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Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Preamble: These guidelines were reviewed and approved, prior to department head vote, by a Faculty Taskforce. The taskforce had representatives from each academic department as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Department</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Dr. Stephen Curley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Biology</td>
<td>Dr. Tom Iliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Dr. Ed Clancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Sciences</td>
<td>Dr. Kyeong Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Transportation</td>
<td>Capt. Jim Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Administration</td>
<td>Dr. Grace Wang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines and procedures are based on requirements and guidelines found in the following:

3. Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost’s Promotion & Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines and Guidelines for Annual, Mid-Term Review & Post-Tenure Review (http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/Annual,-Midterm-and-Post-tenure-Review-guideli-(1).

For the purposes of this document, Texas A&M University at Galveston is considered a “College” of Texas A&M University. All System and University documents referring to faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, and review apply to the Galveston Campus.

II. EXPECTATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The expectations of the Galveston Campus for its faculty are that they continually strive for impactful contributions in teaching, in service to the department, university and to their profession, and for tenure-tenure track Faculty to establish and maintain an independent and sustainable scholarship program that leads at minimum to a national reputation in their area. What sustainability means for different fields will be different in terms of absolute resources required to allow the Faculty to maintain an active output in his/her discipline.

The mandatory intermediate reviews and the annual faculty reviews are expected to evaluate the contributions to our undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, research and/or scholarly activities, and engagement. Specifically, the impact of faculty members’ activities on academic endeavors needs to be demonstrated. The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor differ in degree and emphasis as described in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.
Department Heads are primarily responsible for ensuring that the University and Galveston Campus procedures are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of his/her accomplishments and performance. The overall purpose of these guidelines is to ensure the integrity of the annual review, intermediate review, promotion and tenure process, and post-tenure review in order to retain and promote the best faculty possible. Within these overall procedures, it is specifically noted that departmental practices may differ because of variations in department size, the nature of departmental faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. Departmental procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with System Policy, University Rules, and Campus Guidelines while achieving departmental objectives.

The guiding principles in setting review guidelines are presented below:

- Every Department should have review guidelines to clarify how annual, promotion and tenure (P&T), and post tenure reviews (PTR) are performed. In the absence of Departmental guidelines and procedures, recommended procedures for each of the three review processes are included in this document. Departments may chose to use these guidelines as a default but existing Departmental guidelines should prevail.

- In the case of P&T and PTR reviews, only Faculty of similar or higher rank can review the dossier (e.g. Tenured Associate and Full Professors for Assistant Professors going up to Associate with Tenure; Full Professors for promotion of Associate to Full; Tenured Faculty and Associate and Full Instructional Professors for Assistant Instructional Professors going up to Associate, etc).

- The P&T review committee should be the same for any particular rank reviewed during a cycle (if 2 or more candidates in a Department are going through the same rank review – e.g. Assistant to Associate with tenure – then the P&T committee for these should be the same).

- In the event that any (or all) of these reviews require a committee, the guidelines should specify how members are appointed (how is the committee composed, who is responsible for the decision to appoint committee members, what is the selection process and/or eligibility criteria?)

- What is the process for writing the report of any review?

- For reviews that require external reviewers’ comments, who is in charge of identifying names from external reviewers? Who is in charge of soliciting letters?

- If an external member is needed from an external Department on the P&T review committee, the guidelines should describe the process for selecting such a member, what the eligibility criteria are, and who makes the decision to include the external member.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW

The annual review is performed by the Department Head and the process must be completed to support his/her recommendations of merit pay increases for faculty. Each faculty member must submit an annual review report to the Department Head each year. The report will normally be due by January 31 for the preceding calendar year. The Department Head will notify faculty members each year of the due date. Faculty
members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the multiple missions of Texas A&M University, in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member. Typically, the report will address the following activities:

Section A. Teaching
Section B. Scholarly and Creative Activities
Section C. Service
Section D. Department Specific Activities
Section E. Prospectus
Section F. Evaluation

The Department Head will invite each faculty member to schedule an in-person conference to review the materials submitted, discuss performance, and agree on goals for the next year. Evaluation of the faculty member in each category will normally follow the criteria presented in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2. The signature of the faculty member and the Department Head on the Form G2 will serve to confirm that the annual review has taken place, but not that the faculty member necessarily agrees with the assessment.

Examples of criteria that may be employed in evaluation of Faculty for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are found in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

A. Teaching

This category includes, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction, development of new courses and teaching methods, including the development or expansion of electronic delivery of course content, academic advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and mentoring.

The Teaching section will document the faculty member’s teaching accomplishments for the review year. Teaching is an important mission of the University, but more than acceptable teaching is expected. Publication of instructional material and development of methods that improve the curriculum are both desired and meritorious. Faculty members shall be permitted to respond to or qualify written comments in course evaluation forms.

