

# **College of Engineering Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

*Updated October 2020*

Approved by the Dean of Faculties Office December 12, 2020

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Faculty Tracks and Ranks</i></b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Areas of Faculty Performance</i></b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Teaching	9
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>11</b>
3.2.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Research	11
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>12</b>
3.3.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Service	13
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Administration (if applicable)</b>	<b>14</b>
3.4.1	Criteria for Effectiveness in Administration	14
<b>4</b>	<b><i>Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness</i></b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Research</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Service</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Indicators of Excellence in Administration</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Indicators of Effectiveness in Administration</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5</b>	<b><i>Promotion and Tenure Review</i></b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1.1	Assistant Professor	20
5.1.2	Associate Professor	21
5.1.3	Full Professor	23
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty</b>	<b>23</b>
5.2.1	Lecturer Titles	23

5.2.2	Instructional Professor Titles _____	24
5.2.3	Professor-of-the-Practice Titles _____	25
5.2.4	Research Titles _____	27
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Process _____</b>	<b>28</b>
5.3.1	Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration _____	28
5.3.2	Required Documentation _____	29
5.3.3	Solicitation of External Reviewers _____	31
5.3.4	Workflow _____	33
5.3.5	College of Engineering Tenure & Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC) _____	34
5.3.6	Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (DTPC) _____	35
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Annual Review</i> _____</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Purpose _____</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Focus _____</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Time Period of Review _____</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance _____</b>	<b>42</b>
6.4.1	Performance Ratings for Teaching _____	42
6.4.2	Performance Ratings for Research _____	42
6.4.3	Performance Ratings for Service _____	43
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Required Components _____</b>	<b>44</b>
6.5.1	Faculty member’s report of previous activities _____	44
6.5.2	Written evaluation _____	45
6.5.3	Meeting with the faculty member _____	46
6.5.4	Performance Assessment _____	46
<b>6.6</b>	<b>Assessment outcomes that require action _____</b>	<b>46</b>
6.6.1	Unsatisfactory Performance _____	46
6.6.2	Needs Improvement Performance _____	47
<b>6.7</b>	<b>Timeline _____</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines _____</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>7</b>	<b><i>Midterm Review</i> _____</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Purpose _____</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Process _____</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Feedback from the midterm review _____</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>8</b>	<b><i>Post-Tenure Review</i> _____</b>	<b>50</b>

8.1	Purpose of Periodic Peer Review	50
8.2	Peer Review Committee	50
8.3	Process	51
8.4	Professional Development Review	52
8.5	Professional Development Plan	55
8.6	Appeal	55
8.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	56

## 1 Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University **College of Engineering** is to serve Texas, the nation and the global community by providing engineering graduates who are well-founded in engineering fundamentals, instilled with the highest standards of professional and ethical behavior, and prepared to meet the complex technical challenges of society. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College of Engineering for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation and the characterization of excellence in research, teaching, and service require both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance 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](#); such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</a>

<b>12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I</b>	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
<b>Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
<b>Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure</a>

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

The definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#).

Tenure-track and tenured faculty titles are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Academic Professional Track (APT) titles in the College of Engineering are in five tracks: Lecturer Track (Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, and Senior Lecturer), Instructional Track (Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor), Professor of the Practice Track (Associate Professor of the Practice or Professor of the Practice), Research Track (Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor), and Visiting Track (Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor).

Areas of activity are defined in the [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Tenure-track and tenured faculty must contribute to research, teaching, and service. For APT faculty, when the title involves two areas of activities, the appointment letter must specify the primary and secondary area of activity and the expected effort level at each area. In accordance with section 2.3 of the [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#), the areas of activity for APT faculty members are defined as the following:

- Faculty in the Lecturer Track have teaching as their sole area of focus.
- Faculty in the Instructional Track have teaching and pedagogical innovation as their primary area of focus. Commonly, research in engineering education is the secondary area of focus, but the appointment letter may specify service or non-educational research as the secondary area of activity.
- Faculty in the Professor-of-the-Practice Track have teaching as their primary area of focus. The secondary area can be research or service.
- Faculty in the Research Track have research as their primary focus. They may have as a secondary area of focus teaching or service, but

- with no significant amount of recurring teaching ([Guidelines for Texas A&M University Research Professor Positions](#), section 4.4).
- Faculty in the Visiting track have their activities specified in their appointment letters.

### 3 Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

*Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance: teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; administration; technology commercialization; and contributions to advance the diversity and internationalization goals of the university.*

Every tenured and tenure-track faculty is expected to perform in the three main pillars of academe viz: teaching, research, and service. Every Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty is expected to perform in the pillars designated in their appointment letter, in accordance with the Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles.

Furthermore, contributions in areas listed above (first paragraph of Section 3, in addition to teaching, research, and service) must be awarded due credit in the evaluation process.

*Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (e.g., an administrative role) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and, if required by the System Regulations, by the Dean. Faculty with an alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on those assigned duties (including administrative assignments).*

## 3.1 Teaching

*Teaching* is central to the mission of the College of Engineering, and effectiveness in this realm of activity is required of all faculty. All faculty members with appointments that include teaching are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effective classroom instruction is expected and required. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students outside of the classroom is also expected. Some of the Academic Professional Track faculty also have appointment letters that include research activities, and may be also expected to mentor students outside of the classroom. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. *Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching.* Other measures/sources of information include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; 4) domain-specific evidence of student learning outcomes; 5) evaluation of course syllabi and material; and 6) innovation in pedagogy.

