

Department of Soil and Crop Sciences

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 13, 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

Revised on February 26, 2023

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS	3
3. AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	4
3.1. <i>Research, scholarly activity or creative work</i>	4
3.2. <i>Teaching</i>	4
3.3. <i>Service</i>	4
4. INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	5
4.1. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	5
4.2. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	5
4.3. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</i>	5
4.4. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</i>	5
4.5. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Service</i>	6
4.6. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</i>	6
5. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE	6
5.1. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i>	6
5.2. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)</i>	8
6. ANNUAL REVIEW	9
6.1. <i>Purpose</i>	10
6.2. <i>Focus</i>	10
6.3 <i>Time Period of Review</i>	10
6.4 <i>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance</i>	10
6.5. <i>Required Components</i>	12
6.6. <i>Assessment outcomes that require action</i>	13
6.7. <i>Timeline</i>	14
6.8. <i>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:</i>	14
7. MID-TERM REVIEW	14
7.1. <i>Purpose</i>	14
7.2. <i>Process</i>	15
7.3. <i>Feedback from mid-term review</i>	15
7.4. <i>Mid-term review for Academic and Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professors and Lecturers</i>	15
8. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	15
8.1. <i>Purpose</i>	15
8.2. <i>Process</i>	15
9. POST-TENURE REVIEW	17
9.1. <i>Purpose</i>	18
9.2. <i>Peer Review Committee</i>	18
9.3. <i>Process</i>	18
9.4. <i>Professional Development Review</i>	19
9.5. <i>The Professional Development Plan</i>	20
9.6. <i>Appeal</i>	20
9.7. <i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i>	21
10. GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS	21

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences at Texas A&M University is to promote the wise use, management, and stewardship of soil, plant, and water resources by preparing students for careers in soil, plant, and environmentally related disciplines; discovering new scientific knowledge and developing associated technologies to sustain environmentally sound and economically profitable production systems. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document provides a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences 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. 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 general guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit. Such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/pdf.php?number=12.01.99.M1
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Faculty Affairs 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 Texas A&M University faculty ranks and tracks is at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#).

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (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 assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1. Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research is critical to the mission of the College and a defining element of our University as a Research institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to be nationally/internationally recognized leaders in their areas of study. They should demonstrate impact that advances their field or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status in the case for 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. This impact should be supported by number, quality and impact of research publications in leading journals as well as journal citations; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, state, private, corporate funders, 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 faculty member's work and how it has influenced and advanced their field of study.

3.2. 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 and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required, but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria in evaluating teaching effectiveness include but are not limited to: knowledge of and enthusiasm for 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.

3.3. 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 professional contributions to society. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

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.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Soil and Crop Sciences 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, accomplishments can be described as those that lead to career development and 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 may not apply to every faculty member and there may be other appropriate indicators.

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

Excellence indicators may include, but are not limited to:

- Manuscripts published in leading refereed journals
- Books and chapters published
- Significant grant proposal funding
- Research awards
- Intellectual property
- Significant research accomplishments
- Recognition by peers, e.g., invited presentations, workshop leadership
- Evidence of research impacts in agriculture, the environment, industry, and public clientele that lead to improved economic, environmental, and social standing.

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

These effectiveness indicators may include, but are not limited to:

- Manuscripts published (peer reviewed scientific and nonrefereed technical articles)
- Grants and contracts
- Presentations at scientific/industry/commodity meetings (faculty member/graduate student)
- Evidence of sustained accomplishments of research project objectives

4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Excellence Indicators ***in Teaching*** may include, but are not limited to:

- Outstanding student evaluations
- Selection for a university, college or professional society award for teaching
- Development of innovative teaching methods and materials
- Teaching Honors, writing intensive, communication or study abroad courses
- Submission of new course proposals
- Involvement in student professional training of exceptional theses or dissertations

4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

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

- Good student evaluations
- Teaching grants
- Publishing on scholarship of teaching and books and book chapters related to teaching
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Undergraduate and graduate courses taught
- Theses and dissertations completed
- Advising and counseling

4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

Excellence indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** may include, but are not limited to:

- Editorial contributions (editorial board, advisory board, guest review activities)
- Professional honors and awards
- Professional leadership (offices held, committees, task forces)
- International activities

4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

Excellence indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service*** may include, but are not limited to:

- Committees (University, College, Department)
- Professional organizations (membership and activities)

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (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 Department of Soil and Crop Sciences are described in the sections below.

