

Department of Food Science and Technology

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

Revised on May 28, 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 20, 2021

Revised on November 2, 2020

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS	4
3. AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	5
3.1. <i>Research, scholarly activity or creative work</i>	5
3.2. <i>Teaching</i>	6
3.3. <i>Service</i>	7
4. INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	8
4.1. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	8
4.2. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	8
4.3. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</i>	8
4.4. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</i>	8
4.5. <i>Indicators of Excellence in Service</i>	9
4.6. <i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</i>	9
5. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE	9
5.1. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i>	9
5.2. <i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)</i>	10
6. ANNUAL REVIEW	11
6.1. <i>Purpose</i>	12
6.2. <i>Focus</i>	12
6.3. <i>Time Period of Review</i>	12
6.4. <i>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance</i>	12
6.5. <i>Required Components</i>	14
6.6. <i>Assessment outcomes that require action</i>	15
6.7. <i>Timeline</i>	16
6.8. <i>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:</i>	16
7. MID-TERM REVIEW	16
7.1. <i>Purpose</i>	16
7.2. <i>Process</i>	17
7.3. <i>Feedback from mid-term review</i>	17
7.4. <i>Mid-term review for Academic and Professional Track (APT) Assistant Professors</i>	17
8. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	17
8.1. <i>Purpose</i>	17
8.2. <i>Process</i>	17
8.3. <i>Extensions to the Probationary Period (“Tenure Clock”)</i>	19
8.4. <i>Reconsideration in the Terminal Year</i>	20
8.5. <i>Non-Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty</i>	20
9. POST-TENURE REVIEW	20
9.1. <i>Purpose</i>	20
9.2. <i>Peer Review Committee</i>	21
9.3. <i>Process</i>	21
9.4. <i>Professional Development Review</i>	22
9.5. <i>The Professional Development Plan</i>	23
9.6. <i>Appeal</i>	23
9.7. <i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i>	23
10. GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS	24

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Food Science and Technology at Texas A&M University is to create new knowledge that leads to high quality, healthy, diverse, safe, and sustainable food systems to address current and future national and global needs. We are committed to knowledge discovery and delivery of high-quality education to position the science of food within a sustainable framework, with emphasis on improving health and wellbeing. 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 Food Science and Technology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among research, teaching, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general Unit guidelines for faculty, annual review, tenure and promotion, 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
11.18.21 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M1.pdf
02.06.20 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf
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: https://college.agrilife.org/aglsfacultyaffairs/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2023/03/AgriLife-Research-and-Extension-Guidelines-for-Promotion-Process-with-Appendices_03.2023.pdf](https://college.agrilife.org/aglsfacultyaffairs/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2023/03/AgriLife-Research-and-Extension-Guidelines-for-Promotion-Process-with-Appendices_03.2023.pdf)
- Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures - [12.99.99.A0.01 Faculty Performance Review](#) and [12.99.99.A0.03 Faculty Promotion](#): <https://agrilifeas.tamu.edu/documents/129999a003.pdf/>

- Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service [Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist Faculty:](https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2020/03/Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf)
<https://faculty.aglifesciences.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/119/2020/03/Specialist-Career-Ladder-Guidelines-2020.1-16-20.pdf>

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. Historically, the Department has not utilized the Instructional Professor Track but will consider appropriate appointments. Duties, responsibilities and expectations parallel the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer appointments, with teaching and service components. The service component could entail some administrative responsibilities as defined by the Department Head, but it is not required.

Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Historically, the Department has only utilized the Research Assistant Professor title but under appropriate situations would consider appointments at the Research Associate Professor and Research Professor levels. As a non-tenured member of the faculty, the Research Assistant Professor develops and executes research programs in an agricultural/life science specialization relevant to the Department. The terms of appointment and promotion to Research Associate Professor are defined by AgriLife policy and may include acquisition of independent funding. Research Assistant Professors are expected to contribute to an environment of collegiality and collaboration within the Department through limited service on committees and related activities.

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

Fulfilling its mission of achieving world class status, Texas A&M University places a very high value on acquisition of new discoveries and dissemination of new knowledge that is vital to the citizens of Texas, the nation, and the world. 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. Candidates for promotion must provide compelling evidence that they espouse the spirit of creative discovery. These can come from a recognized and well-funded research program, high

quality publications in noted peer-reviewed journals with high impact factors in research and extension, invitations extended to the candidate to speak at national and international conferences, membership on government and private review panels, and awards bestowed specifically for research accomplishments.

