

# **Texas A&M School of Public Health Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

**Approved February 16, 2024**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

**1. INTRODUCTION..... 4**

**1. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS..... 5**

**2. AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE (REFERENCE UNIVERSITY RULE 12.01.99.M1, SECTION 4.4.1)..... 5**

**3. INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS ..... 9**

**5. PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE..... 12**

**6. ANNUAL REVIEW..... 19**

**7. MID-TERM REVIEW ..... 23**

**8. POST-TENURE REVIEW ..... 25**

**9. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ..... 26**

**10. GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS..... 28**

**APPENDIX..... 29**



# 1. Introduction

## Our Mission

The Texas A&M School of Public Health is committed to transforming health through interdisciplinary inquiry, innovative solutions, and development of leaders through the Aggie tradition of service to engage diverse communities worldwide.

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 School of Public Health 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 teaching and scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of providing fully inclusive metrics for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([UR 12.01.99.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 School of Public Health (SPH); and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE
<a href="#">12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</a>
<a href="#">12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I</a>
<a href="#">12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</a>
<a href="#">University Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</a>
<a href="#">University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</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.

# 1. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit.

In the School of Public Health, the following faculty titles, ranks and categories of performance are described below.

<b>Academic Professional Track</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Teaching</b>
<b>Instructional</b> Assistant / Associate / Full	Not Applicable	Secondary	Primary
<b>Research</b> Assistant / Associate / Full	Primary	Secondary	Not Applicable
<b>Practice / Executive / Senior</b> Assistant / Associate / Full	As Needed / Assigned	As Needed / Assigned	As Needed / Assigned
<b>Tenure Track / Tenured</b> Assistant / Associate / Full	Primary	Tertiary	Secondary

# 2. 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, and/or creative work; service; patient care and/or community-related equivalent; administration; others, as applicable to the School of Public Health and public health as a discipline and profession. 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).

The School of Public Health takes into consideration research and scholarship, teaching, and service in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance in all three areas: scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

## 3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required. Faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and expand 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 should be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient

to evaluate teaching. The criteria for effectiveness that will be considered in evaluating teaching performance can include (but not limited to) the following:

- Surveys of student opinions of teaching: The use of student comments and evaluations can provide an immediate response of student's perspectives.
- Accomplishment of students: The number and caliber of students guided through effective research programs, which resulted in refereed publications and recognition of the development of the faculty members' reputation as a scholar and teacher.
- Evidence of effective student learning: The master of material in subsequent courses.
- Creativity in programmatic development: Indication that a faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches in teaching his/her own courses or new programs (new texts, teaching material used by other educational groups, new teaching technology development, utilization of distance education, etc.).
- Professional peer evaluation: A peer analysis of prepared materials can be utilized to evaluate the quality of preparation, clarity, and appropriateness of educational goals and methods of testing. Professional peer evaluation may involve site visits, departmental exit interviews or performance in subsequent courses.
- Formal teaching recognition: The receipt of awards for outstanding teaching or other formal recognition of teaching excellence by student clubs, the department, college, university, or recognition of contributions to the educational programs of a professional society.
- Self-evaluation of teaching: The instructor's self-evaluation can present a unique insight into the teaching philosophy and professional efforts in teaching activities.
- Flexibility in teaching abilities: When appropriate, the teaching flexibility demonstrated by each instructor should be considered with attention to the ability of the instructor to properly gauge student understanding and distinguish between introductory and advanced presentations.
- Student advising and mentoring: Involvement in student advising programs or honors and fellows programs provide an important component of student development. Faculty participation in practicum/internship management and student placement are also important components of the teaching evaluation. Significant variable credit programs should be identified, and their uniqueness defined.

### 3.1.1 Tenure Track Faculty and Teaching

Although candidates for tenure at the associate level are often protected from heavy doctoral student mentoring, there should be some evidence of the capacity to successfully mentor doctoral students, when applicable. For faculty who work primarily or even exclusively with MPH or undergraduate students, mentoring can be demonstrated in other ways (e.g., publications with students documenting the student contribution, independent student publications, student accomplishments, etc.). As with scholarship, quality matters more than quantity. The criteria are listed in Section 5.0.

