



Texas A&M University at Galveston

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

MARINE BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Contact: Dr. Anna Armitage
Interim Department Head & Professor
200 Seawolf Parkway, Bldg. 3029, OCSB 268
Galveston, TX 77554
Tel: (409) 740-4842 / armitage@tamug.edu
<https://www.tamug.edu/marb/>

Revised: June 2024

Reviewed by Department Faculty: October 2020

Approved by Chief Academic Officer, TAMUG: April 2021

Approved by Dean of Faculties of TAMU: June 10, 2021

Next Scheduled Review: March 31, 2025



Department of Marine Biology

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Document history:

Working from the template provided by the TAMU Dean of Faculties (now Faculty Affairs) in mid 2020, the MARB Evaluation Criteria Committee revised following input from MARB faculty and the Department Head. The following document was produced October, 2020.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance.....	4
3.1. Teaching	4
3.2. Research, scholarly activity.....	5
3.3. Service	5
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness.....	5
4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but are not limited to:	6
4.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but are not limited to:.....	6
4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity includes, but are not limited to:.....	6
4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity includes, but are not limited to:.....	7
4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but are not limited to:.....	7
4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:.....	7
4.7. Acknowledgment of Evaluation Bias:.....	8
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure.....	8
5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	8
5.1.1 Assistant Professor.....	8
5.1.2 Associate Professor.....	9
5.1.3 Professor.....	9
5.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track).....	9
5.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor	9
5.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor.....	10
5.2.3 Instructional Professor.....	10
5.2.4 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer	10
5.3. The Promotion and Tenure Process.....	10

Refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines sections 5.3 - 5.12 for more complete details regarding the promotion and tenure process..... 10

6. Annual Review..... 10

6.1. Purpose..... 11

6.2. Focus..... 11

6.3. Time Period of Review..... 11

6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance..... 11

6.4.1. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:..... 12

6.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are:..... 12

6.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:..... 13

6.5. Required Components..... 13

6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities. 13

6.5.2. A written document stating the Department Head's evaluation and expectations. 14

6.5.3 Meeting between the Department Head and the faculty member..... 14

6.5.4. Performance Assessment..... 15

6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action..... 15

6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance..... 15

6.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance..... 15

6.7. Time-Line..... 15

6.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines..... 16

7. Mid-Term Review..... 16

7.1. Purpose..... 16

7.2. Process..... 17

7.3. Feedback from mid-term review..... 17

8. Post-Tenure Review..... 17

8.1. Purpose..... 17

8.2. Peer Review Committee..... 17

8.3. Process..... 18

8.4. Professional Development Review..... 20

8.5. The Professional Development Plan..... 21

8.6. Appeal..... 21

8.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review..... 21

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status..... 22

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Marine Biology is to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate education in the biological sciences with an emphasis on the biology and ecology of marine organisms and coastal marine habitats to the Texas A&M University at Galveston community.

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 Marine 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. ([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 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, promotion and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/index.html
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/index.html
Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/annual-evaluation-and-mid-term-review.html
Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/evaluation-development/promotion-tenure.html

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. Please also refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which supplements this document (<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>).

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Tenure Track Faculty ranks are as follow:

Assistant Professor: entry level professor, holding a Ph.D. in relevant areas of Biology.

Associate Professor: an exemplary level of accomplishment as measures against the contributions of others in the field; professional conduct conducive to collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University; an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M university, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and evidence indicating commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

Professor: continuing accomplishment in teaching, continuing accomplishment and some measure of national and international recognition in research, and evidence of valuable professional service.

Academic Professional Track ranks are:

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer: should have an appropriate terminal degree or significant experience in the field and demonstrate continuing accomplishment in teaching.

Non-tenure track Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor should have significant responsibilities beyond solely teaching (or research for research faculty) and demonstrate continued excellence in their primary as well secondary responsibilities.

Categories of performance can be found in Section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1 and the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>).