5.1.1. 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.

Normally the rank of Assistant Professor pertains to an initial appointment rather than a promotion. In either case, this rank reflects potential for achievement. It denotes the *novitiate* of the academic order, a fact emphasized by our tenure policies.

Qualifications for this rank include high expectations of future, instruction, research, and service ability and productivity, normally ascertained from written letters of recommendation from outstanding scientists in the candidate's field, evaluation of service as a teaching assistant and/or instructor, the candidate's dissertation, coursework, or written evidence of original research.

5.1.2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires demonstration and evidence of superior performance in instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. Evidence of a substantive research or program including peer-reviewed publications relevant to the job description of the candidate, success in grant acquisition, and other evidence of superior and/or research activities are required. If appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of instructional competence is also required. Other professional and scientific activities, as well as efforts in international, national, regional,

state, and university programs are positive factors. The candidate must have national visibility.

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 4.1) 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 commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) 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 a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of all tenure-track faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally.

5.1.3. For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of superior and sustained performance as a leader in instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. With respect to TAMU, there is no set schedule for consideration of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, but from 5-6 years in grade would be common. Evidence of superior achievement in one or both functions is required of a Full Professor. The relative importance of the three functions is determined by the position description.

Publications that provide evidence of a distinguished research program and, if appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of superior instructional competence are required. The candidate should have achieved national and international recognition within the scope of instruction and research functions in the individual's job description. Significant service contributions to the Department, College, and University are expected through committee assignments and leadership roles, and by visible participation in professional and scientific societies at the national/international level.

Additional measures that may weigh heavily in evaluation for promotion to Professor include quality of instruction; quality of theses and dissertations prepared under the candidate's supervision; the candidate's own research productivity; success at grant acquisition; participation in Departmental, College, and University business; and participation in appropriate activities with commodity organizations and state and federal agencies.

- **Research:** Excellence in Research (see indicators described in 4.1) 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 a commitment to excellence in teaching (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) are expectations 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 a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) 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.

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

For appointment and promotion of APT faculty (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 APT Faculty.

5.2.1. *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 4.3.

5.2.2. *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. Excellence and impact in teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

5.2.3. *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 4.3.

- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) 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 4.1 and 4.2) are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

5.2.4. *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 4.3. 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 4.5 and 4.6) 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 4.1 and 4.2) 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.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance will 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 who are tenured or tenure-track must have an annual written review, for which the department heads or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads 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 and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

For annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans and department heads), 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 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 or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

6.1. Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
 - See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For 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. This ensures both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified. The contributions of the faculty member toward meeting these goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2. Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic 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).

6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will be conducted based on the individual's performance during the previous calendar year.

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, faculty performance (see Section 4) will be rated on five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations," and "Clearly Outstanding" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms 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.

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

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of **progress** or **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity based on the indicators described in 4.2.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of **progress** or **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact

as supported by, for example, funding, manuscripts, increasing citations, presentations, book chapters, or other indicators described in 4.2.

- 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 4.2.
- 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 4.1.
- Clearly Outstanding – those receiving the clearly outstanding rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.1. 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.

6.4.2. 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 4.4.
- 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 4.4.
- 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 4.4.
- 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 4.3. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- Clearly Outstanding – those receiving the clearly outstanding rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.3. 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 discuss what constitutes sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

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

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **activity** or **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.8.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **activity** or **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.8. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of external unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **activity** and **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.8. 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 4.7. 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.
- Clearly Outstanding – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.7. 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.