Evidence of exceptional teaching (demonstrated by student or peer recognition of creativity and commitment to teaching) is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional teaching provide the grounds for promotion to professor. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1.4, "exceptional" performance in one dimension cannot compensate for "inadequate" performance in another. Time in rank is not sufficient for promotion: promotion to professor requires continued demonstration of significant achievement.

### 3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Given that work in public health, by its very nature, crosses disciplines, the "field of public health" is necessarily a broad, flexible term. In some instances, it will intersect significantly with traditional academic disciplines. In others, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within public health. It may represent the novel

merger of two fields. Excellence in public health often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also public health practice.

Faculty are expected to verify standard scholarly metrics at annual evaluation and in consideration for promotion and/or tenure, if relevant, but metrics alone are insufficient in complex determinations about the overall excellence of a faculty. Faculty, in consultation with senior faculty and administrators, are responsible for contextualizing contributions, identifying, and defining the most relevant evidence. Most faculty will not be equally strong across scholarship, teaching, and service. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate's rank and fields or sub-field.

Nonetheless, at a minimum, to be considered for promotion and/or tenure, faculty should have achieved widely recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting the highest standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of public health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence as reflected in scholarly accomplishments.

Examples of measures/sources of information may include:

- Original peer-reviewed scientific publications: The most traditional sense of original basic and applied research is the presentation of that material in formally peer-reviewed publications in scientific journals.
- Invited review publications: One of the more important components of developing national and international recognition for research capabilities is the publication of significant reviews in leading disciplinary scientific journals or review publications.
- Book chapters and book editing: Ongoing research activity may be published in books or specialized monographs of scientific meetings. While these may have varying value and occasionally be of major importance in chronicling or providing direction to a research area, they should not be interchanged with the invited reviews mentioned above.
- Popular press articles and research application bulletins: Publication opportunities exist which are targeted toward specific components of the lay audience in the popular press or applied agricultural service bulletins. This type of publication provides an important component of scientific education and application.
- Textbooks, educational software and teaching materials: There is an ever-increasing demand for educational materials for use in laboratories, lecture courses, workshops, and continuing education. Some of these materials find access to large interdisciplinary markets and some are used entirely within the local domain. The importance of these materials depends on the quality and extended impact of the materials on a wide community.
- Products of research experiences: As a result of research investigations, many products are developed which provide valuable end products in themselves and traditionally represent a variety of integrated research and production-oriented activities. The utility of the research product should be examined in the performance criteria assessment. Included in this forum are the development of patented and non-patented products and/or techniques encompassing the formulation of software, equipment, models, etc.
- Technology transfer: Invention disclosures, patents, copyrights, trademarks, consulting and participation in extension educational programs are important indicators of research performance.
- Development of extramural funding activities: Successful research programs in many areas are able to attract extramural research support from competitive state, federal and industrial sources. The development of competitive funding should be evaluated for the provision of a consistent, directed research program. In addition, it is becoming increasingly possible to develop extramural teaching/research funding relative to the national concerns regarding the future status of scientific education and research.

- Participation in scientific meetings, invited seminars and related activities: An indication of research activity can be demonstrated by participation in scientific meetings, particularly as invited speakers at major symposia. In addition, however, published abstracts and short published research reports associated with meetings can contribute to the evaluation of research quality.
- Peer recognition, awards, and commendations: The peer-recognition of research accomplishments and their impact on clientele groups provides a valuable indicator of the external impact and significance of the research program.
- Solicitation of scientific expertise: Requests to serve on decision-making panels (i.e. program reviews, consultation with government or industry, select scientific panels, publication editorial work, and peer grant review) represent measures of the potential importance of scientific effort. Invited reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others constitute a particularly significant testimony of importance.

The record of research grant proposals and fellowships both submitted and awarded should be examined and interpreted. These components should demonstrate a positive pattern of professional development of the faculty member as a creative scholar. Original work typically should be considered as evidence of scholarly work and productivity only after acceptance for publication or presentation.

### 3.3 Service

Evidence of excellent service to the Department, School, University, or field of public health is also considered in annual evaluations and tenure and/or promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field.

