



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

## College of Arts and Sciences

### Department of Physics & Astronomy

## GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

*Approved by the College of Science Executive Committee: December 13, 2016*

*Updated and Approved: January 10, 2019*

*Updated and Approved: February 27, 2020*

*Updated: November 24, 2020*

*Updated: December 20, 2024*

*Updated: July 10, 2025*

*Updated: January 19, 2026*

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Areas of Faculty Performance</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Annual Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>7. Mid-Term Review</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>8. Post-Tenure Review</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status</b>	<b>31</b>

### **1. Introduction**

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Arts and Sciences is to provide the highest quality education in science and liberal arts to all Texas A&M majors, while leading in fundamental scientific research and creative scholarship. The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences deliver scholarly and technical expertise to the state, nation and world and prepare our students to become the next generation of leaders. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College of Arts and Sciences 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. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University, the College and the Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

In this document, the College of Arts and Sciences clarifies from its perspective the procedures, general expectations, and responsibilities regarding the evaluation of all faculty positions in the College. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department Heads, Department and College evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult but most important functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the College depends upon the quality of these reviews.

This document articulates general Department of Physics and Astronomy and the College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for faculty annual review, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review, consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

TITLE	LINK
<b>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</a>
<b>12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf</a>
<b>12.06.99.M1 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M1.pdf">https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M1.pdf</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.

It is critical to establish a general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the College. Furthermore, professional integrity and concern for the common good are hallmarks of the academician. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to develop a scholarly and balanced approach to his or her specialty, with full recognition of the requirements of the agencies and other administrative units that may share in their mission, responsibilities, and/or compensation.

These documents are reviewed, interpreted, and approved on a regular basis by the College of Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, the Texas A&M University Vice-President for Faculty Affairs, and the Provost.

## **2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks**

The department has a diverse faculty with a wide array of duties and responsibilities. Regardless of the track or rank of faculty, the department recognizes the vital contributions all faculty make to its mission and goals. Within the department, faculty may be tenure track and have an unmodified title or non-tenure track (academic professional track) and have a modified title. The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe model patterns of emphasis that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable departmental evaluations. The definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at University Rules 12.01.99.M1.

### **I. Tenure Track**

A specific system of faculty tenure underpins the integrity of an academic institution; it is awarded to individuals in recognition of their demonstrated capabilities and reflects continued worth to the University, College, and department in anticipated intellectual development and performance. The awarding of tenure allows the tenured individual freedom of teaching and scholarship. Tenure is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual's academic citizenship and service, teaching, and scholarship.

**Tenure.** Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom. Tenure is granted to a subset of faculty who are appropriately capable and productive in research, teaching,

citizenship, and service, and who have demonstrated over time that they will likely continue to be especially productive. The tenure track is not considered appropriate for faculty members who are narrowly focused on either teaching or research activities. Faculty being evaluated and seeking promotion and tenure should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements from the University, College, and Departmental perspectives. The College of Arts and Sciences conducts formal college-level reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: 1) near the end of the third year of service (mid-term review) and 2) during the penultimate (sixth) year of the probationary period (promotion and tenure review). In this document, the department clarifies from its perspective the procedures defined in System Policy 12.01, University Rule 12.01.99.M1, and University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines (posted by the Provost's Faculty Affairs office).

Included in the Tenure Track are the following unmodified titles/ranks: **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor** and **Professor**.

## **II. Academic Professional Track**

The College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Physics & Astronomy recognize the vital contributions that all faculty members make to our mission and are committed to career development and job stability. As such, appropriate evaluation and reward mechanisms for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty members are essential. Decisions on the promotion of APT faculty members must accommodate their unique job descriptions and allow for evaluation and recognition of their contributions to the college and department. This document is designed to provide a means to appoint, evaluate, promote, and retain APT faculty members whose effectiveness and excellence make them beneficial members of the college and deserving of promotion and stability of appointment.

The expectations of the Department of Physics and Astronomy for its APT faculty are that they develop a balanced approach to their teaching, research, service, and scholarly activity when applicable. The nature of teaching requires both flexibility and freedom (UR 12.01.99.M1). Departments may make Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments when programmatic needs can best be met by persons whose academic responsibilities would make appointments to the tenure-track inappropriate. Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty must have credentials appropriate to the title and consistent with SACSCOC rules for accreditation. APT faculty can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and indicators of effectiveness and excellence to be used for APT faculty member appointments, annual review, and promotion.

Research faculty members are also in the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Physics & Astronomy academic professional track. University guidelines for appointment and promotion of research track faculty are provided by the Provost's Faculty Affairs office in the Research Professor Hiring Guidelines.

Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences include the Professorial and Lecturer tracks and ranks. The Professorial track includes adjectival designations, such as "Instructional", "Research", and "Visiting". APT ranks in the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Physics & Astronomy are the following modified titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional

Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor, Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Lecturer.

### **Instructional Track**

Appointment to the APT instructional faculty rank requires, at a minimum, a PhD degree and evidence of superior teaching experience. APT faculty can, in some circumstances, be assigned to graduate courses. In such cases, the faculty member should have unique qualifications and be properly credentialed. Assignments to teach graduate courses should not be made without the approval of the Department Head.

***Instructional Assistant Professor.*** The position of Instructional Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but also make additional contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Assistant Professor title will hold a PhD degree in the related field. Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to engage in activities other than teaching. Most commonly, instructional faculty will contribute to outreach and/or service. A contract of instructional faculty may include research activities at some level. In this case, it is expected that the research component will be compensated by the extramural funds at the respective level. Additional activities may be noted in the annual performance evaluation, but are not formally evaluated. Instructional faculty are evaluated in two areas, with teaching weighted at a minimum of 70%, and service or research components. Activities weighted at or below 10% level will not be formally evaluated. For example, instructional faculty with 70/20/10 weights for teaching, research, and service components, respectively, will be evaluated in teaching and research only. Most commonly, the activities split for instructional faculty will be 75/25 between teaching and service, which corresponds to the standard teaching load of five 3CH courses per academic year (for a total of 15 credit hours), with a typical split of 3+2 or 2+3 in the regular fall+spring semesters.

