cover sheet also has a section that provides the faculty member’s raw merit score based on the percentage of merit distribution between the different areas and scores. Usually, the merit score numerically correlates with the overall progress toward promotion. However, a Needs Development or Unsatisfactory rating in any one area will carry more weight in the overall rating as it represents a serious deficiency and impediment to making progress toward achieving promotion. In this situation, the overall rating is designated in consultation with the Dean and may be lower than the mathematical result from averaging the scores or the merit calculation.

**Associate Deans**

All Associate Deans will be placed in an alternate work assignment. Tenured Associate Deans at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will have merit ratios defined as 80% Administrative, 10% Research, and 10% Service. Academic Professional Track Associate Deans at the rank of [Adjective] Associate Professor or [Adjective] Professor will have merit ratios defined as 80% Administrative and 20% Service. They will be reviewed annually in all areas of performance with all ratings assigned directly by the Dean.

For the period of their predominantly Administrative appointment, Associate Deans will be exempt from being rated on overall “progress toward promotion” and their overall assessment will be primarily based on their performance
in their administrative responsibilities. Productivity expectations in research and service will be proportional to their adjusted assignment.

For Associate Deans holding the rank of Associate Professor the Dean will receive comments annually in the areas of research and/or service from the Committee for Appointment and Promotion of Professors (for tenured Associate Deans) or by the Committee on Appointment and Promotion of Clinical and Instructional Faculty (for APT Associate Deans). These comments are provided to serve as informal feedback so these individuals will be aware of their progress toward promotion. In receiving this feedback for research and/or service, the expectations will be comparable to and consistent with their non-administrative faculty peers and not adjusted for their administrative assignment. Research and service activities conducted during their Administrative appointment will be included as part of the individual’s body of work at the point of seeking promotion to the rank of Professor or [Adjective] Professor.

At the point at which any Associate Dean steps down from the predominantly Administrative appointment, the individual will be given appropriate development opportunities and a window of time to re-engage in research and/or service at a level consistent with other non-administrative faculty members.

**Merit Calculations**

Based on University guidelines and budgetary considerations, the University Libraries Executive Team will determine the available merit “pool” available each year. The Business Services staff takes the available funds and uses a mathematical formula to distribute them proportionately among the eligible faculty based on the calculated merit score from the evaluation cover sheet. This is the only point in the evaluation process where there is a comparative element between individual faculty members. Intentional efforts are made to establish parity across the Tenure-Track/Tenured and Academic Professional Tracks.

When merit scores tend to be clumped together in the higher ratings, then this uses a larger portion of the available funds, the spread between scores will be reduced, and more faculty will receive an amount that is closer to the “average” merit.

### 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 or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window. The category of Librarianship is reviewed in context of the past calendar year. Research/Scholarship and Service are reviewed on a sliding window of the past three calendar years.

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. See Appendix for tables depicting criteria for rating faculty performance relative to each track and rank.

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

Unsatisfactory
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in the performance of most areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Customer Service: Does not follow up on customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Disengaged in the development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Is not involved in team-based activities; and/or, when a member of team is not an effective member (e.g., does not make contributions to team projects, misses team meetings and is generally uninvolved in team-based projects)
- Communication: Does not engage in dialogue with active listening and escalates conflict through destructive communication methods/styles/techniques
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates a lack of awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
- Professional Development: Shows no evidence of self-reflection and does not pursue professional development opportunities
Needs Development
- Performance: Documented deficiencies in performing some areas of primary assigned responsibilities
- Customer Service: Not open to and/or effectively responding to customer needs and requests
- Skills and Knowledge Development: Minimal development of knowledge and skills necessary to meet customer needs
- Teamwork: Attendance, participation, and contributions to teams and work groups is inconsistent
- Communication: Demonstrates unprofessional communication methods/styles/techniques or regularly fails to respond to colleagues and customers
- Strategic Awareness: Demonstrates minimal awareness of community, University, and Library issues and concerns
- Professional Development: Demonstrates little interest or activity in sustained professional development

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

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

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

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

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

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

The evaluation of untenured, tenure-track assistant professors varies with their time in rank. First year assistant professors are not expected to be comparable with those closer to mandatory tenure review. For example, at that stage “evidence of continuing progress” may focus on identifying a research topic and developing a methodology to bring to completion over the next year. As a faculty member moves through their pre-tenure probationary period, the standards for activity within the previous three years rise accordingly.

Associate Professors with Tenure are expected to provide evidence of continuous engagement in high quality research and publication toward building a national reputation to receive positive annual evaluation, continued appointment, and promotion.

Professors with Tenure are expected to provide evidence of continuous engagement in high quality research and publication and a national reputation in a specialized area to receive positive annual evaluation and continued appointment.

[Adjective] Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors

For [Adjective] faculty, this applies only to those who have Librarianship/Research appointments.