Examples of measures/sources of information may include:

- Departmental service: All faculty are involved in various departmental services; however, the requirements of that service vary significantly. Some faculty members provide major programmatic leadership. Included in these activities are student recruiting, placement services, departmental student club advising, and similar activities that provide nonacademic components of student development.
- College or university service: Selected faculty members provide major service on college or university-wide committees or task forces, public relations activities, and the Faculty Senate. Distinguished efforts in such activities provide important contributions to the Texas A&M University community.
- Community or statewide resource or leadership activities: Some faculty members provide an irreplaceable resource for community development and continuing education. While these activities may or may not be a direct component of their professional responsibilities, extraordinary service or quality of community enhancement should be considered in a faculty evaluation. Of particular importance is the role that faculty have in youth education and development through both formal and informal programming. Another issue involves adult and continuing education activities which may or may not be a part of the professional responsibilities of a given faculty member.
- Contributions to government, industry and commerce: Many faculty members are asked to contribute their professional or scientific expertise to informational needs or to the solution of practical issues in the public and private domain. As appropriate, a statement should be provided relative to the service activities and problem solving aspects of the faculty member.
- International involvement: In seeking to achieve a global perspective among students and professors, faculty at Texas A&M University are encouraged to contribute to worldwide economic and cultural development and enhance global understanding through their efforts at the international level. This includes assuming responsibility for international research enhancement grants, participation in USAID projects, and forging new collaborative relationships with international institutions.
- Contributions to professional disciplines: Many faculty members serve as officers and leaders in the disciplinary activities of their professional societies. The significance of these appointed and elected positions should be clearly explained.



### 3.4 Administration:

Faculty members in the School of Public Health may, at times, be asked to take on administrative roles either within their department, in the School of Public Health, or an administrative unit at Texas A&M University (i.e., a Center or Institute administrative role, or administrative office). Some of these appointments may be temporary and others may be permanent; however, these appointments will be based on terms jointly agreed upon by the Department Head, Dean, and faculty member. In addition, a memo describing the terms will be signed by the relevant administrative leaders, which will include the expected proportion of time associated with the administrative appointment. When a faculty member has an administrative appointment, they may be evaluated on their effectiveness to (among other things):

- Align, motivate, and inspire people they supervise to believe in a vision and attain specific outcomes.
- Identify and hire capable and qualified individuals.
- Organize and manage projects effectively.
- Communicate effectively.
- Be flexible to adjust to change both within the unit and to outside factors.
- Budget appropriately and manage in a fiscally responsible manner.

## 3. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow, provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in [Appendix I](#) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

The following indicators of teaching excellence and effectiveness are applicable to all faculty (APT or TT) who have teaching responsibilities among categories of performance.

4.1 Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** includes, but is not limited to:

### 4.1.1 Instructional Activities

The SPH provides the following indicators of outstanding merit and of merit. Note that these are examples and do not represent a checklist.

#### Indicators of Outstanding Excellence (Merit) in Instructional Activities

- a. Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer- evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- b. Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- c. Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- d. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- e. Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- f. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- g. Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- h. Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- i. Exceptional service as a peer evaluator

#### Indicators of Merit in Instructional Activities

- a. Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes

- b. Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- c. Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- d. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- e. Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- f. Evidence of high quality class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- g. Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- h. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- i. Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- j. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- k. Effective service as a peer evaluator

#### 4.1.2. Mentoring

Candidates for professor in departments that offer doctoral degrees are expected to have chaired or co-chaired student committees or demonstrate successful student mentoring in other dimensions. Candidates for promotion to professor must not only demonstrate the capacity to mentor students, but also junior faculty members. Again, the quality of mentorship is vital and mentorship in name only is insufficient. Indicators of mentorship include but are not limited to criteria suggested in University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Appendix I:

#### Indicators of Outstanding Merit In Mentoring

- a. Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
- b. Chair of doctoral research committees
- c. Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- d. Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University Honors program)
- e. Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)

#### Indicators of Merit In Mentoring

- a. Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction (involving appropriate comparisons to department norms) and student outcomes
- b. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- c. Member of graduate student advisory committees
- d. Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)

4.2 Indicators of ***Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** includes, but is not limited to: Scholarship, Reputation, Social Impact, and Funding.

