

# **Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology**

## **Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

**Approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on June 14, 2024**

**Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on June 13, 2024**

**Approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on May 24, 2023**

**Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on March 1, 2023**

**Revised on February 22, 2023**

**Approved by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on February 10, 2021**

**Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on January 20, 2021**

**Original guidelines adopted on June 9, 2020**

## Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION .....	3
2.	FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS.....	3
3.	AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE .....	6
3.1.	<i>Teaching</i> .....	6
3.2.	<i>Research, scholarly activity or creative work</i> .....	7
3.3.	<i>Service</i> .....	7
4.	INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS .....	7
4.1.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</i> .....	7
4.2.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</i> .....	7
4.3.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i> .....	8
4.4.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i> .....	8
4.5.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Service</i> .....	8
4.6.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</i> .....	9
5.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE .....	9
5.1.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i> .....	9
5.2.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)</i> .....	16
6.	ANNUAL REVIEW .....	17
6.1.	<i>Purpose</i> .....	17
6.2.	<i>Focus</i> .....	18
6.3.	<i>Time Period of Review</i> .....	18
6.4.	<i>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance</i> .....	18
6.5.	<i>Required Components</i> .....	20
6.6.	<i>Assessment outcomes that require action</i> .....	21
6.7.	<i>Timeline</i> .....	22
6.8.	<i>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:</i> .....	22
7.	MID-TERM REVIEW .....	23
7.1.	<i>Purpose</i> .....	23
7.2.	<i>Process</i> .....	23
7.3.	<i>Feedback from midterm review</i> .....	24
8.	PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW .....	24
8.1.	<i>Purpose</i> .....	24
8.2.	<i>Process</i> .....	24
9.	POST-TENURE REVIEW .....	26
9.1.	<i>Purpose</i> .....	27
9.2.	<i>Peer Review Committee</i> .....	27
9.3.	<i>Process</i> .....	27
9.4.	<i>Professional Development Review</i> .....	28
9.5.	<i>The Professional Development Plan</i> .....	29
9.6.	<i>Appeal</i> .....	29
9.7.	<i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i> .....	30
10.	GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS .....	30

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology (ECCB) is to conduct interdisciplinary research across all levels of biodiversity, from genes to ecosystems, and to confront the grand challenges of conserving natural resources in a rapidly changing world. This research is integrated with undergraduate and graduate teaching programs to prepare the next generation of leaders in conservation science. 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 Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
<b>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/</a>
<b>Faculty Affairs University 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>Faculty Affairs University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure">https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-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

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#).

**Tenured Professor.** A tenured Professor should lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating aspects of ecology, physiology, behavior, conservation biology,

evolutionary biology and/or environmental science; achieve and maintain national and international recognition and leadership through publication in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; maintain sustained external funding for research; provide leadership to interdisciplinary and interagency regional, state, national and international programs; and, when appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenured Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; through advisement and mentoring of students; and by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and by participating in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The tenured Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and participate in networks that link professional colleagues. Through these and other efforts the tenured Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Tenured Associate Professor.** A tenured Associate Professor should lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating aspects of ecology, physiology, behavior, conservation biology, evolutionary biology and/or environmental science; achieve and maintain national recognition and emerging leadership through publication in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; strive to maintain continuity of external funding for research; provide leadership to interdisciplinary and interagency regional, state, national and international programs; and, when appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenured Associate Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; through advisement and mentoring of students; and by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and by participating in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The tenured Associate Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and participate in networks that link professional colleagues. Through these and other efforts the tenured Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Tenure-Track Assistant Professor.** The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating aspects of ecology, physiology, behavior, conservation biology, evolutionary biology and/or environmental science; strive to achieve national recognition by publishing in refereed journals, giving presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participating in peer review; and develop research grant proposals and acquire external funding for research. The tenure-track Assistant Professor will, as appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Center(s). The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and teach undergraduate and graduate courses in related area of specialization, consistent with needs for the general departmental curriculum and the graduate program. Through these and related activities and by limited service on committees, the tenure-track Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Instructional Professor.** The Instructional Professor will teach courses in biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, biodiversity, conservation biology or environmental science as appropriate, primarily at the undergraduate level. The Instructional Professor is expected to have a well-