6.5. 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).

6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

Faculty will complete a standardized annual activity report in Interfolio Faculty180. An annual plan of work will be uploaded into Interfolio Faculty180 as well.

- The report should be focused on the previous calendar year but should allow a faculty member to highlight 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)

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

The department head 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. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures. The Department Head assigns a ranking (clearly outstanding, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, or unsatisfactory) for each category (teaching, scholarship, and/or service) along with an overall ranking and provides a written summary of the review to the faculty member. The faculty member has an opportunity to add written comments to the summary document. The Department Head modifies the summary document, if appropriate, based upon the input from the faculty member and returns the revised version to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file and loaded into the Workday system.

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

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

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

The department head or supervisor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. Areas of excellence and any areas for improvement are identified. The Department Head offers constructive comments to facilitate the continued success of the faculty member in the near term and in progress toward promotion where appropriate. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4. 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.

6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1. Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall “Unsatisfactory” rating 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 or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head 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.

6.7. Timeline

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Faculty Affairs’ 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.”

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

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to 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](#).

7. 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), a mandatory comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), shall be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

7.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member. 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, 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.

7.2. Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (Due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)

7.3. Feedback from mid-term review

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

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

To provide a formative review of Instructional Assistant Professors 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.

8. Promotion and Tenure Review

8.1. Purpose

The Department of Soil and Crop Sciences seeks to retain and reward faculty members who develop distinguished teaching programs at the graduate and/or undergraduate levels, develop exceptional research programs, and share their time and professional expertise in service both within and outside the University community. 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 primary 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) recognizes 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.

8.2. Process

8.2.1. Guidelines for the Promotion/Tenure Review Process

The promotion/tenure review process (including timelines and dossier requirements) for all college faculty follows the [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and the [Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The departmental P&T committee will 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 will be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by each department/unit. This is 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 committees) 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.

8.2.2. Mentoring Committee

During the first year of employment in the Soil & Crop Sciences Department, each Assistant and Associate Professor will be assigned a minimum of two mentors from faculty in the Department. Associate and Assistant Professors should meet annually with and be evaluated by their mentoring committees. Assistant and associate professors should be kept informed in writing on their progress toward promotion and/or tenure by the Department Head. Mentors provide assistance and counsel, as needed or requested, to Associate and Assistant Professors and to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The role of the mentors is advisory only. Faculty can seek counsel from the mentors as well as from the Department Head.

8.2.3. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all Departmental faculty with the rank of Professor and Associate Professor and who hold a majority appointment with TAMU and hold an O2 appointment and all Academic Professional Track faculty of equivalent rank with an O2 appointment. Associate Professors will consider and vote exclusively on candidates for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and shall be excused from the Committee during deliberations on candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Only faculty with higher rank will consider and vote on promotions. Both the APT and tenured members will review, discuss, and vote on APT promotion cases. Only tenured members can attend discussion or vote on tenure-track cases.

The Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be elected annually by the faculty of the Department. A Vice-Chairperson shall be elected annually by the faculty of the Department.

The role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is advisory. However, all votes of the Committee are recorded, and the summary departmental recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will become part of the promotion and tenure documentation reported to the Department Head. The Department Head makes promotion and tenure recommendations for the Department to the Dean

8.2.4. Promotion/Tenure Review Process

The entities responsible for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure in the Soil & Crop Sciences Department are the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The lifetime achievement report along with external recommendation letters and other documents prepared by the candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the exception of individuals recused by way of conflict of interest.