#### 4.2.1 Scholarship

There is no absolute number of journal articles or books that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of public health, there is no specific h-Index score that can be considered as a required threshold for all fields or disciplines. In addition, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate all estimate this citation metric differently. While scholarly metrics can be important yardsticks, the question of whether a candidate has achieved a sufficient body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field should weigh all of the following:

#### Indicators for Scholarship

- a. Significance and focus of prior research and research trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement, CV, relevant scholarly metrics (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
- b. Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals (e.g., the best in the candidate's field) as measured by metrics such as Scimago Journal Rank and as judged by experts in the candidate's field;
- c. Number and significance of primary-authored (typically first- or last- authored) published articles;
- d. Patents that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts;
- e. Achievement of an overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

#### 4.2.2 Reputation

Reputation as an independent scholar and researcher who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The Departments and School should weigh all the following:

##### Indicators for Reputation

- a. Faculty being considered for promotion to the associate level with tenure should have, at least, emerging national and international reputations.
- b. Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.
- c. At both the level of associate professor and professor, evidence of the candidate's national or international reputation is typically measured by the quality and depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from leading scholars in the discipline or field in question. See Section III, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.

#### 4.2.3 Social Impact

While social impact is not required for tenure and promotion, a tool such as Altmetrics can provide an objective measure of the social impact of a candidate's scholarly work, which may be used to augment traditional indicators of academic impact (as defined in Section I.A.1.a above). However, a high level of social impact is not sufficient to compensate for deficiencies in academic impact.

#### 4.2.4 Funding

While in some fields scholarly impact and reputation is not dependent on securing external research funds, and the School does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion or tenure, in all fields research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, external funding may serve as an indicator of the candidate's research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are insufficient for tenure or promotion. The quality of scholarship is ultimately determinative.

### 4.3 Indicators of ***Excellence in Service***

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure track lines. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional service, defined as "sustained service to the University [that] is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding," provide the grounds for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, "exceptional" performance in one dimension cannot compensate for "inadequate" performance in another.

At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in major conferences and serving on task forces.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of top-tier journals in the field of public health or the candidate's sub-specialty, chairing significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, serving on or chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, NSF, NIOSH, etc.).

## 5. 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, patient care, 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 School of Public Health takes into consideration research and scholarship, teaching, and service in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance in all three areas: scholarly activity, teaching, and service.

The criteria for the unit is as follows:

5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Appointment to tenure-track assistant professor implies the candidate meets the criteria for the rank.

5.1.2 Associate Professor: Criteria for promotion and tenure from assistant to associate rank requires demonstration of excellence in public health. This includes

- a. Exemplary or above rating in research/scholarly activities
- b. Satisfactory or above in teaching/pedagogy
- c. Satisfactory or above in service

5.1.3 Professor:

- a. Sustained achievements of exemplary or above rating in research and at least one of the two other categories (teaching or service)

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure track lines. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in **extraordinary circumstances** can exceptional service, defined as "sustained service to the University [that] is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding," provide the grounds for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, "exceptional" performance in one dimension cannot compensate for "inadequate" performance in another.

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

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

Academic Professional Track Faculty (research and instructional, lectures, and/or practice appointments) who are candidates for promotion on non-tenure-accruing track lines should demonstrate excellence in one area, in addition to service. Expectations are not, however, necessarily limited to only two areas, as described below. As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2, APT faculty "should have significant responsibilities beyond solely teaching (or research for research faculty)."

Offer letters for APT positions should clearly state whether faculty members are responsible for excellence in teaching (and the number of courses to be taught) or research (and any expectations for external grant support) and the nature of their responsibilities.

As per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.4, consideration for promotion normally occurs after five years in a given rank, though faculty may seek promotion earlier.

### **APT Faculty with Teaching as a Primary Expectation**

#### **5.2.1 Instruction for APT – Teaching Focus**

At a minimum, faculty with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate proficiency in instruction/teaching and render service contributions related to departmental and college academic needs. Assessment of both performance dimensions, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual.