***Instructional Associate Professor.*** The position of Instructional Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make additional contributions in scholarship, outreach or service. Faculty members in the Instructional Associate Professor title will hold a PhD degree in the related field. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching. Most commonly, instructional faculty will contribute to outreach and/or service. A contract of instructional faculty may include research activities at some level. In this case, it is expected that the research component will be compensated by the extramural funds at the respective level. Additional activities may be noted in the annual performance evaluation, but are not formally evaluated. Instructional faculty are evaluated in two areas, with teaching weighted at a minimum of 70%, and service or research components. Activities weighted at or below 10% level will not be formally evaluated. For example, instructional faculty with 70/20/10 weights for teaching, research, and service components, respectively, will be evaluated in teaching and research only. Most commonly, the activities split for instructional faculty will be 75/25 between teaching and service, which corresponds to the standard teaching load of five 3CH courses per academic year (for a total of 15 credit hours), with a typical split of 3+2 or 2+3 in the regular fall+spring semesters.

***Instructional Professor.*** The position of Instructional Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching, but who also make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Such contributions shall be recognized broadly, inside and outside the TAMU

community. Faculty members in the Instructional Professor title will hold a PhD degree in the related field. Instructional Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent teaching and meritorious scholarly and/or service credentials with evidence of recognition beyond TAMU community. Most commonly, instructional faculty will contribute to outreach and/or service. A contract of instructional faculty may include research activities at some level. In this case, it is expected that the research component will be compensated by the extramural funds at the respective level. Additional activities may be noted in the annual performance evaluation, but are not formally evaluated. Instructional faculty are evaluated in two areas, with teaching weighted at a minimum of 70%, and service or research components. Activities weighted at or below 10% level will not be formally evaluated. For example, instructional faculty with 70/20/10 weights for teaching, research, and service components, respectively, will be evaluated only in teaching and research. Most commonly, the activities split for instructional faculty will be 75/25 between teaching and service, which corresponds to the standard teaching load of five 3CH courses per academic year (for a total of 15 credit hours), with a typical split of 3+2 or 2+3 in the regular fall+spring semesters.

### **Lecturer Track**

**Lecturer.** The position of Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are neither required nor expected to make contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Lecturer title will hold a PhD degree in the related field and primarily be engaged in instruction. The standard teaching load for a lecturer is nine credit hours per semester (six courses per academic year). Lecturers will be formally evaluated only in teaching activities.

**Senior Lecturer.** The position of Senior Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are neither required nor expected to make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Senior Lecturer title will hold a PhD degree in the related field and will be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in some service or administrative activities as required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. The standard teaching load per semester is nine credit hours or six courses per academic year. Senior Lecturers will be formally evaluated only in teaching activities.

**Principal Lecturer.** The position of Principal Lecturer is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and who are not required to consistently make significant contributions in scholarship or service. Faculty members in the Principal Lecturer title will hold a PhD degree in the related field and will be engaged in instruction. They may be expected to engage in service or administrative activities as required to carry out or complement their instructional duties. The standard teaching load per semester is nine credit hours or six courses per academic year. Principal Lecturers will be formally evaluated only in teaching activities.

**Reclassification between APT tracks.** The Department of Physics and Astronomy and the University consider the transition from Lecturer to Instructional Assistant Professor, from Senior Lecturer to Instructional Associate Professor, and from Principal Lecturer to Instructional Professor as a lateral move and a reclassification of title and not a promotion. See the drespective discussion on the faculty affairs website (<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/academic-leaders/reclassifications.html>).

### **Research Track**

**Research Assistant Professor.** The position of Research Assistant Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research. Faculty members in the Research Assistant Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Assistant Professors are generally not expected to engage in teaching. However, such activities may take place based on the agreement between the department and the faculty. In such a case, they shall be considered in the annual performance evaluation.

**Research Associate Professor.** The position of Research Associate Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but who also may make additional contributions in teaching, outreach or service. Faculty members in the Research Associate Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Associate Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent research. They are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in the annual performance evaluation.

**Research Professor.** The position of Research Professor is an academic professional track appointment for faculty members whose primary responsibility is research, but who also may make additional contributions in outreach, teaching, or service. Faculty members in the Research Professor title will hold a terminal degree in the research field. Research Professors are expected to have a record of effective and excellent scientific research and a meritorious scholarly reputation at the national or international level, and appropriate service credentials. Research Professors are not expected to engage in teaching, but should such activities take place, they shall be considered in the annual performance evaluation.

The College of Arts and Sciences and Department of Physics and Astronomy use other titles, such as **Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, etc.** Additionally, titles such as **Senior Professor** and **Executive Professor** are used in a more limited manner. Appointments for such titles require the Dean's approval.

### **Multi-year Instruction Track Appointments**

The Texas A&M University System policy 12.07 does not authorize rolling appointments for APT faculty. Therefore, the following College of Arts and Sciences guidelines for the granting and extension of multi-year fixed-term appointments for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors have been established. Granting of the initial multi-year fixed-term appointments will be made upon a peer review of the candidate's qualifications, as per the criteria stated in departmental guidelines. Extension/renewal of multi-year fixed-term appointments will be decided in the penultimate year of a multi-year appointment. Faculty members cannot be terminated during the multi-year fixed-term appointment period except for good cause or financial exigency.

APT faculty members appointed at the **Lecturer** or **Instructional Assistant Professor** levels will have annual appointments and are not eligible for multi-year fixed-term appointments unless justified by the Department Head and approved by the Dean.

Faculty members appointed to **Senior Lecturer** or **Instructional Associate Professor** will have annual appointments. After serving continuously for three years (years of service in lower ranks are included),

Senior Lecturers and Instructional Associate Professors may be eligible for a three-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval.

Upon promotion to a **Principal Lecturer** or **Instructional Professor** and after serving continuously for five years, including service at lower ranks, a faculty member may be eligible for a five-year fixed-term appointment upon recommendation by the Department Head and with the Dean's approval.