### 3.1.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Teaching

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- Peer evaluation, including review of instructional materials (syllabus, lecture notes, assignments) and in-class observation, documented by memo to DH;
- Student feedback, as documented in student evaluations and in the summary of student input provided within peer evaluation;
- Critical self-evaluation and impact of actions towards the continuous refinement of teaching practices, as documented in the FPR;

- Development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses;
- Authorship of instructional material;
- Course outcomes, as indicated in ABET assessment reports;
- Student mentoring in research, with emphasis on graduate student training, as evidenced by student annual performance reviews, publications with student mentees, and student awards;
- Mentoring and training of instruction support staff, e.g., teaching assistants, lab assistants, peer teachers;
- Engagements in teaching development activities (e.g., CTE workshops, the Transformational Teaching Symposium) as a participant, presenter, or facilitator;
- Engagements in engineering education through the College's Institute for Engineering Education and Innovation;
- Engagements in non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses);
- Contributions to workforce development, as evidenced by successful course offerings through TAMU/TEES centers or competitive grants from national agencies to advance/expand training;
- Publications in highly selective or highly visible venues in engineering education;
- Nominations and awards for teaching.

Additional criteria for effectiveness that may be considered in evaluating teaching performance include:

- Supervision of extra-curricular student projects that enhance student learning (e.g., in the context of student organizations or team competitions);
- Contributions to improving teaching practices, procedures, or tools at the department or college level;

- Contributions to industry or academic partnerships that impact student learning;
- Contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement;
- Contributions to student's career guidance.

## 3.2 Research

Research effectiveness is expected of all faculty with appointments that include research. All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to: 1) publish scholarly work in recognized high-quality venues; 2) build national and international level recognition in their respective professional areas; 3) pursue and sustain their research through external sponsorship/funding; 4) effectively manage research program personnel, particularly Ph.D. students – including providing financial support and career development guidance. These same expectations apply to APT faculty members with appointments that include research as the primary focus area. APT faculty members with research as a secondary focus area need to demonstrate effectiveness in research activities at the degree that corresponds to the effort level specified in their appointment letter and with recognition of impact through applied research. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing research. *Measures/sources of information include:* 1) research expenditures, including indirect costs generated and students supported; 2) submission of grant proposals, including white papers and review reports; 3) publications, evidence of impact, and external expert review of papers; 4) patents, licenses, and commercial adoption of research; and 5) recognition with awards and nominations.

### 3.2.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Research

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are:

- Publication portfolio, the quality of publication venues (e.g., journals or highly selective conferences, as appropriate for the discipline), citations;
- Active research grants, proposals submitted, and other evidence of active and strategic engagement in pursuing funding opportunities;
- Research expenditures;
- Portfolio of patents, licenses, and other evidence of commercial adoption of research products;
- External expert review of quality and impact of scholarly work;
- Leadership position in the grants and publications;
- Nominations and awards for research.

### 3.3 Service

*Service* is central to the shared governance model of the College of Engineering, and effectiveness in service within the department and within the broader professional community is expected of all faculty. Tenured faculty are expected to contribute service effectively to the college and/or university. The expectation from the junior tenure-track faculty is that they will devote the majority of their service effort to their profession as opposed to devoting service time internally within the university. This expectation flips later in the career, with senior tenured faculty and tenured associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of full professorship having to demonstrate strong evidence of service to the department, college, and university at large, while keeping external visibility in their research community. Service expectations also apply to APT faculty with appointment letters that include service as the area of secondary focus.

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to: 1) serve on departmental committees; 2) take on leadership roles in departmental committees and/or initiatives, as assigned; and 3) represent the department in College- and/or university-level committees, as assigned; and 4) pursue leadership positions within one or more professional societies. APT faculty

members with appointments that include service are also expected to serve the department, college, university, or their professional community. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing service. *Measures/sources of information include:* 1) committee assignments; 2) meeting attendance and minutes; 3) professional society positions and related responsibilities; 4) self-evaluation; 5) peer-evaluation; and 6) feedback from professional peers inside and outside of the university.

### 3.3.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Service

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are:

- Meeting organization, attendance, contribution, and follow-up on assigned action items (as appropriate for the committee or task-force);
- Peer-evaluation, by an anonymous survey (for committee chairs) and chair evaluation (for committee members), written self-evaluation;
- Leadership in scholarship aspects of professional societies, including editorial boards and/or organizing committees of conferences;
- Review of manuscripts submitted to journals and conferences;
- Participation on review panels, boards or study groups for governmental agencies and foundations, and honors and awards committees/panels at national and international levels. Standing appointments and chair roles are highly desirable;
- Election or appointment into significant roles for professional societies.