#### **Indicators of Outstanding Merit in Instructional Activity for APT – Teaching Focus**

Instructional Activity: Student evaluations of formal classroom or lab instruction alone are not sufficient to judge instructional proficiency. Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 suggests the following indicators of outstanding merit and merit (note that these are examples and do not represent a checklist):

- a. Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- b. Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- c. Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- d. Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- e. Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- f. Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- g. Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- h. Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- i. Exceptional service as a peer evaluator

#### **Indicators of Merit in Instructional Activity for APT – Teaching Focus**

- a. Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- b. Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- c. Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- d. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- e. Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- f. Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- g. Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- h. Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- i. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- j. Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- k. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- l. Effective service as a peer evaluator

### 5.2.2 Mentorship<sup>1</sup> for APT – Teaching Focus

Candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on non-tenure-accruing lines (i.e., Instructional or practice)\* should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students effectively. APT with Instructional Emphasis candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship:

- a. *Student mentorship*: Candidates with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for teaching assistant positions, and/or teaching positions.
- b. *Faculty mentorship*: Candidates for promotion to professor with teaching as a primary responsibility must also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the instructional and, if appropriate, research track. Faculty could meet these criteria by serving as an outstanding peer evaluator.

### 5.2.2 Scholarly Activities for APT – Teaching Focus

Scholarship is not a requirement for promotion to associate professor. Unless the candidate's APT appointment includes the atypical condition of scholarship among the requirements, scholarly activities are NOT included among the areas evaluated. While APT-Teaching Focused faculty may exercise the option of engaging in research and scholarly activities outside of their regular appointment (e.g., grant-funded summer research), these activities are not used in the evaluation of merit toward promotion. As is true of other faculty, faculty with primary responsibility for teaching should establish a regional, national, or international reputation for teaching, service, and scholarly accomplishments. See Section III, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters.

### 5.2.3 Service for APT – Teaching Focus

Evidence of significant service to the School, Department, University, or field of public health is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field. The category of service is understood broadly to include student advising and pedagogically related activities outside the classroom. It may in addition, include:

- i. At the level of associate professor: contributions to professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on task forces, participation in organizing major conferences, providing continuing education to the field, and/or training other teachers.
- ii. At the level of professor: service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include chairing significant ad hoc, standing committees (e.g. peer evaluation committees), or task forces; serving on or chairing significant national or international committees.

Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for promotion. Candidates should provide a statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the Department, School, University, or field.

### **APT Faculty with Research as a Primary Expectation**

These faculty will make significant contributions to research activity, and their appointment is often associated with substantial research funding or work on a particular project. Research faculty can also be assigned to teaching or service activity. Typically, these activities will be central to research activity and involvement of students in research, and requires approval by the Vice President for Research. If instruction is more than 50% of assigned duties, it is likely that a reclassification to an instructional track is needed. Research faculty members will primarily be evaluated on research activity, and teaching/service activity incident to the context of their research expertise.

### 5.2.4 Research / Scholarship for APT – Research Focus

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not apply to individuals who hold positions as lecturers. For these individuals, only requirements regarding teaching apply.

Research faculty are expected to secure extramural funding to support at least 75% of their salary for their appointment. Other than adhering to any university and system policies regarding funding sources, there is no minimum requirement on the number of grant submissions, nor are there restrictions on sources of funds (e.g., federal grants, state contracts, foundation endowments), nor on funding dollar amounts other than the need to cover their salary.

There is no absolute number of journal articles or books that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of public health, there is no specific h-Index score that can be considered independent of specific field or discipline. In addition, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar all estimate this citation metric differently. While scholarly metrics can be important yardsticks, the question of whether a candidate has achieved a sufficient body of quality research should weigh all of the following:

- a. Significance and focus of prior research and research trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement;
- b. Number of first-authored/senior-authored published articles as a measure of both impact and scholarly independence;
- c. Publication in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals;
- d. Achievement of an overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field at the rank sought by the candidate.

#### 5.2.5 Scholarly Impact for APT – Research Focus

The Departments and School should weigh all of the following:

- a. Faculty being considered for promotion to the associate level should have, at least, “emerging” national and/or international reputations. Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.
- b. Evidence of the candidate's national or international reputation is typically measured by the quality and depth of recognition demonstrated by detailed knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from leading scholars in the discipline or field in question.

See Section 5.3, Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.