documented record of effective and excellent teaching. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning lab exercises, ordering supplies, providing pre-laboratory instruction for teaching assistants, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, supervision of grading of lab reports, and assigning final grades. In some cases, the Instructional Professor may supervise and train graduate teaching assistants and contribute to graduate and undergraduate student mentorship. The Instructional Professor will participate in committee service, both in the department and in the larger university community. The Instructional Professor may assume some administrative responsibilities as defined by the Department Head. Through these and related activities, the Instructional Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Instructional Associate Professor.** The Instructional Associate Professor will teach courses in biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, biodiversity, conservation biology or environmental science as appropriate, primarily at the undergraduate level. The Instructional Associate Professor is expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning lab exercises, ordering supplies, providing pre-laboratory instruction for teaching assistants, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, supervision of grading of lab reports, and assigning final grades. In some cases, the Instructional Associate Professor may supervise and train graduate teaching assistants and contribute to graduate and undergraduate student mentorship. The Instructional Associate Professor will participate in committee service, both in the department and in the larger university community. Through these and related activities, the Instructional Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Instructional Assistant Professor.** The Instructional Assistant Professor will teach courses in biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, biodiversity, conservation biology or environmental science as appropriate, primarily at the undergraduate level. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning lab exercises, ordering supplies, providing pre-laboratory instruction for teaching assistants, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, supervision of grading of lab reports, and assigning final grades. In some cases, the Instructional Assistant Professor may supervise and train graduate teaching assistants. The Instructional Assistant Professor may participate in limited committee service in the department or larger university community. Through these and related activities, the Instructional Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Senior or Principal Lecturer.** The Senior or Principal Lecturer will teach courses in biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, biodiversity, conservation biology or environmental science as appropriate, primarily at the undergraduate level. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning lab exercises, ordering supplies, providing pre-laboratory instruction for teaching assistants, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, supervision of grading of lab reports, and assigning final grades. The Senior or Principal Lecturer may participate in occasional committee

service both in the department and in the larger university community. Through these and related activities, the Senior or Principal Lecturer will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**Lecturer.** The Lecturer will teach lecture and/or laboratory courses in biology, ecology, evolutionary biology, biodiversity, conservation biology or environmental science as appropriate, primarily at the undergraduate level. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning lab exercises, ordering supplies, presenting pre-laboratory lectures, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, supervision of grading of lab reports, and assigning final grades. Through these and related activities, the Lecturer will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

**AgriLife Research Assistant Professor, AgriLife Research Associate Professor and AgriLife Research Professor.** Historically, the Department has only utilized the AgriLife Research Assistant Professor title; for appropriate situations the Department may consider appointments at the AgriLife Research Associate Professor and AgriLife Research Professor levels. As a non-tenured member of the faculty, the AgriLife Research Assistant Professor develops and executes research programs in an agricultural/life science specialization relevant to the Department. The terms of appointment and promotion to AgriLife Research Associate Professor are defined by AgriLife policy and may include acquisition of independent funding. AgriLife Research Assistant Professors are expected to contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department through limited service on committees and related activities.

**Professor of the Practice.** Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Assistant Professor of the Practice are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are normally for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia. Professors of Practice normally teach courses related to their area of professional expertise for the Department on a temporary basis.

### 3. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), 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/Creative Work; Service**). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

#### 3.1. Teaching

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

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

### 3.2. Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research, including scholarly activity and creative work, is a central mission of the College. Effectiveness in research is required of all tenure-track faculty. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. The criteria for excellence and effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating research performance are described under 4. *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness*.

### 3.3. Service

Service is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty, with expectations shifting depending on rank. Activities in the area of Service must be directly related to the mission of Texas A&M University. The mission of Texas A&M University is broad, and many types of activities can qualify as academic service, if they are documented and the relation to the university mission is clear. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating service performance are described under 4. *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness*.

## 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations.

### 4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** include, but are not limited to: outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews; student satisfaction; student learning outcomes; evidence of courses being taught at a rigorous and challenging level; innovations in pedagogical/course designs; development and effective implementations of high impact learning experiences (e.g., study abroad, capstone, W courses, etc.); publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (textbook, case studies, etc.); publication of research on disciplinary teaching and learning; receipt of external or highly-competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects; outstanding performance in graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, time to degree, placements, etc.); invited presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and national/international conferences; significant efforts in peer mentoring in teaching or as a facilitator in teaching workshops; leadership in curriculum development efforts of the academic unit; active engagement in educational reforms at the institutional and national levels; and recognition of excellence by teaching awards at college, university, and national/international levels.

### 4.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** include, but are not limited to: peer reviews confirming effective teaching performance; reasonable student satisfaction and student learning outcomes as

reflected in performance on exams and assignments; successful implementation of evidence-based pedagogical practices and course designs; development of a new courses or revision of an existing course; successful graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, placements, etc.); receiving non-competitive internal funding for teaching/learning projects; participation in curriculum development; professional development activities for effective instruction; and selection for a departmental teaching award.

#### 4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of ***Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** should reflect a sustained and ongoing record of publication and creative scholarly outputs with high impact. Such indicators include, but are not limited to: publication of high quality peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and books that receive recognition for advancing the direction of a discipline or interdisciplinary efforts addressing important issues (as indicated by high citation rates); work demonstrating significant translational impacts (including patents and applied outcomes that shift the course of policy and management); success in securing competitive funding from federal, state and private foundations and other major funding sources; invitations to give talks at peer institutions and keynote or plenary talks at national and international professional conferences; selection for prestigious external awards and fellowships; and invitation to serve on professional advisory panels and boards.

