

Department of Entomology

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

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

Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on June 14, 2024

Approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on April 12, 2023

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

Approved by the Faculty and Department Head, Department of Entomology, February 08, 2023

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS	4
3. FACULTY MENTORING	7
3.1. Selection of Committee Members	7
3.2. Management of Committee	7
3.3. Best Practices and Outcome of Committee Meetings:	8
3.4. Managing Composition of Committee	8
4. AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	8
4.1. Research, scholarly activity or creative work	9
4.2. Teaching	9
4.3. Service	10
5. INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	10
5.1. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work	10
5.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work	10
5.3. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching	11
5.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching	11
5.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service	11
5.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service	11
6. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE	12
6.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	12
6.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)	13
7. ANNUAL REVIEW	14
7.1. Purpose	15
7.2. Focus	15
7.3. Time Period of Review	15
7.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	16
7.5. Required Components	17
7.6. Assessment outcomes that require action	19
7.7. Timeline	19
7.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines	19
8. MID-TERM REVIEW	20
8.1. Purpose	20
8.2. Process	20
8.3. Feedback from mid-term review	21
8.4. Mid-term review for Academic and Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professors	21
9. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	21
9.1. Purpose	21
9.2. Process	21
10. POST-TENURE REVIEW	25
10.1. Purpose	26
10.2. Peer Review Committee	26
10.3. Process	26
10.4. Professional Development Review	27
10.5. The Professional Development Plan	28
10.6. Appeal	29
10.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	29
11. GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS	29
APPENDIX 1: OUTLINE OF ANNUAL MENTORING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY	30

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Entomology at Texas A&M University is to create and implement knowledge that improves lives. Faculty, students and staff conduct discovery, translational, and applied entomological research, which is delivered to Texans and the world, through educational outreach, classroom teaching, publications, and distance education. 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 and community, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Entomology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among research, teaching, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
<u>University</u> Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
<u>University</u> Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure

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.

Faculty ranks, areas of performance, evaluation criteria, review and promotion processes for AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension Service are defined in the following guidelines:

- [Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Guidelines for Promotion Process](#)
- Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures - [12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review](#) and [12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion](#)
- Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service [Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty](#)

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

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

Tenured Professor. A tenured Professor should lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national and international recognition and leadership through publications in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; maintain sustained external funding for research; provide leadership to interdisciplinary and interagency regional, state, national and international programs; and, when appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Centers. The tenured Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of high-quality courses; through advisement and mentoring of students; and by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and by participating in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The tenured Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the tenured Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

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

Tenure-Track Assistant Professor. The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and lead a research program in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology and related disciplines; achieve national recognition through publications in refereed journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings and participation in peer review; and develop research grant proposals and acquire external funding for research. The tenure-track Assistant Professor will, as appropriate, collaborate with research programs at AgriLife Research and Extension Centers. The tenure-track Assistant Professor will develop and teach undergraduate and graduate courses in related areas of specialization, consistent with needs for the general departmental curriculum and the graduate program; contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through advisement and mentoring of students and by participating in graduate dissertation committees. Through these and related activities and by limited service on departmental service committees, the tenure-track Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

Principal Lecturer. The Principal Lecturer will develop and deliver classroom teaching, primarily at the undergraduate level, in support of the educational goals of the Department for both departmental majors and non-majors in topics related to entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; supervise and train graduate teaching assistants; contribute to student mentorship through office hours and other outside-the-classroom teaching opportunities as appropriate. Participate in occasional committee service both in the department and in the larger university community.

Senior Lecturer. The Senior Lecturer will participate in classroom teaching, primarily at the undergraduate level, in support of the educational goals of the Department for both departmental majors and non-majors in

topics related to entomology, forensic sciences and related disciplines; supervise and train graduate teaching assistants; contribute to student mentorship through office hours and other outside-the-classroom teaching opportunities as appropriate. Participate in occasional committee service both in the department and in the larger university community.

Lecturer. Present lecture and/or laboratory courses in entomology, forensic sciences and related disciplines as appropriate. For lecture courses, specific duties and responsibilities include preparing and presenting lectures, holding review sessions, writing and grading homework and examinations and assigning final grades. For laboratory courses, duties and responsibilities include planning experiments, ordering supplies, presenting pre-laboratory lectures, assuring proper safety procedures are followed, grading lab notebooks and lab reports, and assigning final grades. Both lecture and lab courses involve training and supervision of teaching assistants.

Assistant Lecturer is not a faculty level position and is typically used to allow doctoral students interested in seeking an academic career to develop teaching courses.

Instructional Professor. The Instructional Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and/or related disciplines; achieve and maintain national and international recognition and leadership through their scholarly work and presentations at regional, national, and international meetings. The Instructional Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The Instructional Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college or university programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the Instructional Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

Instructional Associate Professor. The Instructional Associate Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; achieve and maintain national recognition and emerging leadership through their scholarly work and presentations at regional, national, and international meetings. The Instructional Associate Professor will contribute productively to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department through development and teaching of courses of high-quality; by participation in the activities sponsored by the undergraduate program outside the classroom; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. The Instructional Associate Professor will serve on committees in the Department and other college programs as appropriate; provide service to professional societies that support the discipline; and provide a forum for networking among colleagues. Through these and other efforts the Instructional Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

Instructional Assistant Professor. The Instructional Assistant Professor contributes primarily through teaching and scholarship in an agricultural/life science specialization incorporating entomology, forensic sciences, and related disciplines; achieve national recognition through their scholarly work and presentations at regional and national meetings. The Instructional Assistant Professor will develop and teach undergraduate and graduate courses consistent with the needs of the general departmental curriculum and the graduate program; and may participate in graduate dissertation committees and related activities. Through these and related activities and by service on departmental committees, the Instructional Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department.

Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Historically, the Department has only utilized the Research Assistant Professor title but under appropriate situations would consider appointments at the Research Associate Professor and Research Professor levels. As a non-tenured member of the faculty, the Research Assistant Professor assists in the development and execution of research

programs in an agricultural/life science specialization relevant to the Department in collaboration with a sponsoring member of the tenured faculty. The terms of appointment and promotion to Research Associate Professor are defined by AgriLife policy and may include acquisition of independent funding. Research Assistant Professors are expected to contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department through limited service on committees and related activities.

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

3. Faculty Mentoring

Peer mentoring is intended to provide professional guidance for tenure- and academic professional track assistant and associate rank professors on and off campus, as well as for instructional assistant and associate professors throughout the reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure (RPT) process. Guidance provided by the committee to the mentee is not a mandate.

Mentors play a key role in providing constructive critique and advice to mentees throughout the RPT process. Mentoring also provides guidance and assistance to assistant professors as they seek to integrate into the Department of Entomology and the Texas A&M University (TAMU) community.

In order to maximize the efficiency and value of the mentoring process, faculty acting as mentors will agree to play an advocate role. Although mentors are required to make their mentees aware of any perceived weaknesses in their programs, they should refrain from discussing confidential conversations in public. Mentors will have access to inside information that should be kept confidential to improve trust and prevent mentors from unwillingly and negatively biasing any of their mentees' evaluations.

Mentoring Committee's Mission Statement: To provide guidance and assistance to faculty in the Department of Entomology falling in the previously described categories as they seek to develop a nationally and/or internationally recognized, sustainable program, while integrating into the Department of Entomology and TAMU community, as well as to successfully navigate the RPT process.

3.1. Selection of Committee Members

Each mentoring committee will consist of three to five faculty members holding a rank higher than the rank of the mentee. Some considerations for selecting mentoring committee members include, but are not limited to:

- Faculty in the same discipline who can provide feedback on grant proposals, funding strategies, laboratory setup, manuscript submissions, and other research-related activities.
- Faculty with a similar mission and expectations with regards to research/teaching/Extension activities.
- Faculty from another department who can provide advice on challenges relating to sensitive issues encountered within the Department of Entomology.
- In all of the above cases, faculty can be selected from another department or college at TAMU or another Tier I institution and can serve these roles as the candidate best sees fit, particularly when faculty within the department do not meet these criteria.
- The mentee is encouraged to seek the mentorship of faculty who come from different backgrounds so that the mentoring experience can be as productive as possible.

3.2. Management of Committee

- The department head (and/or associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) will work with each mentee to develop a mentoring committee within the first six months of initiation of employment.
- A committee will remain in place throughout the RPT process from assistant professor to full professor.
- The mentee will designate one individual on the committee as Chair.

- The mentee should meet with all mentors individually (and/or as a group) throughout each year on an as-needed basis, with more interactions recommended early in the mentee's career (monthly or quarterly), compared with later years (semi-annually or annually).
- The entire committee will meet with the mentee formally at least once per year (in person or virtually through an online platform, such as Zoom or Skype).
- At this more formal meeting, the mentee will provide the mentor committee with outlines or drafts of his/her research/teaching/service statements, an updated CV and goals for the next year, as well as the annual mentoring committee form.

3.3. Best Practices and Outcome of Committee Meetings:

The following details will be discussed and then written into a summary (Appendix 1. Example of Outline of Annual Mentoring Committee Meeting Summary) by the mentoring committee chair.

- The chair is encouraged to complete the Faculty Mentoring Program: <https://cte.tamu.edu/transform-learning/mentoring/faculty-mentoring-academy>
- Committee approach leading to generation of a strong summary statement will include:
 - A discussion of resources available to the mentee including, but not limited to, 1) grants and 2) training in teaching/presentations.
 - Discussion that should focus primarily on *providing guidance with regards to crafting a cohesive narrative about one's appointment (e.g., teaching, research, Extension, and/or service) and associated program and articulating its impact*. This will be accomplished primarily through continuous feedback on the mentee's research/extension, teaching, and service statements (*as appropriate to their appointment*).
- Annual outcome will provide:
 - A summary of the mentee's advancements as related to their appointment (e.g., teaching, research, Extension, service), mentee needs, and committee recommendations.
 - A brief synopsis regarding recommendations given to the mentee on how to improve any areas of their job performance to help ensure continuous success throughout the RPT process at TAMU.
 - A finalized version signed by the committee and mentee within one month of the annual meeting being held, and, for the given year, subsequently provided to the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) at the conclusion of each calendar year.
 - The report will remain confidential with the mentee, mentor committee, and department head.

3.4. Managing Composition of Committee

The mentee has the opportunity to work with the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) to reshape the mentoring committee member composition, as needed. If changes to the committee composition occur, the department head (and/or the associate department head for Extension faculty, when appropriate) will submit a letter to the individual(s) being replaced.