#### 5.2.6 Mentorship for APT – Research Focus

Although not the primary consideration, candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on research faculty lines should demonstrate some capacity to mentor either other faculty or students effectively. Faculty members promoted to professor non-tenure accruing lines must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship.

- a. Student mentorship: Candidates with research as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for research positions.
- b. Faculty mentorship: Candidates for promotion with research as a primary responsibility should also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the research track.

#### 5.2.7 Service for APT – Research Focus

Local-level service (e.g., department, school, university committees) is not a primary requirement for APT-Research focused faculty. However, evidence of excellent service to the field of public health as part of their scholarly activities is considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with public health impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or public health impact or stature within the field.

- a. At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to professional organizations, serving on boards of organizations impacting research (e.g., pharmaceutical company advisory board). Likewise, service may entail participation in research-related components of major conferences and serving on task forces.



- b. At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of leading journals in the field of public health or the candidate's sub-specialty, serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, NSF, NIOSH, etc.).
- c. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for promotion. Candidates should provide a statement describing their service and how it has impacted the Department, School, University, or field.

### 5.3 Process & Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty, Departments, and the School all have responsibilities in the process of tenure and/or promotion. All tenure and/or promotion discussions are strictly confidential. After submission, dossiers may be made available to candidates only with an Open Records Request (see System Policy 61.01.02). For more information on making an Open Records Request see <https://openrecords.tamu.edu>. Committee members and administrators may not share a dossier with a candidate without an Open Records Request.

#### 5.3.1 Responsibilities of the Faculty Member

Faculty members are responsible for preparing and submitting a dossier that accurately and thoroughly reflects the breadth and depth of their accomplishments, as reviews at all levels are based only on materials included in the dossier.

#### **Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must:**

- a. Provide an accurate and current annotated curriculum vitae (CV). The CV should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.)
  - i. Candidates must use the [vita template](#), and have the option of using the vita template created in Interfolio (drawing on data already entered during annual review). Candidates should not alter the order or structure of items in the template. The template includes an annotation to specify authorship protocols within the discipline regarding order of authorship and contributions if not lead author. The grants section of the template should be used as is, without alteration and including all the indicated information. The template includes a 200-word biography of the candidate, which will be published in the recognition booklet featuring newly promoted and/or tenured faculty.
  - ii. Candidates can submit an "Addendum Memo" to their package if they have any substantive additions or changes to the CV after the initial submission (e.g., "Grant proposal X to NSF, listed as pending on page Y, has now been awarded"). This may occur at any level prior to the deadline for submission to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The Addendum Memo must contain a statement that the candidate deems the changes to be accurate as of the date of the memo and must be signed and dated by the candidate. The Addendum Memo must then be submitted through the department head (or dean if no department head) who will ensure the new information is added to the candidate's package in Interfolio.
- b. Provide an impact statement (adherent to VPFA formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship, teaching, and service. This is a concise statement, written by the candidate that conveys the quality and impact of their contributions within each of their areas of responsibility. The statement should individually address each area of responsibility, and include past accomplishments and evidence of impact, present activities, and future plans in each area. The statement should also state plans for future directions. The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and units and the statement should explicitly state the weight assigned to each area. Further, the composition of the statement should reflect the weight assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 75% responsibility in teaching should dedicate the majority of the statement to describing the impact of their contributions to teaching. Academic Professional Track faculty will have a primary contribution in one or two areas, and the focus of the statement should be primarily on those areas, although statements can be included about contributions beyond those assigned areas that reflect the impact of the faculty member. The statement should be maximum three pages, single-



spaced, minimum 12 point font, with 1-inch margins. The statement is uploaded to Interfolio. Detailed instructions can be found [here](#). In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