### 3.4 Administration (if applicable)

Administrative appointments are necessary to establish responsibility for the operational aspects of departments. These typically involve interfacing with – and sometimes supervising – departmental staff. Aside from department heads (which are appointed by the dean), faculty are generally assigned, appointed, or elected into these roles following individual departmental guidelines. Effectiveness in these positions is required of those so appointed. These roles are generally compensated. Evaluation of effectiveness in administration mainly affects decisions on renewal of appointments and/or consideration for additional administrative positions. However, significant impact and excellence in these roles should be considered towards promotion.

Evaluation of administration does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing administrative performance. *Measures/sources of information include:* 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) stakeholder (student, staff, external, etc.) feedback.

#### 3.4.1 Criteria for Effectiveness in Administration

The criteria for **effectiveness** that shall be considered in evaluating administrative performance are:

- Written self-evaluation, including accomplishments towards the administrative position's goals;
- Peer-evaluation, by an anonymous survey of departmental faculty;
- Staff and/or student evaluation, by an anonymous survey, as appropriate to the position.

## 4 Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, excellence and effectiveness in 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 favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on input from the College of Engineering faculty and in accordance with the examples of criteria in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).

#### 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

The indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:

- Internal and external awards for excellence in teaching;
- Student evaluations significantly above departmental norms;
- Superlative peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by the department;
- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students to complete theses or dissertations within appropriate timelines for the discipline;
- Successful career mentoring of graduate students, including job placement;
- Internal and external awards to students under mentorship;
- Grants that support innovation in engineering education;
- Development of textbooks, course materials, educational software, etc. that are adopted at other institutions;
- Outstanding contributions to the advancement of non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses);
- Successful supervision of student projects of high visibility (e.g., project-based in national competitions, deliverables in sponsored research);
- Publications in highly selective or highly visible venues in engineering or computer science education;

- External invited presentations at highly visible venues or prestigious institutions;
- Outstanding contributions to the improvement of teaching practices, procedures, or tools. For example, the creation/piloting of new initiatives to provide out-of-class student support, improve feedback to students, improve the effectiveness of TA support;
- Outstanding contributions to industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning;
- Leadership or outstanding contributions to the college's engineering education efforts with external visibility;
- Outstanding contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement;
- Outstanding contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance;
- Outstanding contributions to practices related to inclusive education and diversity.

#### 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching* include, but are not limited to:

- Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by the department;
- Student evaluations within or above departmental norms;
- Positive feedback from students, e.g., during exit interviews;
- Supervision and mentoring of graduate students to complete theses, dissertations, and/or design projects;
- Publications with students as primary co-authors;
- Nomination of mentored students by the department and/or college committees for awards;
- Contributions to the advancement of non-traditional course delivery (e.g., study abroad, online courses);

- Supervision of extra-curricular student projects that enhance student learning (e.g., in the context of student organizations);
- Publications in venues in engineering or computer science education;
- External invited presentations that advance our educational mission;
- Contributions to improving teaching practices, procedures, or tools;
- Contributions to maintaining industry, academic, or government partnerships that impact student learning;
- Engagement in professional development activities to improve practices in teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students;
- Involvement in the college's engineering education efforts;
- Contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement;
- Contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance;
- Contributions to practices related to inclusive education and diversity.

### 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research

The indicators of *Excellence in Research* include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings pre-identified by departmental faculty as highly selective forums;
- Evidence of substantial impact in the field, as demonstrated by citations, patent licenses, etc.
- Participation in major professional society conferences as a keynote speaker and other significant invited presentation;
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at top-ranked institutions;
- Continuous, substantial funding that supports a large research program including support of faculty salary, graduate students, undergraduate students, and post-doctoral fellows;

- Leadership role in pursuing/obtaining large multi-PI grant funding that involves local collaborators as well as external partners;
- Election to the rank of Fellow in a technical society;
- Leadership positions in committees within award-granting organizations that influence research directions and funding decisions;
- Leadership positions in scholarly or industry publications.

#### 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Research* include, but are not limited to:

- Publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings in which the faculty member is a key contributor;
- Participation in conferences through contributed presentations by the faculty or their students;
- Delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at peer institutions;
- Research funding that sustains a vibrant research program and financially supports graduate students;
- Contributions to improving methods, processes, devices, or technologies which advance the state-of-the-art for industry, government, or military applications.

#### 4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service

The indicators of *Excellence in Service* include, but are not limited to:

- Election to officer or equivalent significant leadership positions in professional society pre-identified by faculty as highly selective organizations;
- Position as Editor-in-Chief (or equivalent) of archival journal(s);
- Position as conference chair, technical program chair, and/or track chair for well-regarded conference;

- Position as chair or appointment to a significant role in standing grant proposal review panel/study section or government boards/study groups/task forces;
- Leadership demonstrated in departmental, college or university committees;
- Leadership and commitment to excellence demonstrated by identifying needs at the departmental or higher level and developing a plan to address them, including setting up new initiatives, building sustainable programs, establishing new practices, and the like.
- Leadership of mentorship and outreach efforts.

#### 4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* include, but are not limited to:

- Participation as elected or appointed member of a professional or technical committee within a professional society;
- Position as Associate Editor (or equivalent) of an archival journal and/or substantial role on the program committee of well-regarded conferences;
- Positive contribution through participation in faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees or initiatives;
- Significant portfolio of peer-reviewing activities for funding agencies, conferences, and journals.
- Significant portfolio of mentorship and outreach efforts.