1. Courses Taught covers all courses taught at Texas A&M University at Galveston. The TAMUG instrument used to assess student perceptions will be used by all faculty members in all courses each semester. The Department Head will compare assessments by students in like courses and subject matters as one aspect of excellence. For example, graduate and undergraduate, required and elective, laboratory and didactic or seminar settings should all be factored into the assessment process and may provide important contextual information. Awards from organizations from within and outside the department, TAMUG, and TAMU might be used to substantiate excellence in teaching. Other evidence could be developed through teaching portfolios, course syllabi, and similar artifacts of the teaching process.

2. Undergraduate and/or graduate students supervised; documents undergraduate or graduate student committee assignments. Indicate whether responsibility is as chair (C) or member of (M) the student’s committee, and whether the committee is part of the A&M system or another institution of higher learning. In teaching students, or through committee work as a chair or member of a student
committee, it is expected that an assessment of the success of the candidate, as evidenced in career placement, publications, or other activity, would be included.

3. Other courses taught; recognizes the development of, or participation in, recognized programs for continuing education, short courses, or special workshops. Written assessments by participants are required. Funding support agency (if any) should be identified. Documented national/international recognition or adoption of program by professional society, state agency, etc., is also desirable.

4. Teaching innovations such as the development of innovative teaching methods and materials (textbooks, software, new curricula, etc.) should be documented. Any of the following would indicate a contribution: creation and teaching of a new course, adoption by other professors of methods/materials developed during the prior year, the introduction or further development of courses or course materials which explicitly incorporate international, interdisciplinary, or multicultural perspectives, high-impact teaching practices, and/or positive review of these methods/materials appearing in respected publications.

5. Invited Lectures; include invitations to teach at outside academic institutions. Normally an invitation from a distinguished institution would constitute a contribution. Combinations of numerous invitations are valued.

6. Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness may be considered in the annual review.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities

For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative or professional activity. Engineering technology, fiction, poetry, and dance are examples. Faculty members must document scholarly activities, including works in progress.

Experts in the same or related disciplines must make decisions about the quality or merit of scholarly and creative work. Peer review is essential. A book or article written but unpublished, an artwork completed but not juried, or the rendering of professional collaboration and consultation not subject to peer recognition is less significant in this category. Examples of the creation, influence, and dissemination of the ideas/work must be documented.

1. Publications include publications in refereed journals, conferences, and/or leading professional journals; the publication of scholarly books, conference proceedings, and/or chapters in scholarly books; monographs, publication of professional projects; technical reports, including those to a granting agency; patents; publications of open-source material will bear more weight if peer-reviewed and from leading open-source publishers; acknowledgment of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, inclusion in an exhibition catalogue, or descriptions in a curator’s statement; and creative work included in a public or private collection, invited exhibition, traveling exhibition, screening, or broadcast. The essence of this section is that intellectual work and its by-products are subject to external peer review. The intent of this dimension is that the dissemination of intellectual work products leads to impact on the field, which itself is evaluated through citation and reference from members of the intellectual community and others. The candidate must thus explain the quality, productivity overtime, and impact of their research/scholarly work. In the case of multiple authorships, the candidate should highlight the level of their own contributions to publication.

2. Showings of creative work in design development or visual and performing arts includes such things as engineering design development; presentation of artistic work in juried or judged venues; inclusion of works in refereed or juried catalogs or collections, or in other invited exhibitions; public forums,
screenings, or broadcasts; and acknowledgement of creative work through selection as a subject for a published article, exhibit catalog, or curator’s statement; show awards, or other forms of external recognition.

3. Funded research includes recognition of receipt of external resources for scholarly and creative activities and/or evidence of completed, peer reviewed research activities. External resources might include, but would not be limited to, fellowships, contracts, or research grants. The status of any research work in progress should be stated. Identification of funding sources (particularly from Federal granting agencies) must be included.

4. Affiliations include potential activities of a research center/laboratory at TAMUG or a similar research entity not affiliated with TAMUG.

5. Other recognition, includes but is not limited to, juried peer awards by professional societies or national/international groups, refereed non-published presentations, editorship of a refereed journal, member of an editorial board, editorship of a professional journal, membership as judge/critic for national/international organization, or reviewer for competitions, grants, publications, expert witness, invited exhibition curator, and external peer reviewer for a funding agency or tenure/promotion review for another university. Work equivalent to participation in two of the following activities (or two items within one activity) would be considered a contribution: (1) serving on editorial boards, (2) judge or critic for national/international competitions, or (3) ad hoc reviewer for competitions, grants, journals, or contract funding agencies.

C. Service

This includes service to the institution—to students, colleagues, department, TAMUG, TAMU, and TAMUS—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our goals of pre-eminence through service to the institution, students, colleagues, professional societies, governmental agencies, and to the public at large. In each case an important consideration is service that results in the creation of ideas, the influence of ideas, and the dissemination of ideas. Quality and impact of service is expected from each member of the faculty. Service is typically the active participation in professional or community organizations or other bodies that utilize a faculty member’s professional expertise in their field, as an educator, etc. The university values both internal and external service.

1. Advising students at the undergraduate level at or beyond the expectations of regular academic advising of faculty to students is noteworthy.