The multi-year term appointment and/or renewal is not guaranteed but is awarded and/or renewed based upon excellence in assigned responsibilities and in alignment with the programmatic needs of the department and college. Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to renew a multi-year fixed-term appointment, shall be given in writing in the penultimate year of the fixed term and in accordance with University Rules. Non-renewal of a multi-year fixed-term appointment cannot be appealed.

### **3. Areas of Faculty Performance**

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

The nature of a faculty member's contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, assigned responsibilities, and stage of career. This document does not provide a specific formula for faculty contribution. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable College evaluations. All faculty members should strive for excellence and are assessed periodically according to their assigned responsibilities. Tenure track faculty members are expected to make substantial contributions in all areas of academic endeavor: research, teaching, citizenship, and service. Academic professional track faculty are expected to make contributions in two areas, and lecturers are expected to contribute in teaching only.

#### **Criteria for Review**

Faculty evaluations will be conducted at regular intervals, once per year, to support and retain faculty who have been hired by the College. The value of a faculty member to the institution determines the degree to which the institution is interested in retaining and promoting the faculty member. Thus, assessment of the value to the institution of a faculty member is of importance. This assessment accounts for the diverse contributions by any faculty member to the many needs and missions of the College, his or her department, as well as the assigned duties of the faculty member. Consistent with Texas A&M policy and the philosophy of the College and the Department, it should be emphasized that both an established track record of excellent performance and the potential for continued excellent performance are of primary importance. The relevant criteria applicable, from the Department of Physics and Astronomy perspective, for the annual evaluation of faculty performance are defined in the following sections.

##### **3.1 Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the department, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty, with the exception of those on research tracks or with other responsibilities (e.g., administrative assignments). 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 broaden the development of the department's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself easily to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but are not sufficient to evaluate teaching. The department shall develop guidelines for the evaluation of faculty effectiveness and excellence in teaching, including specific assessment methods and measures. These shall include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning.

Essential qualifications for instructors are the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. An accomplished science teacher has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, skill at delivering material and presentations, respect for students, and enthusiasm for mentoring and teaching. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance include coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, effective classroom presentation, and reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Student evaluations are central measures for the process of evaluating effective teaching. Peer evaluation may also be used for assessing teaching performance. Indicators of outstanding performance include peer recognition, student satisfaction, and student learning outcomes. Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and professional development are important measures of scholarly teaching. Receipt of awards is a key indicator of teaching success, such as selection for a College, University or professional society outstanding teacher award.

With regard to teaching evaluation, a **Teaching Evaluation Table** should be constructed that contains the following information for the evaluation year: a listing by semester of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, and students' evaluation.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

**3.1.1 *Teaching quality.*** The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including keeping abreast of the spectrum of current literature in one's discipline.

**3.1.2 *Essential pedagogy.*** The use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; written, oral, and visual presentation clarity; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; and stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving.

**3.1.3 *Educational innovation.*** Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Examples of innovations in teaching are, taking **advantage** of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, or developing unique methods to evaluate student learning.

**3.1.4 *Teaching professionalism.*** Mentoring students, using appropriate methods of evaluation and providing adequate feedback to students are essential aspects of professionalism in teaching. Additionally, being aware of students' classroom situations, managing the learning environment, and building rapport with students of all abilities are also measures of professionalism.

**3.1.5 *Impact upon students.*** A positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and values result from effective instruction. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

**3.1.6 Degree of teaching responsibility.** The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to College teaching programs must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having primary responsibility for a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course and evaluating student learning through course assessments.

**3.1.7 Promotion of active, high-impact learning.** Student success requires active engagement in the material. Faculty members should engage in active learning approaches in their teaching, as possible.

**3.1.8 Educational contributions.** Educating the next generation of scientific leaders and researchers is one of the main missions of the department. Faculty contribution to effective supervision of research activities of undergraduate and graduate students and Postdocs is an important metric.

## 3.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

High-quality **research** and publication are fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence and national prominence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence. Impactful **scholarly activity** is defined as creative intellectual work that is validated by peers as original in content and communicated in an effective manner. For purposes of the department, research and scholarly activity might encompass scholarly discovery and the creation of new knowledge, scholarly integration (whereby the relationships among isolated facts are compiled, elucidated, and given perspective), scholarly application, invention or innovation, or scholarly teaching (which is distinct from effective or excellent teaching), where faculty engage in teaching-as-research to develop and communicate teaching resources and best practices in the field.

All tenured faculty members must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other scholarly work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustainable research program, candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, preferably, international level.

A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated science, published work or production of patents. Publications in highly ranked refereed journals carry the greatest weight. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work. Scientific research depends on appropriate levels of funding. Therefore, the capacity for identifying, seeking and obtaining research funding is a critical measure of sustainable scholarly productivity. In evaluation of research funding, emphasis is placed upon extramural granting sources. In all instances, the quality and impact of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

Some APT faculty titles may require scholarly work beyond teaching. Scholarship is broadly defined here as creative intellectual work, typically validated by peers and communicated. For scholarly activities to be most effective, faculty members should have broad-based knowledge, as well as discipline-based expertise. Scholarly works might involve, but are not limited to, the creation of new knowledge or investigations into teaching, pedagogy, and learning. Meritorious teaching scholarship is distinct from effective or excellent teaching. Physics Education Research (PER) is one particular example of teaching scholarship. It will be evaluated based on peer-reviewed publications record, external and internal funding, and record of presentations at regional, national, and international meetings.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating research and scholarly activity performance are:

**3.2.1 Intellectual curiosity.** The foundation of quality scholarly activity is the identification of a topic needing study and motivation to conduct appropriate investigation of it.

**3.2.2 Scientific communication.** Original research and scholarly activity are considered evidence of scientific impact, but only after acceptance for publication or communication at a scientific conference.

**3.2.3 Research funding.** Financial resources, particularly external grants, to conduct impactful scientific research are critical criteria for the assessment of excellence.

**3.2.4 Collaborative approach.** Although individuals are encouraged to develop an independent research portfolio and balanced publication record, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research are all valued by the department.