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

Unsatisfactory

Assistant Professors and [adjective] Assistant Professors
No evidence of progress towards research or publication

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

Needs Development

Assistant Professors and [adjective] Assistant Professors
Minimal progress since previous evaluation, no evidence of accepted presentations or publications.

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

Achieves Expected Results

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

Achieves Significant Results

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

Achieves Outstanding Results

Assistant/Associate/Professors and [adjective] Assistant/Associate/Professors
Demonstrates significant impact of research and publications. Within the previous three years, publishes and presents in appropriate venues, including national and international settings for Professors with tenure and [adjective] Professors.

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

Untenured Assistant Professors
While the Libraries expect assistant professors to begin a program of service, extensive service detracting from solid research activity, is not encouraged. What the Libraries expect from assistant professors is engagement with the institution and/or the profession and evidence that the individual has made substantive contributions to whatever endeavor has been chosen. Individuals should explain the role or goal of the endeavor and the individual’s level and quality of contribution.

*There is a standing exception to these expectations: in an individual’s first evaluation cycle, there may not have been enough time to start any service activity and so an individual may receive “Achieves Expected Results” even though there is little, or no service listed.*

**Unsatisfactory**

No service record, or it is documented that the individual did not attend meetings or made minimal or no contributions.

**Needs Development**

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

**Achieves Expected Results**

[Activity-based] The individual has a few activities listed but cannot demonstrate substantive impact or the impact of their contributions for most of them. In this case, the individual may be spreading themselves too thinly on too many low-impact activities.

OR

[Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the impact of their activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

**Achieves Significant Results**

[Activity-based] The individual demonstrates some impact of several activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In this case, the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

OR

[Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of a few activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research.

**Achieves Outstanding Results**

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

See Appendix 1 for Expected Progression for Untenured Assistant Professors

**Associate Professor with Tenure**

Upon receiving tenure, the expectation is that an Associate Professor will increase their service activity, as a demonstration of their growing leadership or influence in the organization, as an opportunity to share their knowledge and experience with others in both the organization and the profession and in an effort to increase their own development toward promotion to Professor.

Expectations of tenured faculty are not dependent on any prescribed timeline, although those seeking promotion to Professor would be advised to have a robust record of service that more than meets the expectations of service at that level. Lack of performance in service may trigger the post-tenure review.

**Unsatisfactory**

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

**Needs Development**

- [Activity-based] The individual has a few activities listed but cannot demonstrate substantive impact or cannot describe their contributions for most of them. In this case the individual may be spreading themselves too thinly on too many low-impact activities.

  OR

- [Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrated the impact of their activities and can also effectively describe their contributions, but there are only one or two activities. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

**Achieves Expected Results**

- [Activity-based] The individual demonstrates involvement in several activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

  OR

- [Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of a few activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

  In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research.
Achieves Significant Results

[Activity-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the impact of several activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

OR

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

In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research. The activities should show a pattern of professional growth and increasing impact.

Achieves Outstanding Results

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

At this level we want to see real substance. Someone might have just a half-dozen activities, but they are well-chosen and impactful. Someone else might have a dozen things going on but they are all important.

Professors with Tenure

The burden of service is generally heavier for Professors, expecting that they will provide leadership and share their expertise as broadly as possible. The service criteria considered for candidates for promotion to Professor also provides this framework for the annual evaluation at the rank of Professor:

- “a continuous and valuable record of service”
- “exhibit leadership in the library and in the profession”
- “national or international recognition/prominence”

Service is understood very broadly, especially with the ongoing changes in the profession and higher education. However, the case for service activity should have some relationship with the libraries or Texas A&M University locally, the profession or higher education more broadly or, in support of the
land-grant/extension mission or similar initiatives that have positive impact on the community. Service activity is viewed through these values: that it is sustained and impactful, that it demonstrates leadership (writ broadly) and that it makes contributions at a high level.

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

Needs Development
[Activity-based] There is some service, but it does not show engagement outside the libraries; there is little or no evidence of scholarly or professional service outside the university beyond association membership. Leadership roles are not in evidence. Impact is not well documented.

OR

[Impact-based] Service activity is sparse but individual effectively describes their contributions and shows some impact.

Achieves Expected Results
[Activity-based] There is service activity that is consistent and may be at regional, national, or international levels. With a lot of activity indicated, the impact of some of the activities or their contributions is not clearly described.

OR

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

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

OR

[Impact-based] Individual shows consistent service activity and increasing leadership which may be demonstrated as editor or editorial board member of major peer reviewed journals or scholarly presses in the profession, peer reviewer for national and international professional organizations, external reviewer for promotion and tenure at peer institutions, planning national meetings or other similar activities. The role in activity and the impact on the profession is well substantiated.