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 and scholarly activity; and 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: a) use of high Impact teaching strategies (HITS); b) evidence of course development and refinement; c) evidence of professional development; d) mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students; e) student and peer course evaluations and comments.

Student mentorship is encouraged but not expected for APT faculty beyond instructional capacity, unless specified in individual contracts.

3.2. Research, scholarly activity

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to: pursue scientific excellence; conduct original research; disseminate results through peer reviewed publications, conference proceedings, books or monographs and meeting presentations; obtain extramural funding, and involve graduate and undergraduate students in research. Effectiveness and excellence in research affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing research. Measures include quality and quantity of peer reviewed papers, successful grant proposals, type and amount of external support (federal, state, local, private, external, internal), book chapters, meeting/conference presentations (international, national, regional, local). Quality of peer reviewed papers will be defined taking into consideration the specific area/s of expertise of each faculty.

Unless specified in individual contracts, research and scholarly activities are encouraged for APT faculty, but they are not expected.

Similarly, Lecturers are not expected or required to pursue research and/or scholarly activities.

3.3. Service

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to pursue service to the department, college, and university, to the profession and/or to society. Examples of such service are: participate on committees for the department, college and university; prepare campus and off-campus seminars; serve as a journal or textbook editor or reviewer; review grant proposals; host, chair or participate in national and international scientific symposia, conferences, workshops or panels; offer instructional seminars, workshops, websites, and other forms of outreach for schools and the public; serve as a subject expert or consultant for state and federal agencies and industry. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure and promotion. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing service. Measures include quantity and type of committees, seminars, journal and textbook reviews, national and international symposia, conferences, workshops, and panels, public outreach events, and consultancies.

APT faculty are expected to engage in service as specified in individual contracts.

Lecturers are not expected or required to pursue service activities.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

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

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

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Regular use, refinement, and development of High Impact Teaching Strategies across course offerings that enhance student learning (e.g. collaborative learning, visual teaching, worked examples, questioning, concept mapping, consistent feedback, multiple exposures)
- Development of a new course or refinement of a previously taught course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Significant contributions to the professional development of students (e.g. internship placement, student-led research and/or publication, software and equipment proficiency, writing proficiency)
- Impactful mentorship of students that leads to placement into meaningful academic and/or professional positions (e.g. graduate school, post-doctoral position, job with vertical career trajectory)
- Developing and/or providing professional development for other instructors (e.g. extensive peer mentoring, workshop and/or conference development and offering)
- Teaching synergistically across fields of study and/or academic departments (e.g. use of interdisciplinary pedagogical approaches, joint development and/or instruction with other faculty and/or staff)
- Recognition for excellence in teaching (e.g. teaching award, press release on instructional excellence)
- Reception of grant support for teaching/learning projects (e.g. pedagogical research, workshop and conference sponsorship, educational tool development)
- Publication/extensive dissemination of instructional materials/pedagogical tools beyond University (e.g. printed/digital text, videos)

4.2. Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** includes, but are not limited to:

- *Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluations, student satisfaction, and student outcomes*
- *Evidence of high quality in class preparations and interactions*
- *Regular use of various HITS (high impact teaching strategies) in courses*
- *Refinement of courses from one semester to the next, incorporating constructive peer and student evaluation suggestions*
- *Participation in professional development of students (e.g. offering research credits or internships; Undergraduate Honors contracts)*
- *Mentorship of students both in and outside of the classroom*
- *Participation in professional development and pedagogical workshops as offered by the university or external sources, and/or evidence of application of pedagogical research into teaching practice.*
- *Development and distribution of pedagogical methods and materials (print or digital) within the University*
- *Selection for a college or departmental award to recognize teaching*

4.3. Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity** includes, but are not limited to:

- *On-going sustained nationally and internationally recognized research program*
- *Awards, recognition from scientific societies*
- *Demonstrated record of publications from PI's laboratory.*
- *Demonstrated record of grants at the local, state, or federal level.*
- *Number of papers (and 5-year average) in upward trajectory.*