**3.2.5 Acknowledgments of impact.** Accomplishment in research and publication is an important component in decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. These are often best assessed by eminent scholars in the field and acknowledgments of research by peers are valued criteria for evaluation.

**3.2.6. Generation of patents.** Inventive or innovative activities resulting in the production of patents are considered evidence of scientific impact.

### **3.3 Academic Citizenship and Service**

The department must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence and a variety of roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. Additionally, the contribution that a faculty member may make through his or her citizenship and by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, College and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career; however, all faculty members are expected to be good academic citizens.

**Academic citizenship** is defined as a measure of one's commitment and ability to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the missions and mandates of the department, College, University, and profession through service. The key dimensions of academic citizenship are collegiality and teamwork. Collegiality is the relationship between colleagues. Colleagues are those explicitly united in a common purpose and respecting each other's abilities to work toward that purpose. Collegiality and teamwork are the positive, interactive relationships between colleagues in the performance of their academic duties in teaching, research and service.

The department will not discourage debate or disagreement on policies; rather, it is vital to foster and maintain an environment conducive to vigorous debate and inquiry. Faculty disagreement with colleagues and administrators is not to be taken as evidence of a lack of collegiality but should proceed in a manner consistent with civil debate, avoiding personal attacks and promoting resolution of differences. Consistent behavior that undermines collegiality interferes with the mission of the University. Indeed, University Rule 12.01.99.M1 states that "professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University" is a requirement for promotion and tenure.

**Academic Service** contributes to the departmental mission of advancing science locally, in the State and Nation. All faculty members must share the work necessary to maintain the operation of the Department, College and the University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving academic programs and services, the growth of their profession,

and the continuing education of the public at-large. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve at-large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature and reputation of the department.

The scope of departmental activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, advising, and special training or professional development programs. The College of Arts and Sciences also expects its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing minor administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to possess a much broader service portfolio and to provide considerable leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

Some APT faculty titles may require service to the unit beyond teaching. The contribution that an APT faculty member may make by serving on key committees is essential to the day-to-day functioning and progress of the department, the College, and the University. The amount and nature of the faculty member's service contributions are likely to differ as a function of the individual's skills, interests, and stage of career development.

The relevant criteria considered in evaluating academic citizenship and service performance are:

**3.3.1 Personal integrity and accountability.** A faculty member's collegiality and fairness in the performance of required duties is essential to the function of a department. This includes, but is not limited to, timeliness and willingness to cooperate with colleagues.

**3.3.2 Professional communication.** Faculty members must seek to maintain open communications with diverse colleagues and administrators, and must work toward solutions of problems.

**3.3.3 Departmental engagement.** Engaging in activities that benefit others apart from oneself, including accepting reasonable amounts of committee work commensurate with one's academic rank.

**3.3.4 Colleague/Student mentoring.** Developing mentoring relationships with colleague and students, including those of diverse cultures, beliefs and backgrounds, is critical for program success. Additionally, serving as an advisor to student organizations is a valued endeavor.

**3.3.5 Academic leadership.** Serving in departmental, college or university taskforces, major committees or administrative roles (e.g., section chief, assistant/associate department head, or director titles) exemplifies a commitment to the academic whole.

**3.3.6 Service to the field.** Citizenship and service activities, such as society leadership, editorial boards or policy panel memberships, performing reviews for journals and funding agencies that benefit science outside of the University are important criteria for evaluation.

## **4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

The department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Most obviously, the indicators of excellence and effectiveness of performance may vary among faculty on academic professional tracks and those on tenure track. Indicators of excellence and effectiveness will differ for faculty whose roles are primarily in the area of research, as opposed to teaching. Additionally, performance and its 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. Rather, it provides guidelines for the development and implementation of departmental faculty evaluation processes. Nonetheless, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development

and to favorable evaluations of teaching, research/scholarly activity, academic citizenship and service. Documentation of excellence and effectiveness during faculty evaluation is best provided by peer review.

**4.1 Indicators of *Excellence in Teaching*** can include, but are not limited to:

- outstanding evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by department head, peers, or external evaluators,
- outstanding evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- selection for department, College, University, or professional association outstanding teacher awards,
- contribution to new instructional program development, such as development of new courses or major revision of existing courses,
- serving as a chair, co-chair or member of numerous graduate advisory committees,
- publications with authorship by trainees (i.e., undergraduate research publications),
- successful curriculum development grants, and
- obtaining grant support for classroom and laboratory teaching or course development,
- authoring of textbooks or other instructional material, and
- excellence in coordination of multi-section courses.

**4.2 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching*** can include, but are not limited to:

- positive evaluations based on classroom or laboratory visitation by department head, peers, or external evaluators,
- positive evaluations of teaching performance by students,
- evidence of rigorous and equitable grading (i.e., DFQ rates that meet departmental expectations),
- development of appropriate assessment tools for measuring student learning outcomes,
- direction of independent student research,
- completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods,
- significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness, and
- development of innovative pedagogical materials or strategies for active learning.

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

- successful obtainment of extramural funding for research activities,
- prolific publication of research for which the faculty member was a major contributor in peer reviewed journals, publication in top tier peer reviewed journals or publication of particularly important, foundational results in the field.
- invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings,
- recognition from peers by obtaining awards in the field
- invitations to present at national or international meetings,
- authorship of review articles,
- authorship of monographs, books, textbooks, and book chapters,
- evidence of leadership of or significant contributions to successful team research/scholarly activities,
- evidence of leadership of or significant contributions to successful team efforts at the interface of academic disciplines,
- national attention, as demonstrated by special recognition,
- key participation in collaborative research/scholarly efforts,

- key participation in forming collaborative research arrangements with industry,
- creation of innovative technical approaches adopted by others, and
- significant intellectual publication in patents, copyrights or royalty/licensing agreements.