4. Areas of Faculty Performance

(Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; teaching; and service). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance, as well as their evaluation, 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).

4.1. Research, scholarly activity and/or creative work

Research is critical to the mission of the College and a defining element of our University as a Research I institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. A variety of elements are appropriate for consideration for faculty performance evaluations in research, scholarship or creative activities. See the guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for research evaluation, in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines <https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure>. Tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to be respectively nationally and internationally recognized leaders in their areas of study with demonstrated impact that advances their field or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status in the case of tenure-track faculty members. Effectiveness and excellence in research significantly affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for faculty members with research appointments.

Evaluation of research should focus on: 1) how a faculty member has defined, developed and positioned their scholarship and field of study throughout their career to achieve impact and 2) evidence that their leadership and impact in their field of scholarship compares favorably to accomplishments and reputation typical of leaders in their discipline and field of study. This impact should be supported by demonstrated success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, state, private and corporate funders; number, quality, and impact of research publications in the leading journals; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; number of citations and, where applicable, translational impacts. Leadership, impact, and reputation in the faculty member's field should also be documented, for tenure/promotion, through peer evaluation letters from leaders in the same or closely related field from leading academic institutions. Leadership and impact should be demonstrated mainly from analysis of the content of the faculty member's work and how it has influenced and advanced their field of study.

4.2. Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction as assigned and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. A variety of elements are appropriate for consideration for holistic review of faculty teaching performance. See the guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for teaching evaluation, in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines <https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure>.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria to be considered in evaluating teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to: knowledge of subject matter; skill, experience, and creativity with a range of appropriate pedagogies and technologies; understanding of and skill in using appropriate assessment practices; professional interactions with students within and beyond the classroom; mentoring of student research; and involvement with and contributions to one's profession in enhancing teaching and learning.

In the Department of Entomology, most faculty members will have a job expectation consisting of 60% Research, 30% Teaching, and 10% Service. An analysis of the current fixed credit teaching in the department demonstrated that each faculty member's **teaching effort** in fixed credit courses is between 6 and 9 credits of teaching effort per two years. Please note that teaching effort is not equivalent to, and is often higher than, student credit hours. This analysis used the criteria for adjusting teaching effort of fixed credit courses as outlined in the Faculty Senate Workload Document

(<https://dars.tamu.edu/files/workload-policy>) and available on the Department's Intranet at (currently not operational). The Department Head will review the current teaching effort of fixed credit courses for the year under review and their contribution to graduate education through advising graduate students. Each faculty member's current teaching assignment of fixed credit courses and the planned classroom teaching in the next academic year and the number of graduate students they are advising are used to make adjustments to the faculty member's position description. Those faculty who routinely have a teaching effort in excess of 10 credits will be advised to move to a 45/45/10 appointment (R/T/S). A few faculty who have a reduced teaching effort (<6 credits of effort per year) in fixed credit teaching may have their appointment adjusted to 75/15/10 (R/T/S) to account for increased research and scholarly output to be reflected in their job expectations. Evaluation will be based upon the assignment of the faculty member's appointment.

4.3. Service

Service is essential to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to engage effectively in service to their academic unit and the institution, to their profession, and to society. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion. A variety of elements are appropriate for consideration for evaluation of faculty performance in service. See the guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for service evaluation, in the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines <https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Promotion-Tenure>.

Evaluation of service should focus on the significance and impact of the service activities to the academic unit, the institution, the profession, and society. Excellence in service should document how service activities contribute to national and international reputation and recognition for the faculty member and Texas A&M.

5. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Entomology recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)). All representative indicators listed may not apply to every faculty member and there may be other appropriate indicators.

5.1. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** may include, but are not limited to: publication of papers in leading journals of the discipline and books that synthesize the field; significant impact of scholarly (or creative) work on the discipline, such as high citation rates, innovations that influences the direction of the field, and significant translational impacts (including patents); significant success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, private and corporate funders; invited oral presentations at peer institutions and national and international professional conferences; serving on review panels and committees of national or international research organizations; and selection for prestigious external awards and fellowships.

5.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to: publication of scholarly (or creative) work, such as peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books in quality outlets; presentation of papers at national or international conferences or meetings as appropriate to the

discipline; success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, private and corporate funders; and significant professional development activities (e.g. Faculty Development Leave) that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.

5.3. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to: outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; effective practice of inclusive pedagogies and creating learning environments to support the success of all students; publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (textbook, case studies, etc.); publication of research on disciplinary teaching and learning (SoTL); receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects; outstanding performance in graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, time to degree, placements, etc.); invited presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and national/international conferences; significant efforts in peer mentoring in teaching or professional development in teaching as a facilitator; significant contributions to curriculum development efforts of the academic unit; active engagement in educational reforms at the institutional and national levels; and recognition of excellence by teaching awards at college or university levels, and national/international teaching awards from academic societies and other organizations.