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

[Adjective] Assistant Professors

While the Libraries expect [Adjective] Assistant Professors to begin a program of service, extensive service detracting from one’s librarianship in their first year is not encouraged. Emphasis will be on development of professional assignment while initiating a record of service activities at the state, regional, national, or international levels. Individuals should explain the role or goal of the endeavor and the individual’s level and quality of contribution.

Exception: in an individual’s first evaluation cycle there may not have been enough time to start any service activity and so may receive “Achieves Expected Results” even though there is little, or no service listed.

Unsatisfactory

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

Needs Development

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

Achieves Expected Results

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

OR

[Impact-based] The individual demonstrates some impact of several activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research.

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

OR

[Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the impact of several activities and can also effectively demonstrate the impact of their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has chosen breadth of service over depth.

In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research. The activities should show a pattern of professional growth and increasing impact.

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

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

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

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

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

OR

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

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

OR

[Impact-based] The individual effectively demonstrates the substantive impact of fewer activities and can also effectively describe their contributions. In addition, the individual shows leadership in at least one activity or some activity has been solicited. In this case the individual has been strategic in selecting activities that maximize impact.

In any case, the activities should show relevance to the individual’s librarianship and/or research. The activities should show a pattern of professional growth and increasing impact.

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

[Adjective] Professor

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

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Achieves Significant Results**

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

**Achieves Outstanding Results**

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

6.5 **Required Components**

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of *University Rule 12.01.99.M2*, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).
6.5.1 Faculty member’s report of previous activities.

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

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

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

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

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

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

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

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

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

6.7 Timeline

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

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

A faculty member who believes that their 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.

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

7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
● This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

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

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

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

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

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members.
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

The Dean will identify at least 3 tenured faculty members who will constitute the Professional Development Review Committee; the committee members chosen must meet with the approval of the tenured faculty member and may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities when appropriate.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- all annual review documents, including rebuttals, since the last Peer-review or the last 6 years, whichever is less
- a current curriculum vitae provided by the faculty member
- an optional statement, 3 pages maximum, from the faculty member providing relevant context to the past reviews or in-progress/ongoing activity and impact. This statement is different from the annual review statement as it may address the reviewee’s whole portfolio not just the past year’s activities.
- any documentation that provides additional evidence of quality or impact that is provided by the faculty member or the Dean for consideration. The faculty member will have an opportunity to review and respond to any and all documentation provided by the Dean.

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 8.3.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that they are 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.

2 It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

8.4.2.1 The 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 they deem 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 they deem 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.
8.4 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).

8.5 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).

8.6 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 they not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.
For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see Institutional Rule 31.08.01, which indicates the process for this situation.

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

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

10. Adoption and Amendment

10.1 Adoption

This document shall be presented to the faculty at an open meeting and discussed at a subsequent meeting. Following that meeting, there shall be a vote by normal voting procedures. An affirmative vote indicates that the voter agrees that their respective track’s procedures have been accurately represented within this document. This document shall become effective upon an affirmative vote of a two-thirds majority of the faculty voting. All previous documents dealing with matters of tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and evaluation in the University Libraries will be superseded upon ratification of this document.

10.2 Amendments

Amendments to the template provided by the Dean of Faculties Office may only be made by that Office. Any changes to the template from that Office will be automatically incorporated and communicated to the faculty. Recommendations for changes to the template can be made to the Associate Dean for Administration and Faculty Services for transmittal to the Dean of Faculties Office for consideration.

Amendments to University Libraries procedure may be proposed by (1) a review requested by the Faculty Executive Committee or the Associate Dean for Administration and Faculty Services OR (2) CAPCIF, CAPT, or CAPPo OR (3) a signed petition of three or more faculty members. Petitions from faculty shall be submitted simultaneously to the Secretary of the Faculty Executive Committee and the Associate Dean for Administration and Faculty Services.

Proposed amendments will be placed on the agenda for a faculty meeting and distributed with the agenda materials prior to the meeting. Final discussion of the proposed amendment will occur at the next faculty meeting. Special faculty meetings may be called to discuss proposed amendments and revisions according to standard rules for special meetings. For proposed amendments that affect the processes of one track (tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track) alone, the voting faculty for those amendments shall consist of all members of just the affected track. Following the meeting, there shall be a vote by normal voting procedures. The proposed amendment shall become effective upon an affirmative vote of a two-thirds majority of the faculty voting.

Upon ratification, the amendment(s) will be incorporated into the document and the revised document will be forwarded to the Dean of Faculties Office. The revised document will take effect immediately upon ratification of the amendment(s). A summary of revisions will be maintained in the document.
10.3 Revision History

Initial adoption – Submitted for faculty vote via Qualtrics on 10/02/2020; Approved by faculty on 10/16/2020.
Appendix

Appendix 1: Expected progression for untenured assistant professors

Librarianship, research, and service are all three assessed for annual evaluations and for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Service carries the least weight in both situations and untenured assistant professors should carefully consider the amount of time they devote to service. Their greatest efforts should be put into librarianship and research.