- *Sustained record of successful grants at the local, state, or federal level.*
- *Citations number (year to year) in upward trajectory*
- *H index*
- *Invited presentations (5-year average)*
- *Invited contributions (5-year average)*
- *Research related service to federal/state organizations.*
- *Organizer or Program Director of a disciplinary conference*
- *Editor of a peer reviewed disciplinary journal or book with an academic publisher*
- *Officer of a regional, national, or international disciplinary organization*
- *Chair grant review committees*

4.4. Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity** includes, but are not limited to:

- *Evidence of an on-going research program*
- *Extramural funding sufficient to maintain an active research program with graduate students.*
- *Demonstrated record of publications*
- *Demonstrate success with obtaining grants at the local, state, or federal level.*
- *Regular seminars, or presentations to meetings .*
- *Refereeing journal articles, conference abstracts, or book chapters*
- *Citations number (year to year) in upward trajectory*

4.5. Indicators of **Excellence in Service** includes, but are not limited to:

- *Outstanding service performance as evidenced by participation on university, college and departmental committees involving programs and policies that affect the faculties and students of other departments*
- *Regular peer-reviews of journal articles and/or textbook based on national and international recognition in the academic field*
- *Regular reviews of grant proposals from the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other federal and state agencies.*
- *Officer of a national or international scientific society*
- *Regular host, chair or participant in national and international scientific symposia, conferences, workshops or panels*
- *Regularly offer instructional seminars, workshops, websites, and other forms of outreach for schools and the public.*
- *Regularly serve as a subject expert or consultant for state and federal agencies and industry.*
- *Serve on Boards of scientific or non-profit organizations*

4.6. Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** includes, but is not limited to:

- *Effective service performance as evidenced by participation on departmental committees*
- *Regular requests for reviews from peer-reviewed journals and textbook publishers based on national and international recognition in the academic field*
- *informal service roles such as mentoring or peer review of colleagues' work, or providing expertise for a department need.*
- *Occasional requests for reviews of grant proposals from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other federal and state agencies.*
- *Member of a national or international scientific society*

- *Chair or participant in national and international scientific symposia, conferences, workshops or panels*
- *Occasionally offer instructional seminars, workshops, websites, and other forms of outreach for schools and the public.*
- *Occasionally serve as a subject expert or consultant for state and federal agencies and industry.*

4.7. Acknowledgment of Evaluation Bias:

Research provides evidence that the indicators listed in the previous section are subject to evaluation biases. Evaluation and assessments of faculty at all levels should take into account the limits and flaws of such metrics of excellence and effectiveness.

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 and scholarly activity, 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 is as follows:

- Quality, significance, and impact of teaching will be evaluated using the following indicators/criteria: peer evaluations, trajectory toward continuous improvement, student satisfactions, student outcome, course development, teaching awards, publications of instructional materials, student mentoring and advising, membership in graduate committee, graduate student publication, graduate student placement, self-development of activities that lead to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
- Quality, significance, and Impact of research will be evaluated using the following indicators : trajectory in publications and research progress, citations, research grants and awards, external peer reviewed research funding, consistency in funding, type and variety of granting agencies, review panel service, invited national and international presentation, workshop or faculty development activities that improve research effectiveness, contribution of research program to societal need, appropriate dissemination of results, collaborations and faculty role in such collaborations, creativity, recognizability, and degree of risk/reward of research program, invitations, honors and awards.
- Quality, significance, and impact of service will be evaluated using the following indicators: conducting departmental service, serving as officer at (inter)national societies or organizations, or in governmental commission, serving in TAMU administrative roles, serving as a reviewer for journals and grants, participating or chairing standing or ad hoc TAMU committee, commitment to local community or public service, advising student organizations, developing activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness, serving as a chair at (inter)national meeting.