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

- obtainment or pursuit of extramural funding for research activities,
- publication of research for which the faculty member was a major contributor in peer reviewed journals,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings,
- presentation of papers of original research at professional meetings by mentees,
- publication of papers of original research in proceedings of professional meetings,
- effective contribution to an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary project,
- patents, copyrights or royalty/licensing agreements,

**4.5 Indicators of *Excellence in Academic Citizenship and Service***, can include, but are not limited to:

- engaging in activities that foster national and international collaboration,
- making personal contributions to the public mission of the University to forward its programs for the public good,
- engaging in activities that foster diversity, inclusion and a culture of respect,
- excellent serve as a member of a committee within the department, College, or University,
- excellent serve as a chair of a committee within the department, College, or University,
- serving as an officer or board member in a local, state or national professional organization in one's discipline,
- effective and significant service on state, national or international commissions, task forces, committees, or boards.
- attraction of significant development support,
- consultation with state, national or international government offices or programs,
- selection for department, College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards,
- service as an editor or associate editor of a publication in one's discipline, and
- service as a grant/contract reviewer and/or panelist for research organizations, institutions or foundations,
- preparation and presentation of public information and service programs with the goal of increasing public awareness of science.

**4.6 Indicators of *Effectiveness in Academic Citizenship and Service***, can include, but are not limited to:

- recognizing and responding to the needs of colleagues and/or the department, and assisting in times of sickness or other circumstances in which there may be special needs,
- striving to achieve departmental and College goals and mandates,
- engaging in or initiating activities that benefit others,
- making reasonable adjustments that accommodate others or enhance the greater good of the group,
- engaging in the creation of a University culture requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance,
- serving on departmental, College, and University committees and task forces,
- contributing to the promotion of unit diversity, inclusion and climate,
- serving as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations,
- contributing to external developmental efforts,
- serving on a mentoring committee for early career faculty,
- promoting significant teaching, research or service experiences for students,
- promoting national and/or international experiences for students,

- serving as an advisor to student organizations,
- serve as reviewer for professional journals,
- serving in other administrator roles (e.g., section chief, assistant department head, or director title) within the department, College or University,
- participating in K-12 or other public outreach.

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion in the faculty ranks, faculty members shall be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. The promotion process, whether tenured and tenure-track or academic professional track is very similar and is on the same timeline for all promotions.

### 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, academic citizenship 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 promotion and/or tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences are as follows:

**5.1.1 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.** Depending on the appointment and assignment, primary emphasis should be placed on achieving excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, with attention to service. Assistant professors should be building the trajectory and theme of their academic career. Doing this involves developing a clear vision and record of scholarship and sustainable research support, building their teaching skills and portfolio, taking on the role of mentor where applicable, and exploring select service roles that complement their other activities.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track, the criteria are outlined in University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

**5.1.2 Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.** Emphasis should be placed on further development of scholarship within categories recognized by the College and indicated earlier in this document. This personal and professional development is expected to result in recognized leadership and accomplishments in the individual's specialty area. Associate professors will be expected to exhibit increased evidence of academic citizenship and service, as well as excellence and effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities and a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence in the chosen areas of research and scholarly activity. Associate professors aspiring to the rank of Professor must document effectiveness in instruction, as well as research and service, and demonstrate leadership as a scholar through a strong publication record and consistent pursuit of extramural funding and research mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students.

For promotion to Professor, the criteria are outlined in University Rule 12.01.99.M1.

## **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 activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

The promotion process for APT faculty is unique in several ways, as stated in the VPFA guidelines. Importantly, the university does not require support letters for APT faculty. Therefore, letters are not required for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor at the Department of Physics & Astronomy. Since evidence of recognition beyond the TAMU community is expected for Instructional Professor, at least two external letters from the faculty at the rank of Instructional Professor or Professor at institutions other than TAMU are required for promotion to Instructional Professor. No letters are required for promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer.

Research track faculty are expected to demonstrate evidence for a rigorous research program and a significant contribution to the field. This can be best evaluated by peer reviews. For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a minimum of five support letters are required, of which at least two should be external (for the university) letters from “arm's-length” reviewers. For promotion to Research Professor, a minimum of five support letters are required, of which at least four should be external letters from the “arm's length” reviewers.

Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by a department committee, the department head, the college committee, and the dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the Provost's Faculty Affairs office for approval by the Provost and President.

Annual evaluation and considerations for promotion of APT faculty performance shall emphasize the **quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments** in teaching, scholarship, and service. Instructional and Research faculty tracks are evaluated in two of the three areas, while Lecturers are evaluated in the teaching area only. For faculty in the instructional and lecturer APT tracks, the criteria that may be used for evaluation, promotion, and the granting/renewal of multi-year fixed-term appointments (where applicable) are as follows:

### **5.2.1 Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as a lecturer (or equivalent),
- excellent annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism, and
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

### **5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer**, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as a lecturer (or equivalent),
- excellent annual evaluations of teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program.

### **5.2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor**, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an instructional assistant professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership, and
- evidence of scholarly activities or research,
- evidence of outreach and service activities.

### **5.2.3 Criteria for Promotion to Instructional Professor**, can include, but are not limited to:

- experience as an instructional associate professor (or equivalent),
- excellent teaching performance,
- professional growth in teaching,
- expansion of teaching qualifications (including honors, certifications, etc.),
- excellence in assigned teaching responsibilities,
- collegiality and professionalism,
- other contributions to the teaching mission of the department or program,
- participation in program/curriculum development and/or similar activities,
- supervision of program activities,
- program leadership,
- evidence of scholarly activities or service, as applicable,
- internal/external grant funding to support teaching or scholarly activities,
- invitations to teach at domestic or international institutions,
- state, national or international outstanding teaching awards,
- placement of students in academic or professional positions,
- significant service to the College, University, or community, and
- significant service to state, national or international organizations.

### **5.3 Timing of Promotion and Tenure Review**

The timing of the tenure and promotion review is mandated by University regulations. Specifically, the tenure review is conducted during the year determined as follows: calendar year hired plus the probationary period and minus 2 years equals the tenure consideration year. An early review for tenure and promotion can be conducted when requested. While a candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

Extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in special circumstances, pending approval of the Department Head, Dean, and VPFA. Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances and with approval by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases: leave taken without pay or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year (provided the leave is not taken solely to enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure), encountered circumstances that seriously impede progress (e.g., serious illness or injury; primary care of a child or disabled or elderly relative), or serious disruption of the probationary period beyond the candidate's control.