5.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** (for TAMU, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension) may include, but are not limited to: effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction and student outcomes; employing evidence-based pedagogical practices and course designs; development of new courses or major revision of existing courses; practice of inclusive pedagogies and creating learning environments to support the success of all students; effective graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, time to degree, placements, etc.); receiving competitive internal or extramural funding for teaching/learning projects; participation in curriculum development and improvement efforts of the academic unit; significant professional development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness; and selection for a departmental, college or university teaching award.

5.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** may include, but are not limited to: leadership roles in service to the institution, such as chairing major college/university standing or ad hoc committees, being an officer of the Faculty Senate or Council of Principal Investigators, and serving in a college/university administrative leadership role; leadership roles in service to the profession, such as being an officer in a national or international professional organization, serving as program chair at a national or international conference, and serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal in the discipline; significant service to society, such as serving on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board, and providing exceptional professional services to the local community and public at large; significant professional development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

5.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service*** may include, but are not limited to: effective service to the institution, such as serving on college/university and department committees and task forces, being an active member of the Faculty Senate or Council of Principal Investigators, serving in administrative roles or as a committee chair in the department, and serving as an advisor to student organizations; effective

service to the profession, such as being a committee chair in national or international professional organization, being an officer in regional or state professional organization, serving as program chair for regional professional conference, and serving as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations; effective service to society, such as providing consultation to governmental agencies, and providing professional services to the local community and public at large; professional development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

6. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

6.1. 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 (research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences are described in the sections below.

6.1.1. For promotion to Assistant Professor

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

6.1.2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.1) is an expectation of tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research and be recognized as leaders in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Except in the discipline of education, scholarship of teaching and learning should be secondary to scholarship in the research discipline. Collaborative work is encouraged where each member of the group documents their major and independent contribution to the impact of the research. The applicants for promotion should have advanced their field nationally and internationally, demonstrated by specific examples.
- **Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and a sustained trajectory toward teaching excellence (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) are expectations of all tenure-track faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member's appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and some evidence of excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenure-track faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally.

6.1.3. For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 5.1) is an expectation of tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professors. They are expected to be recognized leaders nationally and for most fields internationally who demonstrate impact that has advanced their field. It is incumbent on applicants for promotion to clearly define their field of

research/scholarship and its relevance, value and impact for the department, TAMU/TAMUS, the State of Texas, the nation, and the world. The applicants for promotion should provide specific examples of how they have advanced their field nationally and internationally; activity alone is not a sufficient measure of impact. Leadership and impact of research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.

- **Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and evidence of excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 5.3 and 5.4) are of all tenured faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching effort and load should be documented and reviewed. Teaching course load and assignments should be consistent with the teaching effort associated with the faculty member's appointment, which may vary across disciplines nationally. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented. Impact of teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and evidence of excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of all tenured faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

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

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

6.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 5.2 and 5.3.

6.2.2. For Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 5.3. Excellence and impact in teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

6.2.3. *For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor (or Assistant Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice)*

For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor (or Assistant Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice)

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.2 and 5.3.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these contributions can often have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching.
- **Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

6.2.4. *For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Professor (or Professor of the Practice)*

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 5.2 and 5.3. Leadership and impact in teaching and scholarship of teaching should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 5.5 and 5.6) are an expectation of Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these service contributions should have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 5.1 and 5.2) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. Leadership and impact in research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.

7. Annual Review

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

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

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

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

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

7.1. Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and 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.

7.2. 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 and professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion). The Faculty Annual Performance Review will take into account the faculty member's assigned job expectations outlined in their position description.

7.3. Time Period of Review

The evaluation will be based primarily upon data and metrics pertaining to the previous calendar year, but trends extending into the previous two years and/or into the current year may be considered.

7.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4) will be rated on five categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” “Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations,” and “Superior” based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance. In the Workday system where faculty annual evaluations are loaded, the five ratings are equivalent at “Does Not Meet Expectations,” “Partially Meets Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” and “Significantly Exceeds Expectations,” respectively.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity based on the indicators described in 5.2.
- **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, presentations, book chapters, or other indicators described in 5.2.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, or other indicators described in 5.2.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations and other indicators described in 5.1.
- **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 5.1. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

7.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching based on indicators described in 5.4.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of students, didactic/laboratory teaching, or other indicators described in 5.4.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees, and other indicators described in 5.4.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments and other indicators described in 5.3. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 5.3. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and/or solicited involvement in professional organizations.

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

7.4.3. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 5.6. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service based on indicators described in 5.5. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations (e.g., officer or chair) would be typical.
- **Superior** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 5.5. These faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and/or solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

7.5. Required Components

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

7.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

Faculty will complete a standardized annual activity report in Interfolio Faculty180. The Department Head also requires each faculty member to submit an updated CV, their Annual Plan of Work and a 1-page self-assessment document. The self-assessment document will be a standard form that will contain three components: Teaching, Research, and Service. All documents are needed to complete the Faculty Annual Performance Review. Failure to provide these documents in a timely fashion will result in an overall "Unsatisfactory" rating.