- i. **A research statement** that describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory. Scholars both within and outside the candidate's discipline who read this statement should be able to "clearly see the number on the jersey." In other words, this should be a clear, crisp, highly accessible statement of the specific contributions that set the candidate apart, how those contributions have changed the field, and the arc of the candidate's career.
    - The statement should identify the candidate's most important papers/books. The candidate should provide no more than three exemplary papers that reflect the core argument about scholarly impact. These three scholarly contributions will be sent to all referees and will be a part of the dossier up to the Dean's review.
  - ii. **A teaching statement** that addresses the candidate's philosophy and impact of methods or approaches relating to student achievement, course content, course development, curriculum development, mentoring, and/or service based learning. It must include evidence of performance. For promotion to professor, the statement must provide evidence of "higher-level" efforts or leadership (e.g., course or curriculum conceptualization, innovative teaching methods, mentorship of junior faculty instructors, etc.).
  - iii. **A service statement** addressing the impact of contributions to the Department, School, University, field, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but also of leadership.
- c. Submit and verify other required documentation (as specified in the [University guidelines on tenure and promotion](#));
- d. Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, promotion to full professor (TT), and promotion for Research faculty is required to include a minimum of five (5) arm's length letters, although seven (7) is preferred. **The university does not require outside letters for academic professional track appointments (except for research track). However, departments may require external letters in their units for some titles and not others, based on assigned responsibilities, expectations, and criteria.** Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. When identifying external referees, the candidate should consider the following:
- i. Referee letters will normally be tenured professors (and will, at a minimum, have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring) preferably at institutions belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least institutions with a Carnegie "R1" classification. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.
  - ii. Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm's length evaluators provided the Department Head or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a referee in the past five years.
  - iii. Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.
  - iv. External letters should be from scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. If the application is for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and if a letter(s) is requested from an associate professor, the majority of the letters should be from full professors.

### 5.3.2 Department Head Responsibilities for All Candidates (regardless of whether on a tenure-accruing or non-tenure-accruing line)

- a. Department Heads are responsible for:
  - i. meeting with and advising the candidate about the strength of the different elements of the dossier and the timing of tenure and/or promotion;
  - ii. For candidates on any line whose application for promotion to professor is unsuccessful, a minimum of one year is required before resubmission. This only applies for promotions that do not involve tenure.
  - iii. verification of the dossier before review by departmental committees;
  - iv. verification of the dossier before submission to the Office of Faculty Affairs for submission to the School Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee
  - v. following VP of Faculty Affairs guidelines in the conduct of reviews
- b. The departmental review committee is responsible for an analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure (not a descriptive summary of the candidate's work). The final recommendation must demonstrate that the committee analyzed the case carefully and provide:
  - i. Evidence that committee members have read and engaged with the sample of work provided by the candidate;
  - ii. A clear judgement and, when there is a discrepancy between reviewers, a rationale for the committee assessment:
    - Committees may introduce and discuss relevant external data in making decisions. Any information introduced should be described and summarized in the Committee recommendation letter.
  - iii. Consistency in reviews across candidates.

### 5.3.3 The Office of Faculty Affairs (FA)

The FA is responsible for the following during the tenure and/or promotion process:

- a. Assuring fairness and equity throughout the processes of promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review;
- b. Providing individual consultation at the request of faculty and Department Heads on matters related to scholarship, teaching, strength of scholarship and teaching, timing of tenure and promotion, and best practices for preparing dossier elements;
- c. Providing technical support for the School Promotions and Tenure Committee;
- d. Communicating changes in standards or procedures to faculty, Department Heads, and the School Promotion and Tenure Committee;
- e. Disseminating an annotated checklist and timeline to candidates and Departments based on current VPFA deadlines and requirements (which are revised on an annual basis).

### 5.3.4 SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is governed by the Bylaws of the School wide promotion and tenure committee, which makes clear that its deliberations are confidential. It should conduct a searching analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure. Reports should:

- a. be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any discrepancies between the recommendation of the School committee and the Department committee recommendations or Department Head recommendations;
- b. not duplicate the analysis provided by the Department;
- c. make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for its assessment;
- d. be consistent in its assessment of candidates (e.g., if an h-index is weighed and discussed for any candidate, it should be weighed and discussed for all candidates)
- e. be consistent in its judgment of candidates (e.g., if it critiques the quality of external referees for one candidate, it must make clear that it applied the same yardstick to all candidates)
- f. not include a vote for any member who had the right to vote on the case at the Department level;
- g. such members should not abstain from voting since they are not considered eligible to vote.