Creative works include the development of informatic products built on scholarly research to produce output other than, or in addition to, journal articles. Excellence in creative works includes lead roles in producing significant documentary films; citizen science projects; policy briefs; interactive websites; blogs; digital apps; and founding of a start-up company or non-profit organization. Informatic products may include archived specimens and associated databases, computer program code, informatic datasets, geospatial datasets, models, and other related work that is widely available to the scientific community and/or public.

#### 4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** include, but are not limited to: publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and books in quality outlets (journal impact factors may serve as an indicator); presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines; effort and success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, state and private funders; and participation in professional development activities that may lead to research excellence; invitations to give presentations to local and regional academic units, student organizations, and conference symposia. Effectiveness in producing creative works includes participation in producing archived specimens and associated databases, computer program code, informatic datasets, geospatial datasets, models, citizen science projects, policy briefs, interactive websites, blogs, and digital apps.

#### 4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** include, but are not limited to: leadership roles in service to the profession, such as being an officer in a regional, national or international professional organization; serving as program chair at a national or international conference; serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal in the discipline; serving on review panels and committees of national or international research organizations; significant service to society, such as serving on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board, and providing exceptional



professional services to the local community and public at large (as long as such service is relevant to the mission of Texas A&M University); service as a curator leading efforts in the maintenance and improvement of collection facilities, participating in significant public engagement, and advocating for collections nationally and internationally; leadership roles in service to the institution, such as chairing college/university major standing or ad hoc committees, being an officer on Faculty Senate, and serving in a college/university administrative leadership role; receiving honors/awards recognizing professional service activities.

#### 4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to: effective service to the institution, such as serving on college/university and department committees and task forces, being an active member of Faculty Senate, serving in administrative or curatorial roles or as a committee chair in the department, and serving as an advisor to student organizations; effective service to the profession, such as being a committee chair in national or international professional organization, being an officer in regional or state professional organization, serving as program chair for regional professional conference, and serving as a reviewer for refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national or international research organizations; service as a curator in the maintenance of collection facilities and participating in public engagement; serving the scientific community at large; effective service to society, such as providing consultation to governmental agencies, and providing professional services to the local community and public at large; significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness; and collegiality (attending and participating in seminars, hosting seminar speakers, writing letters of reference for mentees, mentoring of colleagues, participating in student recruitment activities, etc.).

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

### 5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

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

#### *5.1.1. Assistant Professor*

Faculty members holding a tenure-accruing appointment with the rank of Instructor will be promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor upon the receipt of the terminal degree.

#### *5.1.2. Associate Professor*

In accordance with University guidelines, the Department P&T Committee evaluates each Assistant Professor three years post-tenure (mid-term review), and the Department Head completes an independent mid-term review in addition to annual performance evaluations. Assistant Professors may request an informal courtesy review by the Department P&T Committee during any year, and these reviews are not retained by the committee nor used in any way during their mid-term review or evaluation for promotion and tenure. In addition, each Assistant Professor selects three peers to serve on their Mentoring Committee (MC policies

appear in a separate document, Faculty Mentoring Plan, Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology).

**Teaching: Effectiveness in teaching** and a commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 4.1 and 4.2) are expectations of all tenure-track faculty. Teaching should be documented with course syllabi and portfolio materials and reviewed by peers. Documentation of teaching should clearly state assigned course load. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented (e.g., names, period of mentoring, mentee accomplishments).

**Effectiveness in teaching** is expected in the formal setting of undergraduate or graduate courses as well as the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. Effectiveness in teaching can also be demonstrated by contributions to broader curricular development and scholarship of teaching. The faculty member's teaching portfolio, student evaluations, and peer evaluations are used to measure effectiveness in teaching. It is expected that a faculty member will teach courses related to their field of study and contribute consistently and regularly to both undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in a manner consistent with their job description and assigned courses.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek confidential formative feedback by Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) instructional consultants based on review of teaching materials and/or classroom observation, with documentation of efforts for improvements based on their feedback. Applicants can choose to include any of these materials and assessments in the teaching portfolio to help document improvements and achievements in teaching.

Teaching Portfolio - A teaching portfolio should be developed by the candidate, with the assistance of CTE consultants or other appropriate mentors. The teaching portfolio should include a statement of teaching philosophy, descriptions of teaching practice (design, implementation, and assessment), self-assessment of the effectiveness of teaching, a summary of student evaluations, and peer evaluations. It is recognized that some faculty members may engage in scholarship of teaching and learning, such as developing and sharing innovative pedagogies and publishing peer-reviewed journal articles or books with a focus on pedagogy. Some faculty members make significant contributions to curricular improvements in degree programs (these are contributions beyond the specific teaching program of the individual), and these contributions should be included in the teaching portfolio.

The teaching portfolio will be evaluated by the departmental P&T Committee and may or may not be sent to external reviewers and to the Dean's office as a part of the promotion and tenure package. Therefore, it is beneficial to include key points within the CV and teaching statement as appropriate.