#### 4.7 Indicators of Excellence in Administration

The indicators of *Excellence in Administration* include, but are not limited to:

- Securing significant endowed gifts through development activities;
- Creation of sustainable new programs to meet unit needs;
- Significant progress towards diversity and inclusion goals.

#### 4.8 Indicators of Effectiveness in Administration

The indicators of *Effectiveness in Administration* include, but are not limited to:

- Documentation and refinement of policies and operating procedures;
- Operational efficiency with resources that advances the department or unit;
- Providing opportunities for members of the department or unit to develop leadership skills;
- Assistance of upper administration with planning and policies;
- Transparency, open and clear communication of unit expectations, strategies, and plans.

### 5 Promotion and Tenure Review

#### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

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

The criteria for the College of Engineering are as follows.

##### 5.1.1 Assistant Professor

- Teaching: Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are classroom instruction, with student evaluations near or above departmental norms; primarily positive feedback from students, satisfactory peer evaluation, development of new courses and/or significant revisions of existing courses, and effective supervision and mentoring of M.S.

and Ph.D. students to complete theses and dissertations in a timely manner.

- Research: Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in research through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.4. Indicators of particular importance are publications in high quality, peer-reviewed venues in which the faculty member is a key contributor, participation in conferences through contributed presentations, and evidence of externally sponsored research to build and sustain one's research program, including the support of graduate students.
- Service: Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in service through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.6. Indicators of particular importance are participation in activities of a professional society, reviewer for technical journals or highly selective conferences, serving on evaluation panels, and participation with positive contributions to faculty meetings and departmental committees. The focus is on visibility and external service.

### 5.1.2 Associate Professor

Associate professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness with the same quality and impact criteria for assistant professors noted above in Section 5.1.1. Tenured faculty are also expected to contribute greater service to the college and university. To be competitive for promotion to full professor, excellence should be demonstrated as indicated in one or more of the following areas:

- Teaching: Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.1. Indicators of particular importance are awards for excellence in teaching, student evaluations significantly above departmental norms, superlative peer evaluation from

observation and analysis arranged by the department, supervision and mentoring of graduate students that gain employment in academe, publications with students as primary co-authors, and internal and external awards to students under mentorship.

- Research: Excellence in research is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.3. Indicators of particular importance are publications in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings pre-identified by departmental faculty as select forums; participation in major professional society conferences through keynote/plenary and other significant invited presentations; delivery of seminars or similar invited talks at top-ranked institutions; continuous, substantial funding that supports a large research program including support of faculty salary, post-docs, graduate students, and undergraduate students; leadership role in pursuing/obtaining large multi-PI grant funding that involves local collaborators as well as external partners; election to the rank of Fellow in a technical society.
- Service: Excellence in service is demonstrated by indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.5. Indicators of particular importance are assignment to significant leadership positions within a professional society pre-identified by faculty as a select organization; position(s) as Associate Editor or Editor-in-Chief (or equivalent), Associate Editor, or a member of the editorial board of archival journal(s); leadership demonstrated in departmental, college or university committees; and leadership and commitment to excellence demonstrated by identifying needs at the departmental or higher level and developing a plan to address them, including setting up new initiatives, building sustainable programs, establishing new practices, and the like. The focus is on both internal and external service with national visibility.

### 5.1.3 Full Professor

Full professors are expected to continue to meet the same quality and impact criteria for associate professors noted above. Professors are also expected to contribute greater service, leadership, and mentoring. Excellence should be maintained in one or more of the areas, as indicated in Section 5.1.2 above. The focus is on both internal and external service with national and international visibility.

## 5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

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 an emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. Faculty with Lecturer in their title will be evaluated with an emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. APT Faculty with Professor in their title will be evaluated on the quality and impact of their two areas of activities, with the emphasis on each area determined by the level of effort as specified in their appointment letters. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

### 5.2.1 Lecturer Titles

#### 5.2.1.1 Lecturer

- Teaching: Lecturers are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms, primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluation.

To be competitive for promotion to the Senior Lecturer title, Lecturer faculty must demonstrate indicators of excellence in teaching (Section 4.1).

### 5.2.1.2 Senior Lecturer

Senior Lecturers are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in Teaching.

## 5.2.2 Instructional Professor Titles

### 5.2.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor

- Teaching: Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms; primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluations. Faculty with the Instructional Assistant Professor title also need to demonstrate effective engagement in activities that advance engineering education and the overall educational mission of the department. Examples are listed in Section 4.2 (e.g., publications in engineering education venues, grants that support innovation in engineering education, improvements to curriculum, improvement of non-traditional course offerings, innovation of impactful off-classroom student learning, advances in engineering education)
- Secondary Area of Activity: Besides demonstrating effectiveness in teaching as described above, Instructional Assistant Professors need to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of activity. Appointment letters need to identify the second area (research or service) and specify the effort level associated with the primary and secondary areas. It is possible that the two areas of activity receive the same effort allocation (for example, 50% teaching and 50% research.) The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for service are listed in Section 4.6 and the indicators for research appear in Section 4.4.