### 5.3.5 Responsibilities of the Office of the Dean

The Dean of the School of Public Health is responsible for an independent analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure. The Dean's letter of recommendation to the Provost should be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any mixed or negative votes. The Dean should make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for the Dean's assessment. The Dean adheres to all VPFA Guidelines and [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

## 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 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. Each annual review will include overall evaluation of progress toward mandatory promotion/tenure and discussion/review of career/promotion aspiration progress.
  - 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, 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 at SPH focus on the immediately previous calendar year.

## 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 the following 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. Assignment to a category will be determined by departmental guidelines.

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

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

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

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

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- *Satisfactory* – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

- *Exemplary* – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**
- *Most Meritorious* – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

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

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- *Satisfactory* – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will be involved 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 exact form of the faculty member's report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the School, but must include the following:

- Teaching activities (e.g., list of courses and sections taught, enrollment, course development and/or revisions, practica supervised)
- Research activities and outputs (e.g., grants submitted and awarded, funding amounts, collaborative efforts, presentations, publications, technical reports)
- Service activities (e.g., unit, department, institutional, national and international-level committees and to the profession, grant reviews, manuscript reviews)
- Professional development activities and efforts (e.g., pedagogy improvement workshops, grant-writing seminar, conflict-management training).

The report should . . .

- be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.

- include short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

For examples, see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

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

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance. An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean.



- a. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement, developed in collaboration between the faculty member and department head, **no later than 45 days after the evaluation is completed**. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (section 3) of the faculty member.
- b. 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 predetermined 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. These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **May 31** 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 School, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the school with a copy to the VP of Faculty Affairs. The dean of the school will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the VP of Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 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 SAP 12.01.99.M1](#)

## 7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 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, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

### 7.2 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2026 and December 2026. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2023.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2023	7 years	March – December 2026 (due before December 2026 of AY 2026-2027)

### 7.3 Feedback from midterm review

This review should mimic the Promotion & Tenure process as closely as possible. At minimum, a mid-term review includes dossier items contributed by the candidate (CV and Impact Statement) and is reviewed at the department and college/school levels by appropriate faculty committees as well as the department head and dean. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.



## 8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities, and must include peer review of the faculty member.

### 8.1 Purpose

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

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

For the School of Public Health, the post tenure review is conducted at the department-level, followed by the School-level.

The Department Promotion & Tenure Committee conducts post-tenure reviews at the department-level. This is followed by a review performed by the School-level P&T Committee.

### 8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee include the standard materials included in a promotion & tenure review, with the exception of the following:
- External Letters
  - Grants Charts
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

- 8.3.6 A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>2</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 For tenured faculty with administrative appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per university policies for department heads (12.99.99.M0.03 Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Department Heads), deans (12.99.99.M0.02 Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Deans) and provosts (12.99.99.M13 Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Provost and Executive Vice President). For other administrative positions at the college/school or university level (e.g. assistant and associate deans; assistant and associate provosts; assistant and associate vice presidents; and the like) Periodic Peer Review will be conducted by a committee to include other university administrators and department faculty as appropriate for the position and administrative effort.
- 8.3.9 **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, each unit will provide to the dean and the VPFA, 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. Professional Development Review

A Professional Development Review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (section 2 of 12.06.99.M0.01) or an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean, under extenuating circumstances (e.g. serious illness). The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.

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

### 9.1 Purpose

---

<sup>2</sup> It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

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.

#### 9.2 Professional Development Review Committee

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

#### 9.3 Faculty Member Responsibilities

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

#### 9.4 Department Head Responsibilities

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.

#### 9.5 Timeline and Possible Outcomes

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:

- 9.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
- 9.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4,
- 9.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 9.6) acceptable to the dean.

#### 9.6 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 5 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

### 9.7 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 VP of Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the VP of 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 VP of Faculty Affairs (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

### 9.8 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 [System Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation. See the VPFA website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status. Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

# Appendix

## 2021 SPH Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

---

### Contact Office

---

#### Office of Faculty Affairs

Tamika D. Gilreath, PhD  
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs  
[tgilreath@tamu.edu](mailto:tgilreath@tamu.edu)

#### Office of the Dean

Eric D. Wilson, Ph.D.  
Assistant Dean for Accountability and Strategic Initiatives  
[eric.wilson@tamu.edu](mailto:eric.wilson@tamu.edu)