- 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 research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

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

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

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service. Job expectations are adjusted annually at the annual performance review and written into a new position description to account for faculty members who plan to take on an administrative duty, who will be on approved leave during the reporting period, when a new faculty member is hired and will not be teaching classes immediately, or in other circumstances where, on a temporary basis, their job expectations may be 0% in one or more categories. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures. Once the Faculty Annual Performance Review document is completed, the Department Head and the faculty member sign the evaluation to indicate that the review session and feedback occurred. 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. The Department Head can modify the summary document using the written input from the faculty member's response and returns the revised version to the faculty member for their signature. In cases where the overall performance rating assigned by the Department Head is "Unsatisfactory", and the faculty member's written input does not result in a change in rating by the Department Head, the faculty member may request a review of the Faculty Annual Performance Review by the TAMU subcommittee of the elected Promotion and Tenure Committee. The subcommittee provides a written report to the Department Head. The Department Head will use this additional evaluation to consider changing the "Unsatisfactory" rating.

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 and loaded into the Workday system. A copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review is provided to the faculty member. No merit increase can be given without a signed copy of the Faculty Annual Performance Review and position description on file.

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

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

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

A meeting needs to be scheduled between the Department Head and the faculty member to discuss their performance during the previous reporting period with particular attention to his or her overall rating in Teaching, Research, and Service. The department head, director, or supervisor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. Any missing data or errors in reporting can be brought up for inclusion into the assessment. Areas of superior performance along with areas where improvement is needed will be indicated and specific goals will be agreed to if overall performance was rated below Satisfactory. These goals, if met, are designed to elevate the overall performance rating to Satisfactory or above in the next evaluation period. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

7.5.4. Performance Assessment

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

7.6. Assessment outcomes that require action

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

7.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

7.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance

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

7.7. Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The University's Guidelines for Annual & Mid-term Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year."

7.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that their annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the

dean of the college may be appealed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

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

8. Mid-Term Review

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

8.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of APT and tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and/or promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and/or 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/or promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/ director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, 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 mid-term (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action to not renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

8.2. Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2023 and December 2023. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2020	7 years	Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2022-2024)

This review is conducted by the elected Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T committee (8.2.2) with a summary statement provided to all eligible members of the P&T committee following a special called P&T

committee meeting; typically in April or May of the candidate's 3rd year. The dossier is forwarded to the College by the published deadline for review by the College P&T Committee, and the Dean. The midterm review does not go beyond the College.

8.3. Feedback from mid-term 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 (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8.4. Mid-term review for Academic and Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professors and Lecturers

To provide a formative review of Instructional Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors of Practice and Lecturers near the mid-point of the period toward promotion, a similar mid-term review process will be conducted for APT Assistant Professors in the third calendar year in the rank.

9. Promotion and Tenure Review

9.1. Purpose

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

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice) and to Instructional Professor (or Professor of the Practice) recognize demonstrated and continued excellence and impact in teaching and a demonstrated commitment to excellence in service or research. Promotion to Senior Lecturer and to Principal Lecturer recognize demonstrated and continued excellence and impact in teaching.

9.2. Process

9.2.1. Guidelines for the Promotion/Tenure Review Process

The promotion/tenure review process (including the timelines and dossier requirements) for all college faculty follows the and the University. The department-level promotion/tenure review process follows the approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines in accordance with the university rules and guidelines.

Only tenured TAMU faculty are eligible to evaluate and vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion. To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must also hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate. Both tenure track and APT faculty members who hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to evaluate and vote on APT promotion cases. Committee members with conflicts of interest (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or postdoc advisor of the candidate) must recuse themselves from voting on that specific candidate's case.

Candidates should order the CV so that the primary area upon which they are being evaluated is listed first. Tenure track faculty should put research/scholarly activity/creative work as the first section, Academic and Professional Track (APT) faculty (except for those with Research in their title) should put teaching as the first section.

The departmental P&T committee is expected to provide guidance and feedback to the candidates on preparation of the dossier prior to its submission.

Faculty members having budgeted joint appointments in two or more departments are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by each department/unit, in accordance with the guidelines from each department/unit and as specified in the memorandum of understanding executed for the budgeted joint appointment. If the budgeted joint appointment involves other colleges, each dean (and each college level P&T committee) provides recommendations to the provost. The college in which the faculty is administratively located has the responsibility for completing and forwarding the dossier to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. For candidates who are involved with Interdisciplinary Programs, a letter must be requested from the program chair/director at the same time as when external reviewers' letters are requested so they may become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental P&T committee.

9.2.2. Department of Entomology Promotion and Tenure Committee

To be eligible as a member of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, a "faculty member" is defined as any person holding the title of Associate Professor or Professor. Those holding a named professorship or endowed chair are also eligible to participate and vote because they also hold a faculty rank. However, faculty with the modifiers Emeritus, Senior, Visiting, or Adjunct are not eligible to participate nor vote on any promotion dossier. TAMU faculty with modifiers Research, Clinical and Instructional, etc. are "Academic Professional Track" faculty. These faculty are promoted using the same process. They can be members of the Departmental P&T committee if they hold the appropriate rank, but they can only participate and vote for non-tenured faculty. There are four categories of faculty in the Department of Entomology. TAMU faculty are those who are administratively located at Texas A&M University; they are in tenured or tenure-track appointments or they hold a non-tenured appointment as an Academic Professional Track faculty. The other two categories are for those faculty whose primary appointment is with one of the state Agencies – Texas A&M AgriLife Research or Texas A&M AgriLife Extension; generally, these faculty do not hold tenure-track positions and do not participate in discussions nor vote on Texas A&M University faculty. Texas A&M University faculty do not participate in discussions nor vote on Texas A&M AgriLife Research or Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty promotions.