51.1 Assistant Professor

Assistant Professors are expected to have an emerging nationally recognized, active research program, with demonstrated record of publication and seed grants, and presentations at well recognized meetings. Assistant Professors are expected to show service to the Department through committee participation; moderate service to the profession in the form of manuscript reviewer is also expected. Assistant Professors are expected to be effective teachers in formal

setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom and through individual mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students in research, show evidence of course development, trajectory toward improvement of teaching outcomes, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.

5.1.2 Associate Professor

Faculty at the Associate Professor level are expected to exhibit evidence that an on-going, active research program exists and is maintained. They are expected to have a nationally recognized research program that is also emerging internationally, and to demonstrate record of publications and grants at the local, state, or federal level and to regularly give seminars or presentations to meetings, referee journal articles, conference abstracts, or book chapters. Associate Professors are expected to be members in graduate committees, have sustained and continuous graduate student publications, and show a record of graduate student placement (in academia or in the workforce). Associate Professors are expected to show increased service to the department, college and university, and to the community and society.

5.1.3 Professor

Faculty at the Professor level are expected to exhibit leadership in their field, and professional excellence as recognized by peers at both the national and international levels in the form of continued publication in top-tier peer reviewed journals, frequent citation of published papers, and success in maintaining research funding through competitive grants. Other indicators may include appointment to grant review panels, election to office in professional societies, meritorious awards from national/international societies (e.g., National Academy's Awards & Honors), invited lectures at national/international meetings, and other forms of peer recognition. Professors are also expected to show sustained superior performance in teaching, should be committed to teaching in the formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom and as a mentor to undergraduate and graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows. Faculty should be willing to develop new courses or modify existing ones in light of ongoing advances in the subject area as well as implementing new teaching technologies. In the category of Service, Professors should include service to the institution (to students, colleagues, Department, and TAMUG/TAMU) as well as service beyond the campus including service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

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. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track faculty.

5.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor

Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to be effective teachers in formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom, show evidence of course development, trajectory toward improvement of teaching outcomes, student satisfaction, and student outcomes. Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to show some level of service to the Department, University, or the community as specified in individual contracts.

5.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor

Faculty at the Instructional Associate Professor level are expected to exhibit evidence that effective teaching exists and is maintained, and show increased service to the department, college and university, and to the community or society.

5.2.3 Instructional Professor

Instructional Professors are also expected to show sustained superior performance in teaching, should be committed to teaching in the formal setting of the undergraduate and graduate classroom. Faculty should be willing to develop new courses or modify existing ones in light of ongoing advances in the subject area as well as implementing new teaching technologies. Instructional Professors are expected to show service to the institution and/or service beyond the campus including the local community, or the public at large.

5.2.4 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers in formal setting of the undergraduate classroom. Lecturer and Senior Lecturers are not required to consistently make significant contributions in scholarly research or service.

5.3. The Promotion and Tenure Process

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

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.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 or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Annual Reviews will be conducted in February/March each year.

6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

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

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and/or 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 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 report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (i.e., five years), which will allow a faculty member to set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate. Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of content for the report are:

For teaching:

- Undergraduate courses taught
- Graduate courses taught
- Graduate students supervised
- Undergraduate students mentored through research or internships
- Postdocs mentored
- Additional teaching
- Professional development related to teaching
- Awards/expert recognition related to teaching

For Research:

- Publications (per year and up to 5-year average)

- Manuscripts in review
- Grants and contracts
- Unfunded research
- International and national presentations at symposia and conferences
- Professional development related to research
- Awards/expert recognition relating to research

For Service:

- Undergraduate students advised
- University/college/department-wide committees or activities
- Outside TAMU activities (e.g., State and Federal agency advising, industry advising)
- Service activities mandated by provost
- List professional development related to service
- Awards/expert recognition

Additional examples can be found in 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 evaluation and expectations.

The Department Head 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 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 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. 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, they must work with their Department Head 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. Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling the Department Head 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 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 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, 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 mid-term 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, and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members 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 conducted by the Department Head and 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers.

