

Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications 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 June 2, 2023
Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on March 1, 2023
Updated guidelines approved by faculty vote on February 10, 2023
Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties on February 10, 2021
Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on January 21, 2021
Updated guidelines approved by faculty vote on October 12, 2020
(Revisions December 20, 2016, January 15, 2017, November 29, 2017, December 20, 2017, October 2, 2020)
Approved as policy, December 12, 2013 by Faculty Vote
(Revisions December 13, 2012, January 15, 2013, February 15, 2013, December 10, 2013)
Approved policy October 29, 2012 by the P&T committee as defined below
(Major revisions August 14, 2012, August 16, 2012, October 29, 2012)
Approved newly written policy May 19, 2008
(Minor revisions September 1, 1998, August 31, 2000, and October 10, 2002)
Original guidelines adopted on August 11, 1986

Table of Contents

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS	4
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>	5
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>	6
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	7
5.1. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i>	7
5.2. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track 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>	13
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>	14
7.3. <i>Feedback from mid-term review</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>	17
9.2. <i>Peer Review Committee</i>	17
9.3. <i>Process</i>	17
9.4. <i>Professional Development Review</i>	18
9.5. <i>The Professional Development Plan</i>	19
9.6. <i>Appeal</i>	19
9.7. <i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i>	20
10. GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS	20

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications at Texas A&M University is to improve the quality of life and well-being of individuals and communities in Texas, in the nation, and in the world through high-quality teaching, research, service and Extension programs that communicate crucial information for agricultural and life sciences and human performance. The Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications proactively seeks faculty who contribute significant productivity to the missions of the Department, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, and Texas A&M University through meritorious teaching, research, service, and extension. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom; thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (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 department; such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general department 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://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University 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](#).

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 I 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 with demonstrated 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 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.

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 to be considered 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 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 College of Agriculture and Life 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, 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.

4.1. 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.

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

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

4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** may include, but are not limited to: outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student evaluations of teaching 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.

4.4. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** may include, but are not limited to: effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer reviews, student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, 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 award.

4.5. 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.

4.6. 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.

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 College of Agriculture and Life 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.

5.1.2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- **Research:** Excellence in Research 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

- **Research:** Excellence in Research 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 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.

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 as described in 4.3. 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 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 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 are to be conducted in accordance with Section 2.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

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

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

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

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

6.1. Purpose

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

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 focus on the immediately previous calendar year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

6.4. 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," "Exemplary," and "Most Meritorious" 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 **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity based on the indicators described in 4.2.
- 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 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.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include quality publications, funding, citations, and invited presentations and other indicators described in 4.1.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious 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.
- Exemplary – 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.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious 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 have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

6.4.3. 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 4.6.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on indicators described in 4.6. 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 4.6. 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.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service based on indicators described in 4.5. 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.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have nearly all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member based on indicators described in 4.5. 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.

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. Departments may request additional documentation be completed, such as a plan of work, which may be uploaded into Interfolio Faculty180 as well.

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, 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)

6.5.2.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. 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. 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, director, or supervisor and the faculty member

The department head, director, or supervisor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4. Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to 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 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).

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, 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.

6.7. 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."

6.8. 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](#)

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), 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. 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 faculty during their third calendar year in the rank.

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 faculty during their third calendar year in the rank.

7.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/ 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.

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 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 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 summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8. Promotion and Tenure Review

8.1. 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.

8.2. Process

8.2.1. Guidelines for the Promotion/Tenure Review Process

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

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 committees) provide 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.

Candidates for faculty positions whose initial appointment at Texas A&M University is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). The expectations and review process for TRUH will be the same as for the regular tenure and promotion reviews, with the only exception that it can be submitted out of cycle.

8.2.2. Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

The ALEC P&T Committee comprises the entire group of qualified faculty at each rank in question and all tenured faculty in the case of tenure decisions. All faculty members annually elect a Vice-chair to a three-year term to lead the P&T Committee. The Vice-chair becomes the Chair. The Chair and Vice-chair must be ALEC professors. For continuity, the Past-chair serves in an advisory capacity to the Chair and Vice-chair. Terms begin on September 1 following their election. In the event the Chair or Vice-chair leaves their position for any reason the faculty will elect a new person to complete the term. The department head cannot be a member of any ALEC P&T review committee and should not (unless invited by the committee) participate during P&T deliberations.

Departmental faculty members with tenure who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure are eligible to participate for discussion purposes, evaluation processes, and voting decisions on the Review Committee for tenured or tenure-track candidates. For example, tenured professors and tenured associate professors would participate on the Review Committee for tenure-track assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure. For APT assistant professors we would use a similar process with higher ranking faculty reviewing cases, if possible.

8.2.3. Promotion/Tenure Review Process

Candidates should review the university and college deadlines when developing dossiers. The department will provide an earlier timeframe to complete formative and summative reviews prior to the college and university deadlines. A sequence of this timeline is below:

- Early in the spring semester the department head and P&T committee chair will communicate in writing the P&T timeline for that year. Candidates wishing to be considered for tenure and/or promotion must notify, in writing, the department head and the P&T chair of their intentions to submit their P&T dossier.
- The candidate will submit the dossier for P&T Committee preliminary review. The P&T Committee will convene to formatively review a draft packet for feedback and editing prior to the dossier being sent to external reviewers. Candidates will also submit a list of potential external reviewers and a list of excluded potential reviewers, if any.
- Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure will upload their case within Interfolio.
- The department head and P&T chair will seek external letters with approximately 1 month for external reviewers to review the dossier. If mid-term review, internal letters may be used.
- The P&T Review Committees will review packets for voting. Summary statements for research, teaching, and service will be written and submitted.
- The department head receives Review Committee reports.
- Candidate's packet is due in the college dean's office.
- Deadlines (department head/P&T Committee chair notice to faculty members of promotion and/or tenure annual process; candidate notice to department head/P&T Committee chair of

intent to seek promotion and/or tenure; candidate draft packet submission to the P&T Committee chair for formative review and feedback; department head's notice to candidates of list of outside reviewers; and other similar procedural deadlines) will be communicated in writing to all ALEC faculty members.

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 and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, 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 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.

9.2. Peer Review Committee

The department peer review committee for post-tenure review will consist of the chair, vice-chair and past chair of the promotion and tenure committee. The Peer Review Committee cannot be comprised of any faculty being peer reviewed that year.

9.3. Process

Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee include:

- Annual Performance Review reports over the review period provided by the department head and acknowledged by the faculty member.
- Statements of research, teaching and service and a comprehensive CV provided by the faculty member.

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 fewer, as determined by department guidelines, 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.

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 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.
- 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.

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 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 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, 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)

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/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](#)).

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, director, 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 they 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.

When submitting requests for emeritus status, the nominator must include a cover letter and curriculum vitae from the faculty member nominee. Emeritus title is recommended through the department head through the P&T Committee. An affirmative vote of departmental faculty is required before an individual can be recommended for appointment to emeritus status.

Contact Office

Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications

Office of the Department Head

e-mail Michelle.Payne@ag.tamu.edu