The Department of Entomology, Texas A&M University P&T Committee consists of all Associate Professors and Professors and Senior and Principal Lecturers; discussion and voting privileges follow.

- (1) APT faculty promotion cases: P&T Committee members who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will discuss and vote on all Academic Professional Track Assistant Professors and Lecturers. In addition to all faculty listed above, Senior and Principal Lecturers can vote for Lecturers seeking promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Principal Lecturers can vote on Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer. Only those who have achieved the rank of Professor are eligible to discuss or vote on promotion of an Associate Professor seeking the rank of Professor.
- (2) Tenured and tenure-track faculty cases: Only faculty with tenure are eligible to discuss and vote on promotion and tenure decisions for tenured or tenure-track faculty. P&T Committee members who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will vote on all Assistant Professors. Only those who have achieved the rank of Professor are eligible to discuss and vote on promotion of an Associate Professor to the rank of Professor.

The committee's confidential vote and discussions of the dossier of each candidate shall be documented in an evaluative report to be submitted by the Chair of the Committee to the Department Head.

9.2.3. Duties of the Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T Committee

- (1) Two elected Texas A&M University tenured faculty at the rank of Professor serve as Chair and Co-Chair of the Departmental P&T Committee.
- (2) Election will occur each year in January with duties beginning immediately.
- (3) The Chair and Co-Chair stand for election with staggered 2-year terms. Once elected the individual cannot stand for re-election for a period of 4 years (two, 2-year terms).
- (4) Each elected individual must attend training sessions for chairs of P&T committees if available. These are typically held by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs or by the College.
- (5) The Co-Chair rotates to become the Chair in the 2nd year, and a new Co-Chair is elected.
- (6) All TAMU faculty vote for the Co-Chair.
- (7) The duties of the Chair and the Co-Chair are to:
 - a. Compile the written comments submitted by P&T committee members following their review of the dossiers of each candidate seeking promotion into draft reports required by the College and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The Chair/co-Chair may lead writing the draft reports or request members of the P&T committee of appropriate rank and appointment to write selected draft reports. The draft reports will be distributed to the full committee at least 7 days prior to the P&T meeting where the reports will be discussed and revised. The preparers of the draft reports will be identified in the document. The Chair/Co-Chair will prepare the committee discussion report.
Dossiers will be posted in Interfolio and available to the P&T Committee for comment approximately 30 days prior to the meeting of the P&T committee. Committee members will submit their written comments to the Chair and Co-Chair at least 14 days before the annual meeting of the P&T Committee, and draft reports will be made available to committee members at least 7 days before the annual meeting. The annual meeting for mid-term reviews is typically held in May or June and for promotion and/or tenure cases the meeting is typically will be held in late August to early September, depending upon the calendar set by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs as to when documents are due.
 - b. Facilitate the discussion of each candidate's dossier along with the submitted written comments of the entire P&T Committee during the annual P&T Committee meeting.
 - c. Prepare a final summary document that includes points arising during the P&T Committee meeting to be reviewed by the P&T Committee prior to casting a ballot. The Chair and Co-Chair are expected to cast a ballot for each case under consideration.
 - d. Maintain a record of committee member participation in the three steps of the evaluation process (1. written comments, 2. P&T committee meeting, and 3. final report approval).
 - e. Coordinate with department staff to send and receive ballots from members of the P&T committee and to verify final results.
 - f. Work with departmental staff to secure the accuracy of the final summary statement regarding the inclusion of names for every faculty member of the P&T committee who voted.
 - g. Forward the final summary statement before the deadline, with vote totals to the Department Head for inclusion in the dossier.
 - h. For the Department Head to attend the discussion of the P&T Committee, the Head must receive a written invitation from the Chair and Co-Chair. In general, the Department Head is not a participant in the P&T Committee discussion. The Department Head is not eligible to cast a vote because of their supervisory role.
 - i. If neither the Chair nor Co-Chair is available to conduct the annual P&T meeting, the past Chair will serve in this capacity.

9.2.4. Promotion/Tenure Review Process

Review of the cases for TAMU faculty will follow the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The committee will ensure equitable review and evaluation of promotion candidates, based on the guidelines and the position description for each candidate.

In order to cast a vote on promotion and tenure candidates in a given evaluation cycle, a P&T Committee member must fully participate in the evaluation process. 'Full participation' shall be defined as contributing at a minimum, to two of the following three opportunities for committee members to provide evaluative input into the content of the final summary report: (1) Provide written comments on the candidates' dossiers prior to the annual P&T committee meeting; (2) Participate in the annual P&T meeting (mandatory – with exceptions for legitimate scheduling conflicts such as planned travel, family emergencies, etc.), and (3) Review of the final summary document arising from the annual P&T committee meeting prior to the vote (mandatory – no exceptions).