2. Faculty membership and service on System, University, TAMUG, or departmental committees, or the Faculty Senate.

3. Administrative performance as evaluated over time and including written assessments concerning vision, new initiative, and programmatic development. Includes demonstrated accomplishments at the departmental, TAMUG, or TAMU level. Higher ranks are expected to demonstrate significant professional service such as leadership in their professional organization, editorial board memberships, grant review panels, national taskforce or review panels (e.g. NRC reports), international organizations, etc.
4. Demonstrated leadership service on a governmental commission task force, standing committee, council, or board. Holding an office in or serving as a member of a regional, national, or international society, professional organization, or accreditation board. Being the primary organizer of a program for regional, national, or international meetings is considered to have value.

5. Maintaining/creating a University, college, or departmental website.

6. External development activity that contributes to TAMUG or Departmental goals such as fundraising, endowments, scholarships, Professorships, service to the larger professional community, etc.

7. Service activities not covered in other categories, involve the application of the faculty member’s professional expertise not covered in the above descriptions.

D. Department Specific Activities
For details of this section, see your respective departmental evaluation plan.

E. Prospectus
The Prospectus Section provides the opportunity for each faculty member to reflect on his/her accomplishments over the preceding year; present a candid self-assessment of their performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service; and discuss goals for the coming year and beyond. Goals in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service are required. Faculty members should be able to explain the quality, productivity since over time, and impact of their teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments and provide evidence to substantiate progress on their stated goals, so that performance against these goals can be assessed. At the annual review session with the Department Head, these goals may be amended, deleted, or new goals added.

F. Evaluation
Signatures by the faculty member and the Department Head at the end of Form G2 and the Annual Review Evaluation signify that the annual review process took place. The faculty member’s signature does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation. The Department Head will complete a written evaluation in each area as well as an overall evaluation, and return a copy to the faculty member on or before the last business day of April of that year.

IV. Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Titles, Performance and Rolling Contracts

A. APT Faculty Titles
In accordance with Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles:

1. Faculty members appointed to Executive Professor, Professor of the Practice, Clinical Professor, Instructional Professor, Associate Professor of the Practice, Clinical Associate Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Senior Lecturer (exclusive of the adjectives research, visiting, or adjunct) will have annual appointments for at least the first three years, but will always receive 12-months’ notice if they are not to be reappointed. These appointments do not need to be full-time appointments, but intent to change the percent effort of the appointment should
either be by mutual agreement of the Faculty member and the Department, or after 12 months’ notice to the Faculty member. (Section 3.4 of Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

2. Faculty members in these ranks will normally be considered for promotion after five years. However, unless ‘time in rank’ is one of the criteria for promotion, nothing shall prevent a Faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. Each annual Faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. (Senior Lecturers can be promoted to an [Adjective] professorial title if their appointment responsibilities are expanded beyond solely teaching). Failure to receive promotion does not affect reappointment consideration. (Section 3.4.1 of Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

3. Faculty members appointed to Assistant Professor of the Practice, Clinical Assistant Professor, Instructional Assistant Professor, and Lecturer (excluding the adjectives research, visiting, and adjunct) will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service. Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible. Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven year period are entitled to 12-months’ notice if they will not be reappointed. (Section 3.5 of Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

4. Faculty members in these ranks will normally be considered for promotion from these ranks after five years. However, unless ‘time in rank’ is one of the criteria for promotion, nothing shall prevent a Faculty member from seeking promotion at an earlier time. All requests for promotion from eligible candidates must be considered. Each annual Faculty-performance evaluation must address the extent to which their performance is in line with the level of expectation for their current rank, and, if it applies, the extent to which they are making progress towards their next promotion. (Section 3.5.1 of Texas A&M University Guidelines to Faculty Titles)

B. Annual Performance Review of APT Lecturers, Assistant, Associate and Full Professor Faculty

1. In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in the annual review will be established by department Faculty, approved by the department head, chief academic officer, and Dean of Faculties/Associate Provost. The categories will be established by the departmental standards. Criteria for each of the four categories must be established for teaching, scholarship/creative activities, service, and other assigned responsibilities. A rating of “unsatisfactory” must have a written plan for improvement.

2. If the department uses peer evaluations of performance, the departmental process will clearly state how these evaluations are incorporated in the annual review. For example, departments may have peer committees to advise the department head in the annual review process.

3. The annual review reports will also include Faculty members’ progress towards promotion (where applicable).

4. An annual review in which an unsatisfactory performance in any of the areas of review is determined shall state the basis for the assessment in accordance with the departmental criteria.
5. **Lecturers and Assistant APT Faculty:** An unsatisfactory review in any one year may lead to a non-reappointment for the following academic year or a 12-months’ notice of non-reappointment for Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven year period. If a Lecturer and Assistant APT Faculty, who receives an unsatisfactory annual review is reappointed, a report of unsatisfactory performance will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for improvement established by the Faculty and the department head (see following sections).

**Associate and Full APT Faculty:** A report of unsatisfactory performance will be submitted to the Dean of Faculties and accompanied by a written plan for improvement established by the Faculty and the department head.

6. Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will include the following:
   a. specific deficiencies to be addressed;
   b. specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
   c. an outline of the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
   d. timeline for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
   e. specific criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and
   f. resources to be committed by the department in support of the plan.

7. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, the department head shall make a final report to the Faculty member and the chief academic officer. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all Faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed.

8. If within a five-year period, a Faculty member receives two annual reviews with an overall unsatisfactory rating (does not meet expectations) after being placed on an improvement plan, the Faculty member will be notified that her/his appointment will not be renewed and will be given a notice of non-reappointment, following TAMU’s established guidelines which state:

   *Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget. Faculty members who have continuously been in one of these ranks for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven year period are entitled to 12-months’ notice if they will not be reappointed.* (TAMU Guidelines to Faculty Titles, Section, 3.5, May 2013, p. 6)

C. **Rolling Appointments for APT Faculty at the Associate and Full Professor Ranks**

1. Hiring and promotion procedures will follow the established TAMU and TAMUG processes. An academic professional track Faculty at the full professor rank will be rewarded with a five-year rolling contract, in accordance with established guidelines and with the concurrence of the Faculty member and designated administrators. An academic professional track Faculty at the associate professor rank will be rewarded with a three-year rolling contract, in accordance with established guidelines and with the concurrence of the Faculty member and designated administrators. Faculty hired externally as an
instructional associate or full professor will have a one year probationary period before a rolling multiyear contract is awarded.

2. Each Faculty member’s multi-year, rolling contract is evaluated at the time of the annual review. A satisfactory (meet expectations) annual review will result in validation of the multi-year term of the rolling contract and reinstate the period of contract (3 or 5 years). In the event of an unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations) annual review, the rolling contract stops and the Faculty is placed on an improvement plan as outlined in Section IV. B, Paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 above. The rolling nature of the contract will be restored only after obtaining two successive years of satisfactory (meet expectations) annual reviews.

3. If within a five-year period, a Faculty member receives two annual reviews with an unsatisfactory rating (does not meet expectations) after being placed on an improvement plan, then the rolling contract stops and the Faculty member becomes ineligible for a rolling contract. In all such cases, the Faculty member will be notified that her/his appointment will not be renewed and the Faculty member will be given a notice of non-reappointment, following TAMU established guidelines as noted in Section IV. B, Paragraph 9 above.

Annual review reports for APT Faculty with multi-year rolling appointments will have a statement that clearly specifies the status of their rolling contract and its end date. With each successful annual review, the contract is extended by one year.

In the event of a bona fide financial exigency or the reduction or discontinuance of institutional programs at TAMUG, Faculty rolling contract terminations will be carried out in accordance with TAMU rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 7 “Reduction or Discontinuance of Institutional Programs”.

V. PROMOTION AND TENURE: PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Both the TAMU System and University guidelines concerning tenure and promotion are available on the web for review, and can be found at these links (at time of posting):

1. System Policy 12.01: Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (System Policy 12.01: Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure);

All faculty members are expected regularly to review these web sites, or their successor sites, to remain current with University policies and procedures. If there are any difficulties finding them, contact your Department Head. Each new faculty member and candidate for promotion will be provided with the most current printed version of this document for reference.

Members of the TAMUG faculty under consideration for tenure and/or promotion undergo four steps in the TAMUG review process: 1) Evaluation by Department Promotion and Tenure Committee (Department Review Committee), 2) Evaluation by Department Head, 3) Evaluation by TAMUG Promotion and Tenure Committee (College Review Committee), and 4) Evaluation by CAO. The tenure and promotion package is forwarded to
TAMU’s Dean of Faculties Office for routing to and consideration by the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President before being forwarded to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents.

The faculty member will be notified of the results of consideration at each level in the process. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled upon request to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to the decision. This statement is normally provided through the Department Head.

Promotion and Tenure Categories of Performance

The criteria for determining quality in each performance category can be divided into Indicators of Excellence and Indicators of Effectiveness. Examples of these indicators are listed in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2. TAMUG utilizes Appendix I, and recognizes that it is not an exhaustive list of criteria, but has no specific campus wide criteria to add. The accumulation of activities alone does not constitute effective performance. Rather, the candidate must demonstrate IMPACT in addition to quality and productivity overtime.

- **Teaching:** This category includes classroom instruction, academic advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, clinical supervision, and mentoring.
- **Scholarly and Creative Activities:** For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative or professional activity.
- **Service:** This includes service to the institution - to students, colleagues, department, TAMUG, TAMU, and the System - as well as service to the profession and broader community.

A. Tenured-Track (TT) and Tenured (T) Faculty

1. Scheduling

   Time lines and schedules of activities are determined by University Rules and the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties. For details, consult University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties home page, both accessible through the TAMU web site. Also, refer to Appendix A in this document.

   A Faculty member is entitled to early consideration for promotion and/or tenure at her/his own request. Any Faculty member who wishes to initiate early consideration for tenure shall so notify the Department Head in writing no later than April 15 of the year in which the staff member wishes to be considered.

   Faculty members undergoing early tenure consideration shall be considered together with the tenure cohort of the year of tenure consideration commencing in May following the request.

   A Faculty member whose application for early tenure has been unsuccessful shall be considered again in the mandatory year of tenure consideration for his or her rank.

2. Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

   a. In the absence of Departmental guidelines and procedures, the following procedures for P&T review will apply. Each Department will use a Committee of the Whole to perform mid-term and promotional reviews of tenured and tenure-track Faculty on Galveston Campus. The Committee of the Whole consists of all tenured Faculty at or above the rank sought by the individual seeking tenure and/or promotion. If rank holders are not available in the department, then the
Department Head will choose Faculty member(s) beyond the department or campus as necessary to include at least 5 members in the committee. If 2 or more candidates in a Department, going through the same rank review, require a similar external committee member(s), then the external reviewer(s) will need to agree to review all dossiers in consideration. Exclusions of eligible Faculty members from the Committee of the Whole are not permitted except when the Faculty has a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g. spouse).

b. In cases where the Committee of the Whole is larger than 5 Faculty, the Head of the Department will appoint a sub-committee of the tenure and promotion committee, and its Chair (3-5 Faculty). The sub-committee will be appointed for one year, and the Department Head will review new or reappointments every year in the spring. The purpose of the subcommittee is to prepare and review the dossiers for the individual(s) seeking tenure and/or promotion. The sub-committee Chair will solicit letters from outside reviewers, and members of the subcommittee will collect the relevant materials from the department and from the candidate(s), will prepare the reports on teaching, research, and service, and will make sure the dossier is properly assembled. The sub-committee Chair will forward the report to the committee of the whole for a vote. The Chair of the sub-committee will then incorporate the faculty vote in the sub-committee report and will forward to the Department Head.

c. No committee member shall serve at more than one level of the tenure consideration process (e.g. Department and University P&T Committees) of any one candidate in the same year of tenure consideration.

d. Selection of outside reviewers’ letters should be performed according to the University guidelines as outlined in Section IV of the Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines (available on the Dean of Faculties web site). Briefly, the department should aim to include 5 to 7 letters from outside reviews. The minimum number of letters required is 5. Outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better, but letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable. Where the stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, include an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer is appropriate. For example, an institution of lower reputation than Texas A&M may have one of the strongest programs in the candidate’s field. Although letters may be requested from outstanding individuals outside the academy, the file should still include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities. IMPORTANT: Include a list of the department’s peer and aspiring institutions if other than AAU-level institutions, and the basis for the selection. It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers.

e. The candidate may also provide a list of those who should not be consulted. The Department Head or P&T sub-committee also provides a list of possible reviewers. The P&T sub-committee will select a group of at least seven external reviewers from the two lists. The Department Head will then contact the external reviewers. The committee should ensure that a mix of letters is solicited - some suggested by the candidate and some by the Department. Clearly indicate in the External Reviewers Chart who suggested which reviewers, which requested letters were or were not received. All requested letters that are received must be included in the dossier.
B. Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

1. Scheduling

Time lines and schedules of activities are determined by University Rules and the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties. For details, consult University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties home page, both accessible through the TAMU web site. Also refer to Appendix B in this document.

2. Department Promotion Review Committee

In the absence of Departmental guidelines and procedures, the following procedures for P&T review will apply. Similarly to TT/T Faculty P&T Review process, each Department will use a Committee of the Whole to perform promotional reviews of academic professional track Faculty on Galveston Campus. The Committee of the Whole consists of all tenured and APT Faculty and at or above the rank sought by the individual seeking promotion. All procedures cited in Section V. A.2. above apply, to the exception of requiring evaluation letters from external reviewers.

C. The Review Process

1. Dossier Preparation

All Faculty candidates are required to submit a dossier for tenure and/or promotion according to the provisions and schedule determined by University Rules and the Dean of Faculties. With the exception of the tenure and promotion review for TT Assistant Professors, which has a set mandatory review timeline, the decision to submit one’s dossier for consideration for promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Professor and for all APT Faculty should be made by an individual in consultation with his or her Department Head. The Department Head establishes a Department Promotion Review Committee for the individual in accordance to the established Departmental guidelines, or in the absence of such in accordance with Sections V. A or V. B. The Review Committee should meet with the candidates for promotion during the Spring semester of the year in which they wish to be considered, or as soon as possible after the announcement of the schedule for the promotion process for that cycle is announced by the Dean of Faculties, in order to assist them in developing the documentation for their support package, their vitae, and their statements concerning teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

2. Review

Tenure-track faculty will undergo a comprehensive review in their third year. This review will take place sometime during May-December of the individual’s third year on the faculty and will follow the same basic process and timetable as the promotion and tenure process for that academic year. This review should mimic the tenure review process as closely as possible, with the exception of requesting evaluations letters from external reviewers. Candidates should anticipate the activities and approximate dates noted in the annual Dean of Faculties announcement outlining the dossier process (see the home pages of the Dean of Faculties at TAMU or of the Office of Academic Affairs at TAMUG).

In the year that any faculty member is reviewed for actual promotion, the formal tenure and/or promotion Review Committee will be established according to Departmental guidelines, or in the absence of such according to the guidelines outlined in Section V. A. or V. B.