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration.

Complete promotion and tenure packets, including dossiers, external letters and departmental recommendations, are due to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in late fall each year, **approximately the first day of October.**

#### **5.4 Promotion and Tenure Review Dossiers**

The faculty candidate is responsible for preparing documents for inclusion in the dossier, as listed in the University Promotion and Tenure Packet Submission Guidelines. These include the candidate's personal statements, curriculum vitae, and various charts and tables. Typically, this information is provided before May 31st, so that it may be included with requests for outside letters that are typically submitted in June. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers (and, optionally, a list of names of those who should not be reviewers). The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee may also request additional items from the faculty candidate. The dossier includes all elements required by university regulations.

**Dossiers for promotion and tenure review.** Of the two formal college-level reviews (mid-term and promotion and tenure), the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate's tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with University guidelines for tenure and promotion and departmental discussions, reports and votes will be consistent with University rules. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion at departmental meetings and reflect the vote.

**Candidate's curriculum vitae and statements.** The curriculum vitae documents the faculty member's entire academic career and contains precise narratives of accomplishments where appropriate.

Publications and other scholarly contributions are differentiated into those peer-reviewed and those not. The teaching, research and service statement clearly articulates the accomplishments of the faculty member and provides context for evaluation of those accomplishments listed in the curriculum vitae. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts are defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to departmental standards, and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities is clearly defined. Extraordinary accomplishments involving service are clearly represented with an indication of their importance.

**Outside letters of evaluation.** To enhance the effectiveness of the candidate's dossier, the dossier must contain letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. Along with the candidate, the Department Head and departmental P&T committee provide recommendations on reviewers, with the Department Head selecting the individuals who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate. Ideally, most reviewers will be full professors at leading and/or peer institutions. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. **All letters for P&T candidates must be "arm's length".** Letters from previous recent collaborators (last 5 years), former supervisors, recent coworkers (last 5 years), domestic partners or family members such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative, or other colleagues who are not arm's-length will not be considered. In some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate (e.g., being part of a large research consortium that published together). In such a case, the department head must first consult with and get approval from the dean. If approved by the dean, the justification and approval by the dean must be included in the dossier. These external letters are of considerable and special importance in the evaluation of scholarly research activity.

## 5.5 Department-Level Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The initial responsibility for ensuring that the candidate's dossier is correctly assembled lies with the Departmental Promotion, Tenure and Appointments (PTA) Committee. The PTA committee shall consist of six tenured faculty members who serve staggered three-year terms, with three members elected at-large by the faculty and three appointed by the head. Terms will be staggered so that each academic year, one elected and one appointed term will expire. It is expected that the head will use the appointed members to achieve a balanced representation of the faculty in the committee. A copy of the departmental information is available for distribution to the faculty.

When reviewing the dossier, the departmental committee is responsible for the collection of additional evaluation resources as needed for a fair and thorough review of the candidate's teaching, research and service activities. With regard to teaching evaluation, the PTA shall undertake a thorough examination of all course materials, including syllabi, assignments, and exams. The PTA shall compile and submit a Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table with their recommendation, which includes all formal courses taught by the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure reviews). This table will contain the following information for all years (or last 5 years) since the

previous promotion: a listing by semester and year of each course taught by the faculty member, the number of students enrolled, the mean course GPA, and the mean overall student evaluation (i.e., score on 1-5 scale).

The Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Table shall accompany a narrative describing the faculty member's teaching that includes multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of that teaching. The narrative shall contextualize evaluation scores and grade distributions with respect to departmental standards and expectations. Note that numerical evaluation ratings may differ among units. Therefore, a definition of how numerical evaluations were obtained and how they are to be interpreted shall be included in the narrative. Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., nature of courses taught).

***Evaluation Process and Voting Procedures.*** The departmental bylaws outline the procedure and voting process. The PTA is responsible for reviewing outside letters of evaluation and preparing the statement on the credentials of outside referees. The PTA committee also prepares a report evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, and service, and conducts the committee-wide vote. The PTA committee meetings can be conducted in person or virtually. It is a responsibility of the PTA committee chair and all members of the committee to ensure confidentiality. Following the PTA's discussion and vote, a faculty meeting is held where a discussion and an eligible faculty-wide vote is conducted anonymously (i.e., Yes, No, Absent, or Recuse) on each faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. All faculty meetings in the Department of Physics and Astronomy are conducted in person only.

***Recommendation of the Departmental P&T Committee.*** The candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, including strengths and weaknesses of the case, must be included in a signed committee report. This report is submitted to the Department Head as a memorandum that accurately expresses the nature of the faculty discussions and presents in tabular form the vote. This document forms a part of the faculty member's promotion/tenure recommendation packet.

The Department of Physics and Astronomy will have the entire tenured departmental faculty provide the official P&T vote as a "committee of the whole" for the record. The departmental bylaws define the voting procedure.

***Recommendation of the Department Head.*** The Department Head prepares and submits an independent recommendation to the Dean, notifying the candidate at the time of this communication to the College of Arts and Sciences. The department head makes a clear recommendation that summarizes the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explains the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum is limited to three pages in length and includes a summary of the strong and weak points of the faculty member under consideration. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. Each faculty member shall be informed, through the department head, of the recommendations at each step of the promotion and tenure evaluation process and this information shall be transmitted in writing.

## **5.6 College-Level Promotion and Tenure Review**

After receipt of the candidate's dossier, the Dean or their designee ensures that all necessary documents are present. If deficiencies are found, for example, the Departmental PTA Committee's teaching report does not include explicit consideration of the necessary spectrum of evaluation information (student evaluation scores for individual courses, narratives based on peer review, etc.), the dossier is returned to

the Department Head for further action by the departmental committee. If the omission is merely clerical in nature, provision of the necessary documents to the College P&T Advisory Committee may suffice. If the departmental review committee evaluation was not based on the appropriate body of information, the college review committee is responsible for requesting that a proper reevaluation be conducted.