8.1. Purpose

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

8.2. Peer Review Committee

- The ad hoc review committee consists of three members of the Department,
- The three members and the chair of the review committee will be appointed by the Department Head
- Each member of the committee will serve on the committee for up to 3 consecutive years only.
- No review committee member may have a demonstrable conflict of interest or prejudice against the faculty member under review. If a conflict is identified, the faculty member under review may appeal to the Department Head to replace that committee member. If the Department Head declines to do so, the faculty member may appeal the decision to a panel of five other faculty: three selected by the faculty member under review and two by the Department Head.

8.3. Process

8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

Curriculum vitae including the following information:

- Biographical information
- Dates of appointments at TAMUG through current rank
- List of all academic appointments, chronologically, at institutions of higher learning beginning with current academic appointment
- Educational credentials
- List of the professional designations/licenses
- List of other credit-earning higher education courses completed
- List of other courses attended for professional development including course title, date completed, organization/institution conducting course, etc.
- Information on teaching, research and service as follows:

Teaching

- List of all courses taught at TAMUG/TAMU including, at minimum, the following:
 - Course title and number
 - Year/semester the course was taught
 - Credit hours and enrollment
 - Summary results of student evaluations for all courses taught at TAMUG/TAMU using both a narrative format and graphs/tables.
- List of all courses taught (both credit and non-credit) for other institutions indicating title, academic level, and year/semester taught
- List of new courses or new academic programs developed or substantially changed while at TAMUG/TAMU
- List of the innovative teaching methods devised or utilized
- List of the audio-visual and/or online materials developed or utilized
- List of the laboratory or field experience/experiments devised, revised, or utilized
- List of the academic advising assignments/activities
- List of the supervised research such as Directed Studies, Honor's theses, Master's theses, and Ph.D. dissertations
- List of the guest lecturer presentations or performances with their dates and locations
- List of other teaching related activities not mentioned previously

Research

- List of the peer reviewed publications
 - Include full bibliographic citations.
 - Distinguish among journal articles, book chapters, books, and others.
 - Indicate student or post-doc author(s) of the candidate at the time of research.
 - Provide impact factors of the journals.
 - Provide citation counts of the publications.
- List of non-peer reviewed publications
- List of the manuscripts submitted for publication and currently under review
- List of the grants and contracts, and pending or unfunded proposals
- Include full bibliographic citations (e.g., names of investigators, title, duration, funding agency, and total and individual budgets)
- Indicate the role of the candidate (e.g., PI or co-PI)
- List pending proposals separately.

- List unfunded proposals separately.
- List of the paper/poster presentations giving dates, places, and organization
- List of other research activities (e.g., works in progress including stage of progress)
- List of the participation in professional organizations (offices held, sessions chaired, etc.)
- List of the activities as professional advisor, consultant, editor, workshop leaders, etc.
- List of the honors and awards earned for professional publications, etc.
- List of the participation in short courses, seminars, workshops, etc.
- List of any research activities not mentioned previously

Service

- List of the service activity on Departmental-level committees
- List of the service activity on TAMUG committees
- List of the service activity on TAMU committees
- List of the service activity on System committee
- List of the university-related extracurricular activity such as student organization advisor
- List of the community service activity which involves the candidate's field of expertise such as adjudication, advisory boards, career guidance, expert testimony, mediation, etc.
- List of any service activity not mentioned previously.

A statement of teaching, research, and service (6 pages total) that highlights career-wide achievements and has a focus on the last 6 years in the context of a career trajectory.

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.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the

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

Department Head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other Department Head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

8.3.8 By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the Dean and 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.

8.4. Professional Development Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.5. The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6. Appeal

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

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

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

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

8.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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

See the Faculty Affairs website for procedures and forms (<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/current-faculty/employment-actions.html>) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status. To be consistent with the Faculty Affairs recommendation, the faculty member should retire in good standing in order to be positively recommended by the department head.

Contact Office

Department of Marine Biology, Office of the Department Head, e-mail: armitage@tamu.edu