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. Specific criteria that must be documented include the following:

- Record of grants applied for and agencies applied to as well as outcomes. Included should be titles of proposals, amounts (in Dollars) and sources of competitive vs. non-competitive grant research support obtained. The tabulation should be divided into "internal" and "external" competitive vs. non-competitive funding and should include a description of the funding sources in terms of whether they are considered to be "premier", as well as "appropriate" for the discipline.
- Record of all publications by the candidate since the last promotion. Publications are to be listed separately as peer reviewed original research, review articles, book chapters and abstracts.
- Meetings attended by the candidate and the role of the candidate at these meetings: attendee, speaker, chair, co-chair, etc.
- Graduate students and postdoctoral associates who have achieved advanced degrees or training while being supervised by the candidate,
- Honors, awards, or recognitions the candidate and the candidate's undergraduate/graduate students have received, as a result of his/her research and extension.

3.2. Teaching

The teaching mission of Texas A&M University is to provide the highest quality educational programs for its graduate and undergraduate students. This mandates that candidates for advancement in academic rank and/or tenure must show evidence of having performed at the highest skill level in teaching. Teaching includes classroom and laboratory instruction, development of new courses, curricula, and teaching methods, as well as procurement of funding and other resources for teaching. A report on teaching will clearly indicate the type of course and the evidence on which an appraisal of teaching excellence is measured.

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:

- Evidence that the candidate is able to communicate knowledge effectively and stimulate learning and creativity in students. Data should be provided for the courses taught each term and should also include enrollment numbers as documented in the teaching portfolio of the candidate.
- Also included in the portfolio is a self-analysis that specifically states the candidate's teaching philosophy regarding teaching methods, their strengths and weaknesses, the candidate's teaching goals and other information essential to evaluating the candidate's insight on teaching. The candidate should be free to discuss current methods employed and personal improvements that developed over time and with experience. Included in the self-analysis will be a statement regarding the candidate's ability to maintain a challenging course content, evaluate a student learning performance and the candidate's responses to student feedback.
- Student evaluations: Attention will be directed at the student's appraisal of the candidate's ability to communicate and inspire interest in the subject, to demonstrate outward enthusiasm and respect for students, and to show care and concern in pre-class preparation. This information should be obtained from students' comments documented in their evaluations.
- Peer Review: The candidate's skill in teaching will be assessed by faculty who have reviewed course material and are prepared to comment on the quality of the syllabi, the manner in which grades were assigned, the scale of rigor for the material taught, and demands for learning placed on the student by the candidate. If appropriate, meaningful peer reviews will also be sought from instructors who have taught the same course or a similar course in the candidate's department. Peer review for candidates engaged in research will weigh the skills in teaching students the fundamentals of research as evidenced by the student's authorship or co-authorship on original research articles, poster and oral presentations at meetings both local and national or departmental seminars by the student.
- Student learning: For undergraduates, student learning can be assessed by the achievements of former students in subsequent classes, or by graduate study or post-baccalaureate programs that can be attributed in part to the information taught by the candidate in specific classes, if such information is documented in the candidate's dossier. In graduate education this will be seen in theses and dissertations for advanced degrees, awards and recognition earned by the student and career moves the student is able to attain.
- Recognition for teaching excellence from the department, college, university, professional society, or other organization will also be weighed in the evaluation.

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.

A candidate's record during the probationary period and subsequent promotion period will be expected to show increasing evidence of leadership and effective contributions to furthering the goals of the Department of Food Science & Technology and the mission of Texas A&M University. Merely serving on a committee is not an example of exemplary service; there must be evidence of a leadership role by the candidate. Examples of leadership at the department level include developing new ideas for teaching and research programs, addressing and proposing solutions regarding undergraduate/graduate student recruiting, developing new course offerings, inviting and hosting seminar speakers and advising student organizations. At the College and University level the candidate can show participation on university committees or faculty senate, involvement with programs such as the University Distinguished Lecture Series, scholarship committees and honors programs.