Departmental Promotion/Tenure review documents (e.g., departmental statement on research, teaching, and service) is required for all Promotion/Tenure candidates. Only one statement that combines the three aforementioned areas is required though these areas can be prepared by different authors and combined into one statement. This statement must be authored by

committee members at or above the rank the candidate seeks and whom do not have conflicts of interest (COI; recent publications, grants) with the candidate. In many cases COI will exclude departmental mentoring committee members. For each candidate, one "Author" will be identified from the Departmental Promotion/Tenure committee to lead the statements. The Author will, along with the candidate's mentor committee, provide critically constructive feedback on the candidate's dossier before it is sent to external letter writers, which will help them to understand the candidate's case. In addition to drafting the reports, the Author will present the candidate's case to the Departmental Promotion/Tenure committee before the vote. The Author will also contribute to and provide feedback on the "Departmental Promotion/Tenure Discussion Report", written by the Promotion/Tenure Committee Chair as well as any additional requirements added by the College/Agency/University. The Author will be selected jointly by the candidate, the Department Head and the Promotion/Tenure Committee Chair at least six months before the Departmental committee vote. Perspective Promotion / Tenure candidates therefore must identify interest in seeking Promotion/ Tenure at least six months before the Departmental committee vote to ensure adequate time for preparation and for an Author to be identified. After this time candidates will be required to wait until the next cycle. Candidates may choose to withdraw their dossier at any time. All Committee members are expected to read each candidate's dossier-

Faculty will recuse themselves from reading, viewing, or listening to candidate-specific documents and discussions, and from voting on promotion and tenure decisions involving candidates with whom they have a conflict of interest, as defined by any of the relevant superior institutional guidelines (System, University, College, and AgriLife, Board of Regents). For a candidate with whom there is a conflict of nepotism, a faculty must not view any part of the official dossier, and must not attend, view or listen to any Promotion and Tenure Committee deliberations concerning that candidate. They must not participate in the drafting or approval of Committee-based Evaluation Statements.

When the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee meets only members who attend/participate in the meeting in an verified manner will vote on promotion and/or tenure. Attendance may be "in person" or by electronic means arranged by the Department. Attendance will be recorded. Individuals having a conflict of nepotism with a candidate will not participate in **any** phase of the review of the conflicted candidate and will not attend, participate in, view or listen to the relevant part of the Committee meeting, or vote on the candidate with whom they have a conflict. The vote will be by secret ballot.

The Department Head will prepare a recommendation, and it must include the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the recommendation letter to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life.

After the vote and final decision are made, the Department Head shall inform the candidate of the results of the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote and recommendation, and forward the recommendation to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

9. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members. It is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).

2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 9.2.).

9.1. Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is contributing 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.

9.2. Peer Review Committee

A post-tenure peer-review committee consisting of three Professors with knowledge and experience related to the faculty member's discipline will be commissioned by the Department Head to review the on-going productivity relative to the criteria listed in this document for promotion to respective rank (Associate or Full Professor).

9.3. Process

The Department will coordinate a post-tenure review of tenured faculty every year as part of the annual review process and shall include peer review of the submitted documentation as part of the annual process. Documentation submitted to the peer-review committee shall include but will not be limited to:

Position Description. The position description is a part of the annual evaluation and is agreed upon by the Department Head and faculty member. Accurate designation of relative loads in the areas of research, teaching, and service is critical. No load can be 0, and expectations in each area are weighted according to the relative load. Written justification and approval by the department head and dean are required if the load in any area approaches 0.

Teaching achievements. Documentation of teaching should include, as a minimum, number of classes taught, student, evaluations, and peer evaluations. Teaching achievements must be consistent with rank in terms of quantity and quality.

Research accomplishments. Scholarly endeavors include grant funding, scientific publications, and national and international visibility. Research productivity is expected to increase and improve with rank.

Service. Service to the Department; Texas A&M University; Interdisciplinary Programs; greater academic and scientific communities; state, national, international or other public-serving institutions should be documented and consistent with rank and years of service.

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, 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, 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.

9.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head 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.
- 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 has 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.

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

- The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.
- The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 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 9.5) acceptable to the dean.

9.5. 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 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)

9.6. 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. 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 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](#)).

9.7. 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, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

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 website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Contact Office

Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, Office of the Department Head, e-mail david.baltensperger@ag.tamu.edu.