Student Evaluations - Student evaluations provide one means to assess faculty teaching quality and responsiveness. However, it is recognized that student evaluations are subject to potential sources of bias and therefore should not be used as the sole measure of effective teaching. Student evaluations are helpful in revealing areas that may need improvement. Instructors may seek assistance from university sources (e.g., CTE) and/or faculty mentors for guidance to improve teaching performance.

Peer Evaluation - Peer evaluation of the scope, quality, and impact of the candidate's teaching program should be conducted based on reviews of course syllabi, assignments, assessments,

optional classroom observations, and high-impact learning activities, as well as engagement in scholarship of teaching and learning if applicable. This should be conducted by at least two faculty peers with at least one from ECCB, with the option for another from a closely aligned academic unit. These evaluations are mandatory for one of the two years prior to application for tenure or promotion and may involve direct observation or review of videos of teaching in classrooms, labs and/or field trips. Peer evaluations of teaching are optional during other years.

**Establishment and Effective Mentoring of Graduate Students** - Outstanding mentoring of graduate student research, including chairing graduate committees, is an expectation of all tenure-track and tenured faculty members. By the end of their first five years as an Assistant Professor, a candidate should have successfully chaired or co-chaired the committees of at least three graduate students and also have served on the committees of at least three others. It is recognized that Ph.D. students require a higher level of commitment and that their graduation may not occur within the requisite period of evaluation; however, advising PhD students is an important indicator of successful graduate student mentoring. Metrics of student success include scholarly achievements in publication, presentations to professional conferences, honors and awards, and subsequent career success. To recruit and retain high quality graduate students, candidates are encouraged to nominate prospective students for Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Avilés and Johnson Fellowship Program, Regents Fellowships, and national fellowship programs administered by federal agencies (e.g., NSF, DOE, EPA).

**Research: Excellence in Research** (see indicators described in 4.3) is an expectation of tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates are expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship; demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research (which could include scholarship of teaching and learning); and be recognized as emerging leaders in their field of study or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Collaborative work is encouraged, with each team member documenting their specific contribution to the research and its impact. Applicants for promotion to Associate Professor should provide specific examples of how they have advanced their field of study; activity alone is not a sufficient indicator of impact.

*Scholarship through Publication* - A sustained record of publication in peer-reviewed journals is expected when a dossier is submitted to initiate the promotion and tenure process. To demonstrate an active scholarly program at Texas A&M University, some portion of these must derive from work accomplished during the probationary period as a tenure-track Assistant Professor. It is recommended that faculty strive to meet or exceed publication records of peers recently promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor in ECCB, COALS, and peer institutions. The quantity of publications is not the sole indicator of research productivity and accomplishment, and the quality and disciplinary context of the scholarship are important.

Given the breadth of specializations and disciplinary backgrounds of ECCB faculty, it is recognized that faculty members publish in peer-reviewed journals across a wide range of fields, as well as in interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary journals. Bibliometrics (i.e., journal impact factor, number of citations, h index, i10 index) are now widely accepted as reliable indicators of research impact. Nonetheless, bibliometrics vary according to subdisciplines, and impactful articles have been published in journals with relatively low impact factors. Therefore, each publication should be judged based on its demonstrated contribution to the scientific discipline and/or utility in addressing management or policy. Publications in editor-reviewed and non-reviewed outlets (conference proceedings, book chapters, etc.) are recognized as scholarly

achievements, but are not a substitute for, and will not be counted as equivalent to, peer-reviewed journal articles.

The candidate is expected to be first or senior author on most publications that originate from their lab group. It is expected that the first author often will be a graduate student or postdoctoral associate in the candidate's lab group. Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide detailed statements of author contributions within their articles. Senior authorship implies a leadership role in conceptualizing, funding, guiding, implementing and interpreting the work. It is recognized that a candidate's list of publications will include work derived from dissertation and postdoctoral research that predate the individual's faculty appointment; however, the publication record must provide clear evidence of the emergence of a coherent research program based on work accomplished at Texas A&M University.

*Acquisition of Research Funds from Sources External to the Department* – The acquisition of research funds is essential for a faculty member's research success. Funds may be from competitive grants or contracts, and should be used to support research costs, including support for graduate student stipends and tuition. As a new Assistant Professor establishes their research program at Texas A&M University, it may take up to two years to secure external funds from competitive sources. This is a period in which professional networks are created or expanded, a research program is defined, and knowledge is obtained regarding institutional policies and procedures. However, by the end of the fifth year, a record of external research funding should be established. At least one grant should be obtained from a competitive program administered by a federal agency such as NSF, USDA, NASA, EPA, DOE, or NIH. Research grants from these agencies provide evidence of a cutting-edge research program addressing important scientific, natural resource conservation and societal issues. Major foundations, non-governmental organizations and state agencies also are important sources for competitive research funding. In the case of a project involving multiple principal investigators, the proportion of the project funds for which the candidate is responsible should be identified. It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some disciplines than in others. It is also recognized that funding levels in terms of the average size and number of grants and contracts differ widely among disciplines. The fundamental requirement for funding is to support research needs, including students, postdocs and/or technicians, with demonstration of recognition that the research is valued by entities outside of the university system.