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 Food Science and Technology 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 influence 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 satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; effective practice of inclusive pedagogies and creating learning environments to support the success of all students; publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (textbook, case studies, etc.); publication of research on disciplinary teaching and learning (SoTL); receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects; outstanding performance in graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, time to degree, placements, etc.); invited presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and national/international conferences; significant efforts in peer mentoring in teaching or professional development in teaching as a facilitator; significant contributions to curriculum development efforts of the academic unit; active engagement in educational reforms at the institutional and national levels; and recognition of excellence by teaching awards at college or university levels, and national/international teaching awards from academic societies and other organizations.

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 satisfaction and student outcomes; employing

evidence-based pedagogical practices and course designs; development of new courses or major revision of existing courses; practice of inclusive pedagogies and creating learning environments to support the success of all students; effective graduate and undergraduate student mentoring as evidenced by student outcomes (presentations, publications, grants, awards, time to degree, placements, etc.); receiving competitive internal or extramural funding for teaching/learning projects; participation in curriculum development and improvement efforts of the academic unit; significant professional development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness; and selection for a departmental, college or university teaching award.

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.

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 (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

- **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 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 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 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.

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," "Exceeds Expectations," and "Outstanding" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than

five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance. In the Workday system where faculty annual evaluations are loaded, the five ratings are equivalent at “Does Not Meet Expectations,” “Partially Meets Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” “Exceeds Expectations,” and “Significantly Exceeds Expectations,” respectively.

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.
- 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.
- Outstanding – 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.
- 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.
- Outstanding – 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.
- **Exceeds Expectations** – 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.
- **Outstanding** – 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.

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate research/scholarly activity/creative work, teaching, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should also submit an annual plan of work that states 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 evaluation and expectations.

The department head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. Evaluations will take into account the job duties of the faculty member according to the written position description or other assigned duties that were previously defined in consultation with the Department Head. Additionally, the Department Head will provide annual data/statistics on the department and national food science program to serve as a guide for the annual review process. 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 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 faculty member will schedule a meeting with the department head at a mutually agreeable time in the spring semester following submission of the Annual Report and Plan of Work. The department head 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 SAP 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 SAP 12.01.99.M1](#)

7. Mid-Term Review

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

7.1. Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; 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 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

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

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.

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

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

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](#).

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. Food Science and Technology Promotion and Tenure Committee

Faculty members of the Department of Food Science and Technology who are eligible for membership on the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) must hold one of the following academic titles: Professor, Associate Professor, Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, Principal Lecturer or Senior Lecturer. There will be only one Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate all candidates for tenure and/or promotion. The makeup of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of members whose administrative location (ad-loc) is the Department of Food Science and Technology. Only members with an academic rank equal to or above the rank sought by the candidate will be allowed to vote on promotions. Only tenured members with an academic rank equal to or above the rank being sought by the candidate will be allowed to vote on candidates for tenure.

- In accordance with the by-laws of the Department of Food Science & Technology, the chair of the PTC will be elected by the body of faculty eligible for PTC membership. Once elected, the chair will preside at all meetings of all candidates until requested to step down by the Department Head.
- In the event that the number of eligible or qualified members falls below a critical mass, the Department Head may appoint non-FSTC members to the committee on an ad hoc basis provided that their academic rank is equal to or above the rank being sought. Non-FSTC members will be restricted to an advisory role only but will be allowed to cast a vote if the critical mass of eligible PTC members falls below 5.
- The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology can be neither a member of the PTC nor take part in any of the committee's discussions and evaluations of candidates.
- Recommendations made by the PTC will constitute recommendations of the faculty of the

Department of Food Science & Technology.

8.2.3. Food Science and Technology Promotion/Tenure Review Process

Review of the cases for College faculty will follow the [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) and the [TAMU Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The PTC will meet with the candidate in a preliminary package review prior to submitting the final package. The candidate is required to present a seminar before the faculty.