To be competitive for promotion to the Instructional Associate Professor title, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching (Section 4.1) and effectiveness in their secondary area of activity.

#### *5.2.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor*

Instructional Associate professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching with the same quality and impact criteria for Instructional Assistant Professors noted above. Instructional Associate Professors are also expected to have a higher level of contribution in their second area of activities.

To be competitive for promotion to Instructional Professor, excellence should be demonstrated in both the primary and secondary areas of activities.

#### *5.2.2.3 Instructional Professor*

Instructional Professors are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in their activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

### 5.2.3 Professor-of-the-Practice Titles

#### *5.2.3.1 Associate Professor of the Practice*

- Teaching: Associate Professors of the Practice are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.2. Indicators of particular importance are student evaluations near or above departmental norms, primarily positive feedback from students, and satisfactory peer evaluations. As part of their teaching activities, faculty with the *Associate Professor of the Practice* title also need to demonstrate effective engagement in activities that leverage their professional experience to advance engineering education and the overall educational mission of the department (e.g., contributions to industry partnerships that impact

student learning, contributions to undergraduate students' experiences or career guidance, publications in engineering education venues, contributions to the process of curriculum continuous improvement, and other activities listed in Section 4.2).

- Secondary Area of Activity: Besides demonstrating effectiveness in teaching as described above, Associate Professors of the practice need to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of activity. Appointment letters need to identify the second area (research or service) and specify the effort level associated with the primary and secondary areas. It is possible that the two areas of activity receive the same effort allocation (for example, 50% teaching and 50% research.) The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for service are listed in Section 4.6 and the indicators for research appear in Section 4.4.

To be competitive for promotion to the Professor of the Practice title, the faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching (Section 4.1), with emphasis on excellence indicators that reflect impactful initiatives that advance engineering education and/or reflect prominence outside the institution. Furthermore, it is necessary to demonstrate effectiveness in their secondary area of activity, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

#### *5.2.3.2 Professor of the Practice*

Professors of the Practice are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in their activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

## 5.2.4 Research Titles

The Dean of Faculties' document "[Guidelines for Texas A&M University Research Professor Positions](#)" provides university guidelines for faculty in these titles.

Faculty with the title of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor are primarily engaged in research, typically funded with extramural funds. A secondary area of activities is not required. They may engage in some instructional activities, therefore having teaching as secondary of activity. Service is also a possible area of secondary activity. If a secondary area exists, its effort level needs to be specified in the appointment letter.

### 5.2.4.1 *Research Assistant Professor*

- Research: Research Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in research through indicators such as the ones listed in Section 4.4.
- Secondary Area of Activity, if any: Besides demonstrating effectiveness in research as described above, Research Assistant Professors with a secondary area of activity specified in their appointment letters need to demonstrate effectiveness in that area. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level of the secondary area. The indicators for service are listed in Section 4.6 and the indicators for teaching appear in Section 4.2.

To be competitive for promotion to the Research Associate Professor title, the faculty must demonstrate excellence in research (Section 4.3) and effectiveness in their secondary area of activity (if any.)

#### *5.2.4.2 Research Associate Professor*

Research Associate professors are expected to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in research. If a secondary area exists, they also need to continue to demonstrate effectiveness in that area. The assessment of effectiveness takes into consideration the effort level specified in the appointment letter.

To be competitive for promotion to Research Professor, excellence should be demonstrated in both the primary and secondary (if any) areas of activities.

#### *5.2.4.3 Research Professor*

Research Professors are expected to continue to demonstrate excellence in both their primary and secondary (if any) areas of activities, in accordance with the level of effort in each area specified in their appointment letters.

### 5.3 Process

#### 5.3.1 Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration

The department head or the departmental Tenure & Promotion (T&P) committee should identify candidates for tenure and/or promotion by February 15 of each calendar year. The process starts in January with a memo sent to faculty members as follows:

- All non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members who are up for their mandatory review are informed of the timeline. These faculty members are asked if they intend to submit the documentation for either (1) tenure and promotion, in the case of Assistant Professors or (2) tenure, in the case of Associate and Professors.
- All tenure-track Associate Professors (tenured or non-tenured) are asked if they would like to be considered for promotion.
- All eligible APT faculty members, with one of the following titles, are asked if they would like to be considered for promotion: Assistant

Lecturer, Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Assistant Research Professor and Associate Research Professor.

A reasonable deadline for responses should be established so that the department can complete the candidate identification by February 15.

### 5.3.2 Required Documentation

Department heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the process. Candidates should be instructed (in writing) to prepare the required documentation (specified below) and submit to the department head or a designee by a reasonable deadline that will allow time for selection of the external reviewers. It is recommended that departments complete the solicitation of letters by March 31 with exceptional situations going no later than May 31.

The following items are required for the review of tenured and tenure-track candidates:

- A concise statement (maximum of three pages, single-spaced) on impact, goals, strategies, and emphasis on carrying out professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service.
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature.
- A list of between six and eight names of potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. According to university guidelines, the reviewers should be (1) from peer institutions/programs or better and (2) at arm's length, as specified in the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties. The candidates should also be asked to provide a list of individuals that they do not want contacted to be an external reviewer.

- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional).
- The college's Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR).
- Copies of selected refereed publications (their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M) to be forwarded to external reviewers. Departments may set limits on the number of publications to be submitted.
- Other materials as may be requested by departmental T&P committees or the department head (e.g., a teaching portfolio).

The following items are required for the review of APT candidates:

- A concise statement (maximum of three pages, single-spaced) on impact, goals, strategies, and emphasis on carrying out professional responsibilities in the primary and secondary (if any) areas of activity.
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature.
- A list of between three and six names of potential reviewers, together with a short biography of each. For the Research Track, external letters are required; for the Lecturer, Instructional, and Professor of the Practice Tracks, the letters can be internal or external. The reviewer letters are expected to provide an evaluative professional assessment of the performance and impact of the candidate's activities. According to university guidelines, the external academic reviewers should be from peer institutions/programs or better. The candidates should also be asked to provide a list of individuals that they do not want contacted to be a reviewer.
- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional).

- The college's Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR).
- Portfolio highlights (items that represent significant contributions while at Texas A&M) to be forwarded to the reviewers. Representative items for research-focused APT faculty may include publications, patents, and other artifacts describing impactful innovation.  
This documentation is optional for teaching-focused faculty. Representative items for teaching-focused APT faculty may include publications in engineering education and artifacts that represent successful educational innovation. Departments may set limits on the number of items to be submitted.
- Other materials as may be requested by departmental T&P committees or the department head (e.g., a teaching portfolio).

It is expected that candidates provide consistent information across all documents (e.g., CV and FPR).

The department head should make it clear to the candidate that these materials may be updated at any stage of the process, and that updates should be signed and dated by the candidate (as an addendum to the dossier). Updates are to be given to the department head or her/his designee. Any updates made after the documentation leaves the department must still be submitted to the department head (or his/her designee), who will then submit to the dean's office.

### 5.3.3 Solicitation of External Reviewers

University guidelines on the method of selection of reviewers must be followed: about equal number from candidate's and department list; and no one designated by the candidate as not to be contacted. In addition, external reviewers should be at arm's length, as specified in the Promotion & Tenure

Guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation.

To better facilitate the solicitation of input from external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases, the process should take place mid-spring. Department heads are required to review all potential external reviewers to ensure they are from recognized peer institutions/programs or better, clear leaders in the field, and satisfy all requirements specified in the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties. The departmental T&P committee may provide input. Contact with these individuals requesting their service as a reviewer must be in the form of a personal letter from the department head. The solicitation letters must use the University Standard External Review Template. This letter, along with selected materials for review, is recommended to be sent to external reviewers by March 31 and no later than May 31.

The college expects a minimum of six letters with a minimum of four letters received from reviewers selected by the departmental T&P committee and/or department head, and a minimum of two letters received from reviewers selected by the candidate. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the candidate's selections and four from the departmental selections.

The solicitation of letters must follow the procedures for requesting and documenting external letters specified in the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties. For example, if a solicitation letter is sent containing a request for specific examples of the candidate's current and potential scholarship and/or impact of teaching and service and the required statement above, and the referee declines to write a letter for the candidate, that reviewer must still be listed in the dossier reviewer chart, indicating that they declined. Those who review the

candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate.

At no time is the candidate to inquire about the status of the reviewers he/she nominates, or to contact them.

#### 5.3.4 Workflow

Once the necessary number of review letters has been received, they, along with the other items submitted by the candidate, should be made available to the departmental P&T committee for review. The candidate's items may be given to the committee prior to receipt of the review letters at the discretion of the department head. In either case, the confidentiality of hard-copy and electronic files should be maintained throughout the process. Signed and dated updates by the candidate should be distributed immediately to the committee members and department head, and incorporated into the candidate's original items.

As described in Sections 5.3.6.2 and 5.3.6.3, the department receives a set of reports from the departmental P&T committee. The department head prepares a separate recommendation evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, and service. This document must:

- Provide a general basis for the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
- Provide an explanation of the candidate's impact on academic endeavors.
- Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
- Explain special considerations (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances).
- Explain any mixed or negative votes if not explained in the department committee's report.
- Explain the department head's vote, especially if contrary to the departmental committee's recommendation.

Other considerations itemized in section 5.3.6.3 should also be addressed. The departmental T&P coordinator then structures all documents into the dossier for submission to the dean's office.

The department head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including the departmental committee's vote, the department head's vote, the dean's vote, the university's decision, and ultimately the Board of Regents decision. The dean will notify the department heads of decisions at the college, university, and system-level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

### 5.3.5 College of Engineering Tenure & Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC)

#### *5.3.5.1 Selection and Structure*

University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 4.6.3, states "In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide tenure and promotion committee." The CETPAC comprises one member from each academic department. The college's executive associate dean serves as ex officio, non-voting chair of this committee.