**Service: Effectiveness in Service** and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of all tenure-track faculty.

Faculty members at Texas A&M University are expected to serve the needs of the university as well as the needs of constituents external to the university. Examples of internal service activities would include serving on committees and task forces at department, college, or university levels. Examples of external service activities could include the following: serving as ad hoc reviewers and possibly on editorial boards of professional journals; serving as officers in professional societies; serving as ad hoc reviewers and possibly review panelists for competitive granting agencies; organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings; publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, etc.); and providing educational opportunities for citizen groups. It does not include service to a community as a private citizen, rather than in a professional role.

Although service is an important area of evaluation, faculty members should recognize that research and teaching accomplishments will receive greater scrutiny and will be weighted more heavily than service activities during promotion and tenure evaluations. Faculty should therefore not become overly committed to service activities at the expense of research and teaching activities while they are working towards promotion and tenure to Associate Professor.

Effective service also includes acting with professional integrity and responsibility. These qualities are demonstrated by showing respect for colleagues; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, university, and profession. Section 3 of the University's "Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion" offers an expanded, more detailed description of the expectations associated with this criterion.

### *5.1.3. Professor*

The average time-in-rank between appointment to Associate Professor and submission for promotion to Professor is approximately six years. Truly outstanding individuals may meet the guidelines for promotion to Professor (outlined below) in a time frame shorter than this average. This may occur when an individual has demonstrated accelerated development of an original and independent research program, scholarly accomplishments, grantsmanship, graduate student training, teaching, and service. Associate Professors can apply for promotion to Professor at any time and are advised to seek feedback from peers before formally initiating the application. The benchmarks listed for promotion to Full Professor are in addition to those listed for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. In accordance with University guidelines, the Department P&T Committee evaluates Associate Professors every 6 years post-tenure, and the Department Head completes an annual performance evaluation. Associate Professors may request an informal courtesy review by the Department P&T Committee during any year, and these reviews are not retained by the committee nor used in any way during the mandatory reviews performed every 6 years post-tenure.

**Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 4.1 and 4.2) are an expectation of all tenured faculty. Teaching should be documented and reviewed. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of graduate and undergraduate student research. Impact of teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

**Effectiveness in teaching** is expected in the formal setting of the undergraduate and/or graduate courses as well as the mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students. Student evaluations and peer evaluations are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness, and effectiveness in teaching also can be demonstrated by contributions to broader curricular development and scholarship related to teaching. It is expected that a faculty member will teach courses in their specialty and contribute regularly to both undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in a manner consistent with their job descriptions and assigned courses.

Student Evaluations - Student evaluations provide one means to assess faculty teaching quality and responsiveness. However, it is recognized that student evaluations are subject to potential sources of bias, and therefore should not be used as the sole measure of effective teaching. Student evaluations are useful for revealing potential areas of improvement in teaching.

Instructors may seek assistance from university sources (e.g., CTE) and/or faculty peer mentors for guidance to improve teaching.

Peer Evaluation - Peer evaluation of the scope, quality, and impact of the candidate's teaching program should be conducted and may include review of course syllabi, assignments, assessments, classroom observations, high-impact learning activities, and scholarship related to teaching and learning. This evaluation should be conducted by at least two faculty peers from ECCB and (optionally) and/or other academic units or the CTE.

Effective Mentoring of Graduate Students - A hallmark of a Tier-I research university is successful mentoring of PhD students. The expectation is that the candidate would have successfully chaired or co-chaired a minimum of six graduate students to completion, at least two of which were PhD students. Faculty members are encouraged to take advantage of Graduate Merit Fellowships, Graduate Avilés and Johnson Fellowship Program, Regents Fellowships, and national fellowship programs administered by federal agencies (such as NSF, DOE, EPA) to recruit and retain high quality graduate students. Whereas the number of graduate students advised may vary among faculty members, evidence of effective mentoring leading to student success is expected. Metrics of student success include scholarly achievements in publication, presentations at professional conferences and symposia, and honors and awards.

Teaching Portfolio - A teaching portfolio should be developed by the candidate, with the assistance of the CTE or other appropriate mentors. The teaching portfolio should include a statement of teaching philosophy, descriptions of teaching practice (design, implementation, and assessment), self-assessment of the effectiveness of teaching, a summary of student evaluations, and peer evaluations. It is recognized that some faculty members may engage in scholarship of teaching and learning, such as developing and sharing innovative pedagogies and publishing peer-reviewed journal articles with a focus on pedagogy or textbooks. Contributions to curricular improvements in degree programs also may be included in the teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio will be evaluated by the departmental P&T Committee but may or may not be sent to the external reviewers and/or to the Dean's office with the promotion package. Therefore, it is beneficial to build the key points into the CV and teaching statement as appropriate.