There is typically one annual meeting of the P&T Committee where dossiers of candidates seeking promotion and tenure are discussed. All P&T Committee members must individually review the candidates' written dossiers and are invited to submit written comments prior to the annual P&T Committee meeting. In addition, the Chair and Co-Chair will select specific P&T committee members as internal reviewers. These internal reviewers will be tasked with writing the drafts of the Research Section (2 internal reviewers per candidate) and the Teaching Section (1 internal reviewer per candidate). The Chair and Co-Chair will draft the Service Section of the candidate report. Written comments will be submitted through the University's secure Qualtrics Survey application or similar online system. The compiled comments (including the internal reviewer report sections and the written comments submitted by P&T committee members to the Chair and Co-Chair) will be used by the Chair and Co-Chair of the P&T Committee to develop a written report for each candidate. The report for each candidate will be presented for discussion at the annual P&T Committee meeting so that only P&T committee members of appropriate rank have access to them. After the discussion, the Chair and Co-Chair will add a sub-section to each candidate report summarizing the P&T committee discussion. Modifications to the candidates' reports can be made during the discussion meeting. Each time a modification is proposed the Chair or Co-Chair will ask the P&T committee members to vote. Unanimously approved modifications will be added to the report drafts. When not unanimous, proposed modifications will not be added to the main body of the report but to the discussion section only along with the tally of the vote. Roll will be taken at the annual P&T Committee meeting as a record of participation. A faculty member should be present for the duration of a candidate's discussion to be considered "present" at the meeting. A final report for each candidate will be sent to the P&T committee for review within a specified deadline. All P&T committee members present at the discussion of the candidate packet must review the final report to be eligible to vote. Note that the report reflects the general sentiment of the P&T committee at the conclusion of the annual P&T meeting and is independent of a committee member's yes/no vote on a candidate's promotion and/or tenure. As soon as the report review period has passed, an electronic vote with a specified deadline will be initiated by sending an electronic ballot to all eligible committee members who have participated in the P&T committee discussion and reviewed the candidates' report. Votes not cast by the deadline will be recorded as Absent.

All members of the P&T Committee are expected to cast a vote for candidates they are eligible to review. For the final report that is placed in the dossier, votes need to be segregated into tenured and non-tenured votes. Academic Professional Track faculty are eligible to vote on non-tenure track Assistant Professors and all Lecturers if they hold the rank of Instructional (or other modifiers) Associate Professor or Professor. Only Academic Professional Track faculty holding the rank of Professor may vote on non-tenure track Associate Professors or Senior Lecturers seeking

promotion. For cases of tenure-track and tenured candidates, only tenured faculty of appropriate rank may discuss candidates and vote. For cases of Academic Professional Track faculty, the vote of the faculty is the vote of record.

The Department of Entomology faculty have adopted a Code of Conduct (see Appendix 2) that in part states, "Faculty members accept personal responsibility to evaluate people based solely on their performance." This statement is interpreted to mean that each faculty member is to vote individually based on how well a candidate has met or exceeded the Indicators of Effectiveness and Indicators of Excellence when evaluating a candidate for promotion. Organized block voting would constitute a violation of the Code of Conduct. Faculty members have a responsibility to avoid any such activity or appearance of such activities.

The only source of information for making a decision is the candidate's dossier, which includes: 1) CV, signed and attested; 2) external letters of evaluation; 3) candidate's statements on Teaching, Research, and Service; 4) if the candidate has a teaching appointment, a peer evaluation of teaching completed by the departmental Education Committee is required, 5) all tables and charts required by the University's P&T guidelines, and 6) any addenda added by the faculty member. The complete dossier with external letters is to be available for review approximately 30 days prior to the annual meeting of the P&T Committee.

All eligible faculty of the P&T Committee are expected to minimize Absent votes in order for the committee's recommendation to carry maximum influence as the dossier moves forward. Recused votes should only be used for valid reasons. The Chair and Co-Chair will make a determination if an individual is using a valid reason to recuse themselves from voting. In all instances one who is recused cannot be present for any discussion of that candidate. All "No" votes cast for the report require the inclusion of a statement as to which concern(s) raised in the P&T Committee discussion of the candidate dossier were the reason for the "No" vote.

Once a faculty member attains the appropriate rank, their membership on the Departmental P&T Committee is permanent, but contingent on participation as follows:

1. If a P&T committee member fails to participate fully in the annual evaluation process (as defined above) or does not cast a ballot for all candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion for which they are eligible to vote for two consecutive academic years, they will be removed from the P&T Committee. A valid recusal from voting is considered a participatory action. The Chair and Co-Chair will validate the vote and maintain a record of P&T Committee member participation.
2. Two years after removal, the faculty member will regain eligibility, but they can only be re-appointed to the P&T Committee by petition in writing to the P&T Committee Chair and Co-Chair. The faculty member remains ineligible to participate and vote until a petition requesting a re-appointment is accepted.

10. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.MO.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 7) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 10.2).

10.1. 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.

10.2. Peer Review Committee

The Periodic Peer Review Committee will consist of all tenured TAMU Entomology faculty holding the rank of Professor and this committee will conduct Periodic Peer Reviews. The Periodic Peer Review Committee will select one member to serve as Chair (typically the Chair or co-Chair of the P&T Committee, though this is not required).

10.3. Process

Each tenured faculty member will be reviewed by the Periodic Peer Review Committee at least once every 6 years. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a Periodic Peer Review of the faculty member. Faculty holding Endowed and Named Professorships are reviewed by a College Committee and that review, if favorable, constitutes their Periodic Peer Review.

Consistent with University Rule 12.06.99.M0.01 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 3) or a Professional Development Review (section 4), by making a request to the department head".