**College of Arts and Science Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.** The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee following the college-wide guidelines and procedures.

### **5.7 Promotion to Professor**

The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor. However, the review committee composition may be different in the case where the Department T&P Committee includes members who are Associate Professors. Associate Professors may not participate in a review for promotion to Full Professor. When selecting potential sources for outside letters, the candidate and Departmental T&P Committee should ensure that at least some of the sources are able to comment credibly on the candidate's international reputation. The departmental review committee will prepare a Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Chart to accompany the teaching evaluation narrative (see sections 3.1 and 5.5 above). For promotions to full professor, the Candidate's Teaching Evaluation Chart will report course evaluation information for the period since receiving tenure.

### **5.8 Tenure of Associate Professors and Professors**

Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor, although in some cases an expedited process can be approved by the Dean and Dean of Faculties.

### **5.9 Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments in cases where a scholar's expertise is appropriate may be made between academic units. The qualifications for such an appointment shall be the same as those for full appointment in the College of Arts and Sciences. For appointments funded jointly across multiple departments, more than 50% of the appointment shall be located in one department and the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. For purposes of promotion and tenure, if the faculty member has their primary appointment elsewhere in the University, the joint appointment in the College of Arts and Sciences affords no privilege of tenure. If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, then the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with University, College and Departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the department must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty.

### **5.10 Appeals**

University policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If the faculty member alleges such a violation,

he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure.

## 6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In this document, the Department of Physics & Astronomy provides general expectations and responsibilities regarding annual evaluation of all faculty positions in the department. These procedural guidelines are intended to be helpful to individual faculty members, Department Head, Department evaluation committees, and others charged with conducting faculty evaluations or preparing recommendations for consideration by the Head. Evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the College depends upon the quality of these reviews.

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 head will need to collaborate with the head of the appropriate unit to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). In the case of budgeted joint appointments, it is recommended that heads 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 and PRC/RAS with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

College of Art and Sciences annual reviews will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members. The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank and the review should be conducted differently depending upon the stage of a faculty member's career. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance and for merit salary increases.

The departmental bylaws define the annual review procedure in the Department of Physics and Astronomy. It starts with a mandatory annual report submitted by the faculty by mid-February through the Interfolio system. Two peer-review committees are formed for the annual evaluation – the Research Assessment Sub-committee (RAS) and the Peer Review Committee (PRC). The committees are charged with providing the annual evaluation of all faculty and writing a report to DH by late April. The report must include a ranking of all faculty in all areas of performance. The DH reviews the recommendations of the committees and prepares an annual report for all faculty. It is expected that DH follows the

recommendation of the RAS/PRC in the majority of cases. In rare cases, the DH can modify the rankings suggested by the RAS/PRC committee, with clear written justification for such action.

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that APT faculty be evaluated annually in their areas of responsibility, with greater than 10% effort allocated. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for APT faculty. Faculty members should be evaluated largely on their primary responsibility of teaching. However, contributions in scholarship and/or service, including their effectiveness and excellence, shall be evaluated as appropriate for specific job responsibilities. Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with the University rule 12.01.99.M1.

All University-employed faculty members, including APT faculty, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads are responsible. For annual reviews of APT 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 an APT faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities, such as teaching, 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 members with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head and PRC with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. APT faculty members 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.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.
- The purpose of the annual APT faculty review is to provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position. Reviews also provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty

member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved. Finally, such feedback is critical for the faculty member's progress toward promotion.

Annual reviews by the Department Head are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. Annual evaluations are conducted in an honest and judicious manner. Although University rules do not require the department head to consult members of the department's faculty in conducting annual faculty evaluations, in the Department of Physics & Astronomy, annual reviews are conducted by the Peer Review Committee and Research Assessment subcommittee that provides recommendations to the department head regarding annual evaluations.

Annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the APT faculty member and the department/program. 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. Departments shall create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year and their level of progress toward tenure is reported to them in a timely manner. In this regard, Department Heads write a specific annual evaluation for probationary faculty members. This memorandum reports the results of the annual evaluation and states whether they concur with the review committee's evaluation. If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to qualify for tenure, the person should be given a notice in writing of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint.

## **6.2 Focus**

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

## **6.3 Time Period of Review**

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year.

## **6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance**

During an annual faculty review, evaluation in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 3 above) will be rated on five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement", "Meets expectations," "Exceeds Expectations," "Outstanding" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas of teaching performance needing improvement.

Meets Expectations – evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

Exceeds Expectations – evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators and can be evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments.

Outstanding – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category shall be outstanding classroom educators and can be evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

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

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of 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.

Meets Expectations – evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

Exceeds Expectations – evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Annual evaluations should be focused on recent recognitions and achievements, rather than the life-time accomplishments. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

Outstanding – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Annual evaluations should be focused on recent recognitions and achievements, rather than the life-time accomplishments. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

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

Unsatisfactory – the absence of evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service.

Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement in unit service.

Meets Expectations – evidence of **effectiveness** in citizenship and service. Those in this category will be involved in local service and service to the broader community appropriate for their career stage and assignment.

Exceeds Expectations – evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities and service to the broader community, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

Outstanding – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in citizenship and service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities and service to the broader community, administrative duties, and/or outreach efforts.