Department heads nominate two members of the departmental review committee and the dean makes the final decision regarding appointments to the CETPAC, ensuring that the committee is diverse. To ensure diversity and integrity of the process, the dean may invite the College of Engineering faculty ombudsperson to serve as a non-voting member of the committee. An Associate Dean with responsibility comprising diversity and faculty development matters may also be invited to serve as a non-voting member of the committee. Members serve a two-year term, with approximately half of the representatives being held over for the next year's committee and half rotating off the committee. Members are not allowed to vote on cases from their home departments. Furthermore, a maximum of five APT faculty members are invited to join CETPAC for evaluating the promotion of APT faculty candidates. APT faculty participants in CETPAC are selected by the

dean based on nominations from department heads. These representatives must meet university rules for voting eligibility, as described in the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines from the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Committee deliberations and final votes are presented to the dean. The dean may also seek input from the college's associate deans, but it is the dean who votes.

#### *5.3.5.2 College Committee's Report and Recommendation*

The college committee's recommendation report focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's overall performance, reflecting the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other. Feedback may also be provided in this report.

### 5.3.6 Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (DTPC)

#### *5.3.6.1 Selection and Structure*

Departmental T&P committees shall consist of five to nine members who, except as noted in the next two sentences, are tenured full professors in the department. The College of Engineering requires that tenured associate professors participate in the committee's evaluation of tenure-track assistant professors for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. APT committee members (a minimum of two (2); one elected and one appointed) must be included in the departmental review of APT faculty promotions. Regarding jointly funded appointments, note that only faculty members adloc'd to the department can participate in that department's tenure and promotion review process.

The Department Tenure & Promotion Committee (DPTC) shall be constituted as follows: at least half or a majority of the committee shall consist of members elected by the departmental faculty. To provide area balance or interdisciplinary representation and ensure diversity of the committee, the department head may appoint no more than two full

professors from outside the department, or tenured associate professors from within the department. Associate professors must recuse themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of faculty to full professor. Care should be taken so that the size of the committee is sufficient to ensure proper evaluation of candidates for full professor once associate professors have been excused. The members of the committee should be appointed or elected to staggered terms to ensure that not more than one-half of the committee rotates off on an annual basis. Two-year staggered terms are recommended. The department head shall appoint the chair of the committee.

As an alternative to the above procedure, the committee may be constituted of all tenured faculty in a department. Tenured associate professors in the committee are required to excuse themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of faculty to full professor.

Each department specifies in its departmental *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* documents the protocol adopted by the department to determine the composition of its T&P committee. The protocol must be consistent with the rules described in this section and the requirements for eligibility to vote specified by the “Promotion & Tenure Guidelines” document from the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

#### *5.3.6.2 Operation of the Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee*

The departmental T&P committee shall review every tenure-track faculty member for his or her intermediate and mandatory tenure reviews. Additional reviews may be done at the request of either the candidate or the department head. Tenured associate professors and eligible APT faculty members in the Lecturer, Instructional, Professor of the Practice, and Research tracks shall be reviewed by the committee for promotion upon request by either the candidate or the department head. Prospective faculty members whose recommended appointment is with tenure must also be reviewed by this committee. If, because of an annual performance review, a

tenure-track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior to their mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review must be submitted through the department head to the dean with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

For the tenure and promotion process, the departmental committee is charged with:

- Review and evaluation of the candidate's dossier. The departmental committee must not vote on a case unless six external reference letters are part of the dossier.
- Preparation of separate written peer reviews on each candidate's teaching (to include a summary of student feedback, and peer evaluation of teaching, which could include, among other elements, peer evaluation of classroom teaching), research, and service. Authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated, and the author(s) should sign.
- Preparing a complete report and recommendation explaining the committee's vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and, if applicable, an overview of the candidate's progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure (see Section 5.3.6.3). The report is to be signed by all committee members.

The committee may seek input from other sources, including division heads or other faculty members. However, these individuals shall not be present during the committee's final deliberations, nor shall they be present during voting. Since the committee is viewed as advisory to both the department head and the dean, its vote should be independent of any action by the department head. Hence, the department head should not be present during committee discussions or voting.

A secret ballot should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to the department head, who will forward it to the dean. At least two committee members should count and certify the votes and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members must be present and absentee ballots should not be

used unless an explicit waiver is received from the department head or his/her designee. A written proxy may be allowed in emergency situations. Committee members should not abstain from voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest. In these cases, the committee member should recuse him/herself from the discussion of the candidate as well as the voting.

#### *5.3.6.3 Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee Report*

The departmental T&P committee report should address the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member's contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, enhancing diversity and inclusion, technology commercialization, and internationalization climate and experiences (at the university and/or college levels). The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the department head, dean, and upper administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns. Other considerations for the departmental committee report are:

- Authorship of the final report is to be made clear and the report is to be signed by all committee members.
  - University guidelines recommend that a statement such as, "The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee," appear at the end of each report.
- Authorship protocol must be addressed by the departmental committee or by the department head, especially relating to the ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.