**Research:** Excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.3) is an expectation of tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor. Research impact and external recognition should increase throughout the faculty member's career. Professors are expected to be nationally and internationally recognized leaders in their fields of study. Candidates should be able to document how their research and outreach have resulted in significant impact, such as an advancement in our understanding of a natural system, address a conservation or management issue, or a shift in policy. The candidate is responsible for clearly defining their field of research/scholarship and its relevance, value and impact, including some specific examples. Activity alone is not a sufficient measure of impact.

Scholarship through Publication – An outstanding record of peer-reviewed journals is expected for faculty applying for promotion to Professor, with significant academic publishing since the last promotion or most recent five years. Reviews and syntheses in high tier-journals are an effective means to demonstrate the impact of scholarship beyond original research articles. The candidate is expected to be a senior author on a substantial subset of the publications. Often the first author will be a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow, and when cross-disciplinary

faculty teams are involved, credits have to be shared appropriately. Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide detailed author contribution statements within articles, which many journals now require. Senior authorship means that an individual played a leadership role in conceptualizing, funding, guiding, implementing, and interpreting the work. Although not the sole indicator of research impact, citation metrics are an important indicator that should reveal a fairly consistent pattern of annual increase over the course of a candidate's career leading up to application to promotion to Professor.

**Professional Reputation** – The candidate's national/international reputation may be indicated by leadership roles in professional associations, journal editorships, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak at national and international conferences and symposia, invitations to submit review and synthesis papers to journals, invitations to serve on grant review panels, invitations to co-author national and international reports (e.g., National Research Council reviews and policy reports). The candidate also should be able to provide evidence that the quality of their work is held in high esteem by senior faculty at other institutions.

**Acquisition of Funds** – A consistent ongoing record of grantsmanship from multiple funding sources is essential. These efforts should be adequate to sustain the operating costs of a vigorous research program, and to sustain graduate student training. In general, it is expected that a faculty member seeking promotion to professor will have been PI or Co-PI on substantial research funding, with sufficient funds under the candidate's direct control to enable support for an active research program. A substantial portion of the total research funds obtained should be from competitive national funding agencies such as NSF, NASA, USDA, DOE, and EPA. Success in obtaining funding from these agencies provides a strong indication of a research program that addresses major scientific and societal issues using innovative and state-of-the-art approaches.

**Service.** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of all tenured faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

Professional service should address both the needs of the university (internal) as well as constituents external to the university. Examples of internal service activities would include serving on committees and task forces at department, college, or university levels. Examples of external service activities could include the following: service on journal editorial boards and competitive grant review panels; leadership positions in professional societies; providing ad hoc reviews for journals and granting agencies; organizing workshops or symposia at professional meetings; publications in popular outlets (magazines, newspapers, blogs, etc.); and providing educational opportunities for citizen groups, videos, workshops, etc. There is a general expectation that service activities at this level will be of a nature that will have a significant impact on science and society.

Expectations for service suitable for promotion to Professor also includes showing respect for colleagues; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, university, and profession.

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

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with “Instructional” or “Practice” in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

### *5.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer*

**Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 4.1.

### *5.2.2. For Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer*

**Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 4.3. Excellence and impact in teaching should grow throughout the faculty member’s career.

### *5.2.3. For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor to Instructional Associate Professor*

**Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Instructional Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 4.1.

**Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development and program supervision that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. The individual should make significant service contributions to the institution and profession; these contributions often have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching and scholarship in teaching and learning.

**Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

### *5.2.4. For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor to Instructional Professor*

**Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Instructional Associate Professors seeking promotion to Instructional Professor. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 4.1. Leadership and impact in teaching and scholarship of teaching should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member’s career.



**Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development and program supervision critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. The individual should make significant service contributions to the institution and profession, and these service contributions should have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching and scholarship of teaching and learning. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

**Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. Leadership and impact in research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.

## 6. Annual Review

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

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

### 6.1. Purpose

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

- See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

## 6.2. Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

## 6.3. Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period.

## 6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

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

### 6.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Teaching that does not meet the professional standards of the discipline and very low amount of student mentoring. Examples of teaching records that would merit this category include, but are not limited to: failing to meet 10% or more of their classes without arranging satisfactory coverage; not providing updated syllabi for courses; student evaluation results over a three-year period that consistently reveal substantiated claims that reflect lack of adequate instruction effort, and lack of responsiveness to legitimate and pertinent student feedback, as well as poor peer evaluations from faculty. This category should specify the teaching issues (other than scores from student evaluations) that must be addressed by the faculty member.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory teaching. Performance below the basic level expected of faculty, but still showing evidence of teaching effectiveness during the year. Examples of teaching records that would merit this category include, but are not limited to: student evaluation results,

over a two-year period, that consistently reveal substantiated claims that reflect lack of adequate instruction effort, and lack of responsiveness to legitimate and pertinent student feedback, as well as poor or absent peer evaluations from faculty or CTE; syllabi that are inadequate or inaccurate. This category should specify the teaching issues (other than scores from student evaluations) that must be addressed by the faculty member.

- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees. Examples of teaching records that would merit scores in this category include, but are not limited to: completing the expected range of courses with student evaluation responses that are generally neutral or positive, and/or peer evaluations that indicate minor issues for potential improvement; an average amount of student mentoring.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, strongly positive evaluations accompanied by adequate academic rigor, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity/creative works. Examples of research records that would merit this category include, but are not limited to: no submission of grant proposals, no submissions of manuscripts for peer-reviewed publication, or no scientific presentations.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity/creative works. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth. Examples of research records that would merit this category include, but are not limited to: submission of only one small/simple grant proposal that was not funded or submission of only one to two manuscripts for peer-reviewed publication, particularly if such manuscripts are simple or short.
- Satisfactory – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity/creative works. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors. Examples of research records that would merit this category include but are not limited to: submission of a relatively large grant proposal (e.g., individual or multi-PI NSF grant) that was or was not funded, or publication of one major peer-reviewed manuscript, or several peer-reviewed manuscripts.

- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity/creative works. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: high-quality publications, successful substantial funding, and evidence of impact to society (including by measures of increasing citations, well-reviewed public performances, invited presentations to large scholarly or public groups, and direct improvement in ecosystem or biological resources).
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

#### 6.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Examples of service records that would merit this category include but are not limited to: those that cannot demonstrate any actual participation in service to the department, college, university, or professional service outside the institution. Lack of attendance at scheduled faculty meetings.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

### 6.5. Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

#### 6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

The faculty member's annual report and evaluation must include the following:

- A Faculty Achievement Report, following the template provided by the Department Head, with a focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but with latitude to point out the

status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. This includes a listing of achievements under the categories of teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service, as appropriate.

- An updated Curriculum Vitae submitted through the Interfolio Faculty 180 portal
- A Plan of Work document, within which faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

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

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

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

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

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

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

*6.5.4.Performance Assessment*

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

**6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action**

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

#### *6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance*

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

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

#### *6.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance*

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

#### *6.7. Timeline*

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Faculty Affairs 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

## 7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

### 7.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

### 7.2. Process

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

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



### 7.3. Feedback from midterm review

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

## 8. Promotion and Tenure Review

### 8.1. Purpose

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated and continued leadership and impact in a research field nationally and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. Promotion to Professor is granted for continued international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership and impact in teaching and service can be the basis for promotion from associate to full professor (see [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

### 8.2. Process

*8.2.1. The Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee for ECCB consists of all faculty members eligible to serve for each case under consideration.*

- In each case of tenure or promotion, the P&T Committee consists of eligible faculty members holding a rank above that of the candidate being reviewed. As examples, Academic Professional Track (APT) professors serve on promotion committees for candidates that are below them in rank; Tenure-track Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors would be members of the P&T Committee charged with reviewing cases for promotion of a faculty member from a non-tenure position into the tenure track; Associate Professors and Professors make up the committee for Assistant Professors being considered for tenure and promotion; Professors make up the committee for cases where promotion of Associate Professors is being considered. Professors serve as the P&T Committee for Professors during their 6-year reviews. Both non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty members of a higher rank are members of the P&T Committee evaluating faculty members in non-tenure-track positions; only tenure-track faculty members of a higher rank can be members of P&T Committees evaluating tenure-track faculty.
- The Department Head of ECCB appoints the Chair of the P&T Committee. All fulltime faculty members with >50% adloc with ECCB are eligible and automatically appointed to serve on Departmental P&T Committees under the aforementioned guidelines.
- The Chair of the P&T Committee is responsible for keeping the committee's work on schedule to meet deadlines established by the College and the Office of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.
  - The Chair ensures that the candidates' materials are properly prepared.
  - The Chair requests external letters for candidates according to established guidelines.
  - The Chair ensures that review materials are made available to the entire committee well in advance of the scheduled committee meeting.
- Faculty Mentors are tenured faculty members participating in the ECCB Faculty Mentoring Plan.



*8.2.2. All eligible members of the P&T Committee for ECCB, including the Chair and Faculty Mentors, review and vote on each candidate being reviewed for required mid-term review, tenure, and promotion.*

- Votes of Abstain are not allowed (see TAMU guidelines).
- Votes of Absent are only accepted with the required written explanation from the Department Head. Absenteeism from tenure and promotion committee duties is strongly discouraged by the Department, College, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Provost.
- All members of the P&T Committee are accountable for reviewing all materials provided for the candidate under consideration.
  - Committee members must document by signature or by verified login records that they have accessed all materials available for the candidate being reviewed.
  - In advance of a P&T Committee meeting, all committee members are required to prepare for committee discussions by reviewing the dossiers of candidates.
  - Committee members may share written comments to the P&T Committee via a secure internet portal.
- The Chair will designate Promotion and Tenure Committee members as Reviewers. Reviewers serve the role of assisting the Chair and P&T Committee in summarizing and presenting all aspects of a candidate's dossier or other materials submitted for review. Multiple reviewers are preferred so that the entirety of the committee's discussion points, and written comments are taken into account before and after voting. Reviewers should have access to, and may use, materials that were created by the candidate's Mentoring Committee for a candidate.
- For each candidate being considered for tenure and/or promotion, the committee chair will appoint a set of reviewers (composed of 5-9 faculty) responsible for ensuring a complete, accurate assessment of a candidate's record of teaching, research, and service. In conducting these assessments, the reviewers will address all comments received from the entire committee.