Each faculty member under consideration for third-year review, tenure, and/or promotion will be provided with a current description of the materials needed for tenure and/or promotion and a time
line for the preparation of those materials, normally during the spring of the year in which they will be considered. Materials will be prepared in a manner consistent with the guidelines available through the Dean of Faculties Office of Texas A&M University (see the annual Promotion and Tenure publication on the Dean of Faculties home page, also available on the home page of the Office of Academic Affairs).

3. Dossier Evaluation

It is a shared responsibility of the Review Committee, in consultation with the Department Head, to solicit statements and data from the candidate, external reviewers, former students, TAMUG peers, etc., as appropriate, as explained above. It is then the Review Committee’s responsibility to review these statements concerning the quality of the candidate’s teaching, scholarly and creative activities, service, and other activities, based on the Dossier that the candidate presents, that will be forwarded through subsequent levels of the review process. The type of information contained in the tenure and/or promotion package is mandated in University Rules and explained on the Dean of Faculties home page. The responsibility for the objective analysis of the individual candidate is first that of the Review Committee. The Review Committee must provide specific, concrete statements based upon documented evidence and peer review to substantiate their recommendations for retention, promotion, or denial. These recommendations must be consistent with the evidence of performance and impact of all levels of activities as documented in the dossier.

4. Role and Responsibility of the Individual Faculty Member in the Review Process

The ultimate responsibility for assuring that all pertinent materials are supplied to the Review Committee lies with the Faculty member being considered for tenure (herein, “the candidate”). The candidate must explain to the Review Committee, and provide evidence of, the significance and impact of their teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service contributions. Candidates should consult with their Department Head and review University Rules and the Dean of Faculties home page for the materials they should collect. Individuals should also be considering potential external reviewers, persons who are familiar with the field in which an individual is working and whose credentials qualify them to evaluate the candidate’s work (please consult the statement on selection of outside reviewers in section V. A.2.d. above and the Dean of Faculties’ Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines (Section IV).

Documents important to the faculty member for review, promotion, and tenure are the statements on teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, and the curriculum vitae. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to keep his or her vitae current and organized in a manner appropriate to his or her discipline and include all professional activities that would be appropriate to consider for tenure and/or promotion, including, but not limited to, the types of activities mentioned in University Rules and the Dean of Faculties home page.

5. The Dossier

The package of review materials is prepared according to the content and format requirements set in the Dean of Faculties’ Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines.

The candidate’s support package to the Departmental Review Committee may have significant appendix materials, full copies of articles, texts, photographs of creative work, etc., that need not appear in their entirety in the dossier, although at the discretion of the Review Committee, some material may be appended. The Review Committee reviews the curriculum vitae, the candidate’s
statement concerning teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, course listings, etc., and makes suggestions and corrections to improve the package. Appropriate materials, as determined in the Department’s document on faculty evaluation, may be included in the request letter mailed to the candidate’s external reviewers.

The dossier is then assembled by the P&T sub-committee, with statements on the candidate’s teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, drawing from materials provided by the candidate and information extracted from reviewer’s letters. The dossier may contain examples of the candidate’s scholarly or creative activities if they are essential to a proper understanding of the work of the faculty member.

After the College Review Committee has made its recommendations, forwarded them to the CAO and the CAO has made his/her recommendation, the dossier will be transferred electronically to the Office of the Dean of Faculties for TAMU review.

6. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (See also APPENDIX I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2)

Most faculty members should be evaluated for tenure and promotion on accomplishments in each of the three major categories of performance, but with primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their scholarship and other creative activities as well as teaching activities. TAMUG subscribes to the position that although quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than numbers. For tenure and/or promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the Galveston Campus are as articulated below.

a. **Associate Professor:** Promotion to Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure occur concurrently at TAMUG. Granting of promotion and tenure will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions. At the conclusion of their mandatory review period, Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of scholarly and creative activities and publication. Further, it is expected that Assistant Professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The following questions should guide the review.

1) Has the candidate contributed successfully to the research, teaching, and service missions of the Department and the University?

2) Has the candidate achieved substantial national and/or international recognition in research or another form of creative activity in his/her chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the near future?, and

3) If applicable, has the candidate developed, in the probationary period, a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural funding and support for graduate students?

b. **Professor:** The requirements for promotion to Professor at TAMUG recognize the University’s minimum requirements of completion of all requirements expected of an Associate Professor and superior accomplishment in at least one of three domains - teaching, scholarship or service - and a high level of ability in the other two. Professors are also expected to demonstrate outstanding
merit in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. By itself, administrative experience is insufficient as a justification for promotion to the rank of Professor. The following questions should guide the review.

1) Has the candidate developed successfully a leadership role in research, teaching, and service missions of the Department and the University, recognized at national to international levels?

2) Is the candidate recognized, by her peers, as leading scholar in her chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence to do so in the near future?, and

3) Has the candidate developed, since her last promotion, a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural funding and shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision?

7. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (See also APPENDIX I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2)

Most faculty members should be evaluated for tenure and promotion on accomplishments in two of the three major categories of performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. TAMUG subscribes to the position that although quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than numbers. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected. The criteria for the Galveston Campus are as articulated below.