For the first year, assistant professors should seek out library and campus service opportunities but may not have anything on record for the first evaluation cycle.

For the second- and third-years assistant professors should have some record of service. Library and university service are sufficient and can lead to ratings of 2, 3, or 4. The amount of service and the demonstrated impact will determine the final rating.

By the fourth- and fifth-years assistant professors may show evidence of commitment beyond the Libraries and university. Service at the state and regional level may be demonstrated and national service becomes a reasonable expectation, especially in the fifth year. At this stage service should show a pattern of growth and increasing impact. Some assistant professors may be ready to take on formal leadership roles, but they should have a solid record in librarianship and research.

The above expectations apply to those assistant professors for whom this is their first professional position or who have come from institutions with lower service expectations. Those who come to A&M with a service program already begun may choose to take on national service responsibilities earlier.

At every stage impact and a demonstrated commitment to service are more important than quantity of service. It is inadvisable for an assistant professor to have more than a half-dozen service commitments in a single year. Example: serving on two standing library committees, a university committee, reviewing presentation proposals for two regional/national conference programs, serving as faculty advisor to a student group, and participating as presenter in a national webinar in one-year would be excessive for an untenured person.

The Libraries recognize impactful service at all levels and assistant professors may choose to concentrate their service at only one or two levels. For example, one person may have most activities at the national level while another may have no national activities but has made significant impact within the Libraries and/or the university while a third may have mainly state and regional service. Each model is acceptable.

Appendix 2: Relative expected service performance across tracks and ranks

Table 1: Tenure Track Faculty relative expected performance across ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT Asst Prof</th>
<th>TT Assoc Prof</th>
<th>TT Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Template for Unit Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
Table 2: Clinical and Instructional Faculty relative expected performance across ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C&amp;I Asst Prof</th>
<th>C&amp;I Assoc Prof</th>
<th>C&amp;I Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding (4)</td>
<td>Outstanding (4)</td>
<td>Outstanding (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding (4)</td>
<td>Significant (3)</td>
<td>Significant (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (3)</td>
<td>Expected (2)</td>
<td>Expected (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected (2)</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory (0)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (0)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsatisfactory (0) ?
### Table 3: Relative expected performance across tracks (combination of tables 1 and 2 above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT Asst Prof</th>
<th>TT Assoc Prof</th>
<th>C&amp;I Asst Prof</th>
<th>TT Professor</th>
<th>C&amp;I Assoc Prof</th>
<th>C&amp;I Prof*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding (4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outstanding (4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Significant (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Significant (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding (4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outstanding (4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0)?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0)?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0)?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0)?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Improvement (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0) ?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory (0)?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: APT Faculty - Quick Glance - Expectations at Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Librarianship</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Adjective] Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Emphasis will be on development in professional assignment.</td>
<td>Emphasis will be on service at the library, university, and local levels, while initiating a record of service activities at the state, regional, national, or international levels.</td>
<td>Emphasis will be on establishing a productive pattern of research and publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Adjective] Associate Professor</td>
<td>Should exhibit a record of meritorious performance in professional assignment.</td>
<td>Should exhibit a record of consistent service contributions to the profession as well as to the university and the library and must demonstrate commitment to the institution and the profession.</td>
<td>Should exhibit a sustained program of research and publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Adjective] Professor</td>
<td>Professional assignments should be at high levels.</td>
<td>Accomplishments should have achieved a measure of national or international recognition.</td>
<td>Accomplishments should have achieved a measure of national or international recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Emphasis for lecturers will be on development in professional assignment.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Should demonstrate a consistent record of meritorious performance in professional assignment. Expected to make outstanding and important contributions to departmental objectives.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4: APT Faculty - Quick Glance - Expectations for Promotion to Next Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Promotion to</th>
<th>Librarianship</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Adjective] Associate Professor</td>
<td>Requires a record of excellence in performance of professional assignment. Growth in leadership in librarianship should be demonstrable.</td>
<td>Requires a developing record of service with impact on the Libraries and indications of impact on the University and the profession. Growth in leadership in service should be demonstrable.</td>
<td>Requires a sustained program of research and publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Adjective] Professor</td>
<td>Requires continuous evidence of the highest levels of performance in professional assignment that supports having achieved a national reputation in a focused area of expertise.</td>
<td>Requires continuous evidence of a continuing emphasis and high degree of service that supports having achieved a national reputation in a focused area of expertise.</td>
<td>Must demonstrate the highest levels of achievement and impact of scholarship through research and dissemination of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Requires a record of excellence in performance of professional assignment. Growth in leadership in librarianship should be demonstrable.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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