*8.2.3. Responsibilities of the faculty member and others in preparing the tenure or promotion dossier*

- The candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion is responsible for preparing and submitting the following:
  - Candidate statement of impact in research, teaching and service
  - Submit Curriculum vita through the Interfolio F180 portal
  - Submit Grants chart through the Interfolio F180 portal
  - Candidate's list of possible external reviewers
  - Teaching portfolio
  - Submit Faculty biography through the Interfolio F180 portal
  - Submit Faculty data table through the Interfolio F180 portal
  - Submit Letter stating verification of contents through the Interfolio F180 portal

*8.2.4. Timelines*

- Midterm review is required for Assistant Professors per university and college guidelines.
- Post-tenure review, at least once every 6 years, is required for all tenured faculty per university and college guidelines.

- Courtesy, or voluntary, reviews of full dossiers are available upon request by any candidate during non-mandatory review cycles. This is encouraged for Associate Professors considering application for promotion in the near future.

#### *8.2.5. Mentoring*

- The function of a Mentoring Committee (MC) is to advise a candidate, communicate candidate questions or concerns to the Departmental P&T Committee and Department Head (DH), and ensure accomplishments are properly noted and weighted by the P&T Committee. The 'candidate' is defined as a tenure-track Assistant Professor or an Academic Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professor. The committee acts in the best interest of the candidate by providing guidance relevant to the candidate's stated goals for advancement in research, teaching, and service. This advice is intended to enhance the professional standing of both the candidate and department.
- The MC is assigned by the end of the first year of the individual's residence in the department as a tenure-track or APT Assistant Professor.
- Following promotion to Associate Professor, the individual may request their MC to continue its service in order to provide guidance for advancement to Professor. This arrangement is voluntary and can be terminated upon request at any time.
- The MC for a tenure-track candidate consists of at least three tenured faculty members, with one faculty member serving as chair. The chair of the committee must be from ECCB. The other members can be from other departments within Texas A&M University. For APT candidates, the committee (except the chair) can include other APT faculty members. MC members are selected by the candidate in consultation with the DH and others. The DH appoints the MC members in an official memo.
- The DH cannot be a member of the MC. However, if advised by the committee and requested by the candidate, the DH may be invited to participate as a guest in a defined portion of the committee's activities.
- At any time, a candidate can request changes to the MC, which must be approved by the DH in an official memo. For example, a new faculty member joining the department may be seen as a better fit, or the candidate's research may lead in new directions that would benefit from advice from a colleague experienced in that area.
- The MC will evaluate and advise the candidate throughout the period leading up to application for tenure and/or promotion evaluation. Feedback is to be provided following review of documents prepared by the candidate for annual performance evaluations, their midterm dossier, and the dossier and other materials required for application for tenure and/or promotion.
- MC members should be knowledgeable about the candidate's research, teaching, service, and other assigned duties. MC members should review select publications and other relevant and available information, such as citation metrics, grant proposals, award citations, teaching portfolio, student or stakeholder testimonials, etc., prior to evaluation meetings of the P&T Committee.

## 9. 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.).

### 9.1. Purpose

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

### 9.2. Peer Review Committee

The Post-tenure Peer Review Committee will consist of all Full Professors on the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

### 9.3. Process

Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Lifetime Curriculum Vitae
- A seminar summarizing achievements during the previous 6 years (maybe recorded for viewing)
- Other materials as determined by the candidate

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

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

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

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

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.

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<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.

**By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, the department will provide to the dean and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, 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.

#### 9.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 9.3) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.7). 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 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 9.5.) acceptable to the dean.

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.

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.

On behalf of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will solicit a list of names of potential committee members from the faculty member and a list of individuals that should not be contacted. The department head will give feedback on the submitted names and have the opportunity to provide additional names. The Dean will appoint the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee based on the input from the faculty member and the department head.

---

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

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

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.

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

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

#### 9.5. The Professional Development Plan

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

#### 9.6. Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

#### 9.7. 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](#)).

### 10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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

See the website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

#### **Appendix I**

##### *ECCB Faculty Mentoring Plan*

---

#### **Contact Office**

---

Office of Dr. Kirk Winemiller, Interim Department Head, e-mail [k-winemiller@tamu.edu](mailto:k-winemiller@tamu.edu)