The adjective modifier of Academic Professional Track Faculty includes the words Clinical, Executive, Instructional, Research, Senior, and Visiting. Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of the Practice are titles used for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia. Faculty in these non tenure-track appointments will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of service or the area of scholarly research or creative work. Faculty with Research in the title will primarily be expected to make significant contributions to scholarly research or creative work and must contribute to teaching as well.

a. **Senior Lecturer**: The quality and impact of teaching activities will be given primary emphasis for the granting of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to maintain effectiveness in instruction/teaching at TAMUG and/or TAMU. The granting of promotion to Senior Lecturer will demonstrate, over time, excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

b. **[Adjective] Assistant Professors**: [Adjective] Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of service contributions to the department and/or TAMUG and TAMU. The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Assistant Professor (from a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer position) will be based on an assessment of the quality and impact of prior teaching activities and contributions to service. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.
c. **[Adjective] Associate Professors:** [Adjective] Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a productive pattern of service contributions to the department and/or TAMUG and TAMU. The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Associate Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three major categories of performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of effectiveness in service. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

d. **[Adjective] Professor:** [Adjective] Associate Professors are expected to be highly effective in instruction/teaching and to establish a significant pattern of service contributions to the university and/or national professional organizations. The granting of promotion to [Adjective] Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three major categories of performance, with a primary emphasis on the high quality and impact of their teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of excellence and impact in instruction/teaching as well as a pattern over time of significant service. The schedule of promotion activities should parallel that of tenure-track faculty, as nearly as possible.

8. **Department Head’s Review**

In conducting the formal tenure and/or promotion reviews, Department Heads shall draw upon the advice and counsel of the Department Review Committee as well as other appropriate sources. Negative comments contained in external letters are to be addressed by the Department Head as well as by the Review Committee. When the review has been completed, the Department Head will transmit the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of both the Head and the Review Committee to the TAMUG College Review Committee for review. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to advise the faculty member of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at each level of the review. The faculty member may request a written explanation in the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion recommendation at any level.

9. **TAMUG Review**

In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the CAO shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a TAMUG-wide tenure and/or promotion Review Committee (College Review Committee). The College Review Committee is appointed by the CAO and is composed of senior faculty members at the rank of tenured full Professors and including at least one senior Instructional Faculty (Full Professor if available) for the review of Academic Professional Track Faculty.

The College Review Committee submits a complete written report with their recommendation to the CAO. A written report from the College Review Committee is required as a part of each dossier leaving TAMUG. The College Review Committee’s recommendations should be consistent with the evidence of performance as documented in the dossier but should not be merely reiterations of earlier statements.

The CAO’s evaluations of candidates should be independent and not merely restatements of comments made by the Department Head or a Committee. The CAO will submit recommendations to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost by sending complete files to the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties. The CAO will notify the Department Head of recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at levels beyond TAMUG.
10. Promotion and Tenure Process beyond TAMUG

For the policies and procedures used at TAMU, consult University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and the Dean of Faculties home page.

11. Appeal

Faculty members may appeal the announced decision by the University not to continue him/her as a member of the faculty to the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (CAFRT) under the Texas A&M University Rule 12.01.99.M2, “University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion”.

VI. POST-TENURE REVIEW (PTR)

This Post-Tenure Review Section VI. is almost identical to the “Standard Administrative Procedure, Post-Tenure Review” that applies to all of Texas A&M University. Words in red highlight the only differences, and they are related specifically to the Galveston campus of Texas A&M University.

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University at Galveston 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 is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation) as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years.

This procedure does not supersede University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (12.01.99.M2) that defines tenure policies and the process under which dismissal for cause proceedings may be initiated.

A. University Expectations

1. Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g. patient care, extension, administration...) throughout their career.

2. Modifications to these assignments may be expected as a career changes but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.

3. Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and Chief Academic Officer. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

B. Annual Review by Department Head

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

1. In each department, stated criteria for rating faculty performance in an annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by the department head, Chief Academic Officer of
Texas A&M University at Galveston, and Dean of Faculties. These criteria will be published and disseminated in advance of the academic year in which they are to be used. At a minimum, rating categories for annual reviews shall be “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, and “Satisfactory”, each defined according to departmental standards, but additional meritorious categories are normally expected in the annual review process.

2. An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single category: teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g. patient care, extension, administration...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories.

3. An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the Chief Academic Officer.

4. The report to the Chief Academic Officer of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (section VI. C) of the faculty member.

5. If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single category, he or she must work with his or her department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.

6. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department heads or program directors of the appropriate units will collaborate to develop accurate annual reports (12.01.99.M2).

C. Periodic Peer Review

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

1. The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:
   a. Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;
   b. Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
   c. Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and
   d. Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

2. Departments and/or colleges must have post-tenure review guidelines which will clearly state:
a. How peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Periodic Peer Review process. For example, departments may use peer committees that advise the department head for annual reviews, post-tenure review committees, or promotion and tenure committees;

b. Criteria for rating of faculty performance, which must be in agreement with those established for annual review and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty;

c. Review procedures and timelines;

d. The materials to be reviewed. This may, but need not, include materials beyond those submitted for the annual reviews. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon their assigned duties;

e. How a peer review that is incorporated into the annual review process will fulfill the requirements of a Periodic Peer Review for Post-Tenure Review purposes (e.g. once every six years the committee will assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member; use the average of 3 consecutive annual peer reviews; 3 consecutive unsatisfactory departmental annual peer reviews);

f. The process by which peer-review committees are selected.