In each instance the Periodic Peer Review is conducted by the Periodic Peer Review Committee.

Timeline for the Periodic Peer Review and Post-Tenure Review.

1. Tenured faculty members requiring Periodic Peer Review are identified each fall, and by the date specified by the Dean's office, the Periodic Peer Review Committee will make a final report to the Department Head.
2. All tenured faculty members requiring a Periodic Peer Review will submit the following documentation upon the request of the Post-Tenure Review Committee:
 - a. A current C.V.
 - b. The last 5 years of the faculty members Annual Performance Review Data provided by the faculty member as part of their annual review.
 - c. An optional 1-page narrative statement, providing any additional information that the faculty member wishes to provide the subcommittee on Teaching, Research, and Service activities, or any other information that they wish to have considered in the review.
3. For a Periodic Peer Review, each member of the Peer Review Committee will evaluate the submitted materials and provide to the Committee Chair a written statement regarding the faculty member's overall performance since their last peer review using the criteria outlined in Section 5 for Research, Teaching, and Service.
4. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will prepare a summary statement and communicate the statement and the vote results to the faculty member. The faculty member will have the opportunity to meet with the Peer Review Committee to discuss the review, if desired, before the statement is forwarded to the Department Head.

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. The Committee will consider the faculty member's position description when evaluating the faculty member's performance.

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

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

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

A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

10.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 7) or an "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review (see Section 10.3) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 10.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 8.5.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

- The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
 - On behalf of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will solicit a list of names of potential committee members from the faculty member and a list of individuals that should not be contacted. The Department Head will give feedback on the submitted names and have the opportunity to provide additional names. The Dean will appoint the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee based on the input from the faculty member and the Department Head.
- The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements they deem relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.
- The department head will add to the dossier any further materials they deem necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:
 - No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
 - Some deficiencies are identified, but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4,
 - Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 10.5) acceptable to the dean.

10.5. The Professional Development Plan

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

10.6. Appeal

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

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

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

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

10.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

11. 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 provided consideration for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

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

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

Contact Office

Department of Entomology, Office of the Department Head, e-mail t-gold@tamu.edu.

Appendix 1: Outline of Annual Mentoring Committee Meeting Summary

Purpose: The mentoring committee will provide guidance/suggestions on how to improve research/Extension, teaching, and service statements for the mentee to develop a concise and effective program. The following categories listed in each emphasis area are criteria that can be used to develop committee feedback to the mentee. *This document is not to serve as a summary of an individual's annual production but rather provide suggestions on developing a strategy to optimize their program.*

Mentee:

_____	_____	_____
Print	Signature	Date

Mentorship Committee Members:

_____	_____	_____
Print	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Print	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Print	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Print	Signature	Date

- I. **Recommendations Concerning Scope of Research (e.g., Grant Support, Publications, Collaborations, Meetings, Awards, Presentations):**

- II. **Recommendations Concerning Teaching Portfolio (e.g., Formal Courses, Graduate Students, Undergraduate Students, Visiting Scholars):**

- III. **Recommendations Concerning Extension Outreach Programing, Relevance, and Impact (e.g., Presentations, Publications, Agent Training, Justification of Purpose, Impact Documentation):**

- IV. **Recommendations Concerning Service Involvement (Department, University, Professional, Community):**

- V. **Unmet Mentee Needs (Space, equipment, administrative):**

- VI. **Other Committee Recommendations:**

Appendix 2: Code of Conduct Statement, Department of Entomology

The faculty of Texas A&M University Department of Entomology are dedicated to upholding a set of core values as we carry out our academic mission of learning and scholarship with the overarching goal of serving society through our research, teaching, Extension education, and public service missions.

To achieve this excellence, the community of scholars and educators that comprise the Department of Entomology is committed to the highest ethical standards of conduct and integrity as outlined in our Code of Conduct Statement. This statement does not create any additional rules or different rights than are supported through current University and Agency policies, procedures and workplace rules. As a community of scientists we are simply stating that our department strives to be:

Objective: We respect individual and intellectual achievements and contributions to our field in all its forms. For example,

- Faculty members individually evaluate others based on the value of their achievements and contributions to our discipline and to their sub-disciplines.
- Our Faculty evaluates candidates for promotion and tenure both individually and by engaging in deliberations with the whole P&T committee for each candidate.

Accountable: We are responsible for the reputation and success of the department and we expect all to adhere to the highest standards of personal and professional conduct. For example,

- Faculty members accept personal responsibility to evaluate people based solely on their performance.
- Faculty members accept a fair share of responsibility for participating in departmental governance by attending meetings, seminars and volunteering to serve on committees.

Respectful: We treat others in a civil and respectful fashion. For example,

- Faculty members avoid all forms of harassment, illegal discrimination, threats, and abuse of power. We never use, or tolerate others that use, derogatory language about another person.
- Faculty members acknowledge professional indebtedness to colleagues and other scholars by proper citation.

Ethical: We act according to the highest ethical and professional standards and model ethical conduct to all members of the community. For example,

- Faculty members are personally accountable for individual actions and we affirm that we will abide by this code of conduct.
- We fulfill our obligations to manage resources responsibly, prevent waste and abuse, and promote a culture of principled behavior.