- Quality and impact. Departmental committees and department heads should be mindful of the multiple audiences who review the T&P files and need to address “quality and impact” factors within their specific discipline. Assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field. Some example areas: the importance of an award or citation; service and/or election to a professional organization; why published conference papers may be more significant than journal publications.
- Acronyms should be defined at first use, i.e., American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME). Again, assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field.
- Identification of Courses. If reference is made to a course, at first use the complete title of the course must be stated, for example, Thermodynamics for Aerospace Engineers (AERO 212).
- Performance in teaching, research and service, and overall performance must be characterized using:
  - Exceeds Expectations
  - Meets Expectations
  - Does Not Meet Expectations

## 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 academic professional 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 or faculty with participation in multidisciplinary centers, the unit leaders (department heads, directors, or supervisors) will need to collaborate to develop accurate reviews (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). Heads of the

primary appointment shall request input from other heads and/or center directors, as appropriate, and reference this input with the annual review letter for the faculty member. Preferably, this input is in the form of a memo to the primary head, providing an individual review of the faculty member's performance in the secondary appointment/center activities.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is primarily 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 may solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

## 6.1 Purpose

The annual review should 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.

The purpose of the Annual Review process is:

- 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 improved and/or enhanced.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant. See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.
- To provide appraisal of progress being made towards achieving tenure and/or promotion for tenure track faculty.
- To provide appraisal of progress being made towards achieving promotion for the academic professional track faculty.
- To provide appraisal of continuation of tenured appointment in light of the post tenure review process.

## 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, as applicable and as stated in section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). 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 an assessment of progress towards retention and/or 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, for example, three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

## 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3) will be rated as “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Satisfactory”, and “Exceeds Expectations” (optional) based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. The overall performance will also be described using these terms.

### 6.4.1 Performance Ratings for Teaching

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in the criteria listed in Section 4.2.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching (see Section 4.2).
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators, as evidenced by the indicators listed in Section 4.1. In addition, these faculty members may be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

### 6.4.2 Performance Ratings for Research

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Research** are below. For APT faculty, the evaluation also takes into consideration the

level of research activity specified in the appointment letter (e.g., as the second area of focus at 20% effort or primary area of focus at 75% effort).

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research activity.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research, as supported by the indicators listed in Section 4.4.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in research. Effectiveness must be demonstrated through the indicators listed in Section 4.4.
- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally (internationally for full professors) recognized for their research activity. Indicators of excellence in research are listed in Section 4.3.

### 6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Service

The evaluation takes into consideration the rank of the faculty member. For APT faculty, it also takes into consideration the level of service activity specified in the appointment letter (e.g., as the second area of focus at 10% effort).

Indicators of excellence in service are listed in Section 4.4. Indicators of effectiveness in service are listed in Section 4.5.

The performance ratings to be used for the annual evaluation of **Service** are:

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in service.

- Exceeds Expectations – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful service, demonstrating leadership and/or partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

## 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

**For the College of Engineering, the Annual Faculty Progress Report (FPR) document will be completed to satisfy this requirement.**

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

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

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 Written evaluation

The department heads are responsible for annual reviews. They may include other faculty members in the process if they so choose. Departments that operate with an Annual Review Committee must specify the committee composition rules in their departmental *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* document.

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 document will also state the expectations for the next year. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and providing 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 document shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgment 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 end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgments 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 with 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, 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 (Section 8) ratings require further action:

### 6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as an "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance (Section 3) or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall unsatisfactory rating shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Sections 3 and 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) 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), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined 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 his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The

dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#)

## 7 Midterm 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 midterm review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period be conducted (normally by December of the third year; see example in Section 7.2) to determine the progress towards tenure.

### 7.1 Purpose

- A midterm review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period and advise the candidate on ways to improve or enhance the progress in meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion.
- 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 midterm review will include reviews by the unit's P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.

- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- 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.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review, but it is recommended as a best practice that an annual review is done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.

## 7.2 Process

The midterm 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 midterm review is due during the 2022-2023 academic year, the midterm review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Midterm Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 <i>(due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)</i>

## 7.3 Feedback from the midterm review

Faculty members going through midterm review must receive feedback. Midterm feedback to candidates is given by the Department Heads. Department Heads formulate their feedback based on the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee recommendation, their assessment, the

College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee recommendation, and the Dean (or Dean's designee) assessment.

## 8 Post-Tenure Review

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

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

### 8.1 Purpose of Periodic Peer Review

- 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 in enhancing professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

The process for selection of the Peer Review Committee composition for post-tenure review varies by department. Departments must describe their process in the departmental *Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation* document.

Peer Review Committees must have at least three members. A committee member can only review faculty members at the same or lower ranks.

### 8.3 Process

In the College of Engineering, the periodic review happens every six years. For faculty members holding endowed chairs or professorships, the review will happen every five years, in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M2.01](#).

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee:

- 3-page statement on teaching, research, and service
- Most recent Faculty Progress Report
- Student evaluations of teaching (PICA) and peer teaching evaluation report

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 this document (in Sections 3 and 4), therefore being 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 (five for faculty members holding endowed chairs or professorships) 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 this document. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 8.4).

- 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 this document. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (Section 8.4).*
- 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, the 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 31<sup>st</sup>**, 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

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

(see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 8.2) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7) The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review, see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems

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

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

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be done in a timely fashion (normally within three months after the 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,

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

## 8.5 Professional Development Plan

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

## 8.6 Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the

Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

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

### 8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

---

## Contact Office

---

Office of the Executive Dean of Engineering

E-mail and phone number are available at the [College of Engineering Leadership Team webpage](#)