3. A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department/college guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (section VI. D).

4. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (section VI. D).

5. 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 and the faculty member.

6. For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department the department head will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.

7. By no later than May 31st, each department will provide to the Chief Academic Officer 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.

D. Professional Development Review

1. A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (section VI. B) or an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (section VI. C) or upon request of the faculty member (section VI. G). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the Chief Academic Officer when
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.

b. 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 Chief Academic Officer, 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. 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:

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

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 Chief Academic Officer to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section VI. B.4.

f. 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 Chief Academic Officer. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section VI. D) acceptable to the Chief Academic Officer.
E. The Professional Development Plan

1. The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria developed under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the Chief Academic Officer, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, 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.

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

   a. Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
   b. Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
   c. Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
   d. Set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
   e. Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
   f. Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

2. Assessment.

   The faculty member and department head will meet regularly to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the Chief Academic Officer. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the Professional Development Plan.

3. Completion of the Plan.

   a. When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and Chief Academic Officer. The successful completion of the Professional Development Plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

   b. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and Chief Academic Officer agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Professional Development Plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.
F. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4, Faculty Grievance 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 Chief Academic Officer, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.

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 Chief Academic Officer, whose decision on such an appeal is final.

If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the Chief Academic Officer, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

G. 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 (section VI. C) or a Professional Development Review (section VI. D), by making a request to the department head.

Related Statutes, Policies, or Requirements

*Supplements System Policy 12.06*
ATTACHMENT A: TAMUG TT/T FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

Specific dates beyond the college level are published each year by the Dean of Faculties Office, at [http://dof.tamu.edu](http://dof.tamu.edu).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Calendar (Approximate timeline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form Department Review Committees</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Heads:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet individually with department faculty who seek tenure and/or promotion</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform the TAMUG VP/COO and the CAO of the dossiers being prepared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion and Tenure Candidates:</strong></td>
<td>Late April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submit current curriculum vitae to the Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submit a list of potential external reviewers and persons not to be contacted to the Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assemble materials to be sent to external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidates submit full personal dossier for external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department Head selects external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td>May – July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact external reviewers to secure consent (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send review packets to external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td>Early September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to evaluation of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to other activities, if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Reviewers:</strong></td>
<td>Early September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Return Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Promotion and Tenure - Review Committees:</strong></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare statement on quality of external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write needed reports for inclusion in Dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Calendar (Approximate timeline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Dossier for University review process, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s three-page narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s curriculum vitae, with signed statement of accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s acknowledgment of Dossier contents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of other Activities, if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Statement on quality of Reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All letters to and from outside reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Recommendations from Department Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forward Dossier to Department Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College:</strong></td>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Head:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Late September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations from Department Head added to Dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossier forwarded to CAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Late October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• College Review Committee recommendation added to dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossier forwarded to CAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAMUG CAO:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Early December</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossiers and recommendations to the Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost:</strong></td>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets with the CAO to discuss TAMUG recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost:</strong></td>
<td><strong>January/February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forwards recommendations to the University President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University President:</strong></td>
<td><strong>January/February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forwards recommendations, as necessary, to the Board of Regents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Regents</strong></td>
<td><strong>April/May</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions and Tenure Effective</strong></td>
<td><strong>September 1st</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT B: TAMUG APT FACULTY PROMOTION PROCESS

Specific dates beyond the college level are published each year by the Dean of Faculties Office, at http://dof.tamu.edu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Calendar (Approximate timeline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form Department Review Committees</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Heads:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet individually with department faculty who seek promotion</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform the TAMUG VP/COO and the CAO of the dossiers being prepared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion Candidates:</strong></td>
<td>Early August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidates submit full personal dossier and updated current curriculum vitae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td>Early-Mid September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to evaluation of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to evaluation of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect materials related to other activities, if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Promotion and Tenure Committees:</strong></td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare Dossier for University review process, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s three-page narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s curriculum vitae, with signed statement of accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Candidate’s acknowledgment of dossier contents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of scholarly and creative activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review Committee’s evaluation of other activities, if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Statement on quality of reviewers, if any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All letters to and from outside reviewers, if any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Recommendations from Department Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forward dossier to Department Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Head:</strong></td>
<td>Late September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations from Department Head added to dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossier forwarded to Campus Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Promotion and Tenure Review Committee:</strong></td>
<td>Late October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Review Committee recommendation added to dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossier forwarded to CAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Calendar (Approximate timeline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMUG CAO:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dossiers and recommendations to the Provost</td>
<td>Early December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets with the CAO to discuss TAMUG recommendations</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forwards recommendations to the University President</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University President:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes a final decision on recommendation(s)</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>