## **6.5 Required Components**

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with 12.01.99.M1, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### **6.5.1 Faculty members' report of previous activities**

The exact form of the faculty member's F180 Interfolio report must include the following:

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

The following items are expected in the report:

- **Research and Other Scholarly Activity**
  - Publications
    - Papers published in refereed journals during the past calendar year
    - Papers submitted to refereed journals during the past calendar year, but not published during that time
    - Contributions to national and international conference proceedings that were published during the past calendar year
    - Contributions to national and international conference proceedings that were submitted during the past calendar year, but not published during that time
    - Other publications, such as books, book chapters, etc.
  - Patents, and patent applications.
  - Presentations at National or International meetings
  - Seminars and colloquiums
  - Other research / scholarly related activities and accomplishments
  - Project Funding
    - Active funded projects during the past calendar year. Include title, sponsor, PIs and CoPIs, total amount, amount associated with the reporting faculty (estimate), account number, start and end dates, and personnel supported by the project.
    - Proposals submitted but rejected or not yet decided
  - Research Projects not currently funded
- **Teaching**
  - Courses taught. Include title and course number, level, semester, number of students and number of sections taught.
  - Comments on classroom teaching
  - New courses, laboratories and Instructional Materials Developed
  - Research supervision
    - Undergraduate research
    - Graduate research

- PostDoc research
- Other teaching activities
- **Service**
  - Service on committees. Include committee name, type, your role (chair or not), number of meetings per year, hours spent in calendar year, percentage of committee work done by you
  - Administrative duties
  - Graduate and Undergraduate recruitment
  - Other services, such as service as an officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organizations; reviewer for refereed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations; editor or member of editorial board of a major journal; member of review panel for a national research organizations; service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies; service on a major governmental commission task force or board; advisor to student organizations, etc.
- **Other Activities**
- **Graduate Student Support**
- **Undergraduate Student Support**
- **Summary of Accomplishments.** Describe in free form what you consider to be your most significant accomplishments during the past calendar years and provide the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. State your short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

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

The department head 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 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 made in Interfolio's Faculty 180 that:

- 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 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. Note that all written annual reviews are available to the person being reviewed upon request.

### **6.5.4 Performance Assessment**

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, scholarly activity, and service, as appropriate for the assignments, 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.M1 (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 6.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 8.2.) 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 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by 12.06.99.M1 (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 8), 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 department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The VPFA's *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."

## 7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of 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. The letters of recommendation (internal or external) are not required for the mid-term review. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's PTA committee, department head, the college P&T committee, and the 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 target time-period for the midterm review is the calendar year of hire plus three years. For example, if the faculty member is hired in calendar year 2025, then the review should be done between March 2028 and December 2028.

See below an example of the mid-term review of a faculty member hired in calendar year 2025.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2025	7 years	Mar – Dec 2028

**Dossiers for the mid-term review.** The mid-term reviews are a significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty. These early reviews are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews are thoughtful and careful. Faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period. Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for tenure and promotion, except that external letters are not required. Additionally, work under review or in progress is of special importance in mid-term evaluations. The curriculum vitae must clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications. Mid-term department level reviews are conducted by the PTA and department head.

Mid-term college-level reviews require copies of all annual review evaluations and letters be sent by the Department Head to the candidate. The mid-term dossier also includes a report on teaching, research, and service, written by the department's PTA. The teaching documentation contains an evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the educational mission of the department and an evaluation of teaching quality. Reports on peer review or classroom visitations may be included, and a summary of numerical teaching evaluations from individual courses is required. The recommendation letter from the Department Head indicates his/her overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.

### **7.3 Feedback form midterm review**

Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head, and departmental PTA.

## **8. Post-Tenure Review**

In accordance with University SAP 12.06.99.M1 (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, Peer Review Committee (PRC) and Research Assessment sub-Committee (RAS).
- 2) Periodic review by PRC and RAS (see Section 8.2.).

### **8.1 Purpose**

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

### **8.2 Peer review committees**

The Peer Review Committee (PRC) performs annual reviews and periodic reviews of all faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The PRC shall consist of five tenured faculty elected at-large. Each member will serve a two-year term, and terms will be staggered.

The Research Assessment sub-Committee (RAS) is charged with providing assistance to the PRC in evaluating research performance of all faculty. The RAS will report the results of its assessments to the PRC in a timely fashion. If the PRC has reservations about the RAS assessment of any faculty members it will meet with the RAS to resolve these differences. The committee shall consist of three tenured faculty elected at-large, and three tenured faculty appointed by the head. All appointments are for two-year term, and terms will be staggered so that only three terms expire in any given year. It is expected that the head will use the appointed members to achieve a balanced representation of the faculty in the committee.

## **8.3 Process**

The periodic review of tenured faculty will evaluate the faculty member's scholarly productivity in teaching, research and academic citizenship and service over the period of six years in accordance with the criteria for categories of performance as defined in departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines and shall be reported as either Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.

### **8.3.1**

Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee will include the curriculum vita, teaching evaluations, annual reports for six previous years. Research and teaching statements may be requested by the PRC during the periodic peer review process if clarifications are necessary.

**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 (meet expectations), 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 PRC/RAS and the department head.

**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>1</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head will share the report with the other department head of the secondary unit.

**8.3.8** **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>,** each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

#### **8.4 Professional Development Review**

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 6.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review (see Section 8) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.6). 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 SAP 12.06.99.M1 (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 8.5) 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.

**8.4.2.1** The Dean will meet with the Department Head and the faculty member to determine the membership of the Professional Development Review committee. The committee will consist of three faculty members at a rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on the review committee will depend on the specific responsibilities and assignments of the faculty member under review.

**8.4.2.2** Once charged, the College of Arts and Sciences requires that the ad hoc Professional Development Review committee meet and evaluate all of the materials described in Section 8.4.3 below and any other documentation provided by the Department Head.

---

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

**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. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 8.5 below) acceptable to the dean.

**8.4.5.3** Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates on the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 8.5 below) 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, 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 the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

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

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

### **8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review**

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

### **8.8 Flexibility**

Flexibility should accrue with seniority. Flexible guidelines are appropriate during post-tenure review. This faculty evaluation process should assess the contribution of a faculty member toward carrying out the university's overall missions. Thus, determination of what constitutes a satisfactory evaluation in all categories of research, teaching and academic citizenship and service should be guided by flexible criteria. The criteria described in the department guidelines for post-tenure review should take such flexibility into consideration.

## **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 VPFA website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status. In the Department of Physics and Astronomy, the emeritus status is awarded based on the overall long-term contribution of the faculty member to the department, after a discussion at the faculty meeting and a vote of the faculty at large. The emeritus status is granted if the majority of the faculty voting are positive.