After reviewing the candidate's dossier, the PTC will hold an open discussion by all members regarding the qualification of the candidate in the essential areas applicable to the evaluation. The committee will vote on the candidate at the end of the discussion. Voting will take place by secret, sealed ballots that will be distributed at the meeting. Ballots will differentiate tenured vs non-tenured votes of the committee members. Only committee members who were present for the discussion of the candidate (whether in-person or virtually present) will be allowed to vote. **A minimum of 5 votes must be cast. All ballots must be returned to the committee chair by noon the day following the meeting. A simple majority of all votes cast is the minimum required for a positive recommendation.**

Following the vote, whether favorable or unfavorable for tenure, promotion, or for tenure and promotion, the chair of the PTC will assign individual members to prepare separate summaries evaluating the candidate's teaching, research, and service components. The chair of the PTC will use these evaluations to prepare an overall summary of the committee's evaluation and voting results in a report to the Department Head. If there is a mixed vote, the report should reflect the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate's case, and the committee's final recommendation. If members whose votes were in the minority wish to do so, they may submit a minority report with the majority report. However, and as per TAMU Faculty Affairs guidelines, submitting minority reports is discouraged. If a minority report is desired by those dissenting, it must indicate the name(s) of those submitting it, as unattributed minority reports will not be accepted. It is deemed that the vote of the PTC represents the vote of the faculty.

The Department Head after completing an independent review of the faculty member's record and reviewing the letter from the PTC and the interdisciplinary faculty (if applicable) will prepare his/her own letter for inclusion in the final dossier. The letter to the Dean will follow University guidelines and state with evidence a recommendation as to whether the faculty member should or should not be granted tenure and/or promotion. In the event of divergence in opinion between the PTC and Department Head, the head may request a meeting with the chair of the PTC prior to submitting a letter to the Dean. If the differences cannot be reconciled, the head must state the reasons for the impasse in the letter to the Dean that clearly delineates the differences of interpretation and a sound rationale for denying or granting of tenure and/or promotion.

8.3. Extensions to the Probationary Period ("Tenure Clock")

The "tenure clock" for a tenure-track faculty member is calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of Tenure Consideration Year (e.g., regardless of month, if the contract start date is in 2015 + 7 years of probation – 2 years = 2020. The candidate's dossier will be assembled in Spring 2020. The mandatory review will start in the Fall 2020. If successful, the Board of Regents will grant tenure in Spring 2021, and the promotion and/or tenure will become effective on September 1, 2021).

- Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member and approval and, recommendation by the department head and dean, and final approval by the Vice

Provost for Faculty Affairs.

- Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer probationary period may be requested if there are compelling extenuating circumstances. The request must be submitted prior to the mandatory year for granting of tenure. Any extension of greater than one year must be approved by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases:
- The faculty member is taking leave without pay, or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year, provided the leave is not taken solely for the purpose of pursuing activities that will enhance the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and tenure.
- The faculty member has encountered circumstances that may seriously impede progress toward demonstrating qualification for the award of promotion and tenure. Such circumstances might include (but are not limited to):
 - serious illness or injury;
 - having responsibility for the primary care of an infant or small child;
 - having responsibility for the primary care of a close relative who is disabled or seriously ill; or
 - any serious disruption in the probationary period for unexpected reasons beyond the faculty member's control.
 - The above guidelines for extension of the probationary period for tenure were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the president of Texas A&M University.

8.4. Reconsideration in the Terminal Year

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean and the Provost. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.

8.5. Non-Reappointment of Tenure-track Faculty

Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year appointments, a decision not to reappoint an individual who is on probation can be made at any time up to the year of the mandatory review. Non-reappointment should be considered if performance is unsatisfactory to the point that it is clearly unlikely the person will meet the expectations for tenure, as neither party benefits from prolonging an unsatisfactory situation. Such a decision is made, of course, with great care and only in compelling circumstances. Please note that notification of non-renewal may be made in spite of a prior decision to extend the probationary period. However, once notification of non-renewal is made, no request for extension of the probationary period may be made.

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

Tenured members of the department's PTC will serve as the Peer Review Committee. In the event that the number of eligible or qualified members falls below a critical mass, the Department Head may appoint tenured, non-ad-loc members to the committee on an ad hoc basis. The Peer Review Committee cannot be comprised of any faculty being peer reviewed that year.

9.3. Process

Periodic Peer Review will take place prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and once every six years thereafter in accordance with Texas Education Code section 51.942. A faculty member may request an early review or a separate peer review, if so desired. Materials to be reviewed by the Peer Review Committee include:

- A full Curriculum Vita including Research, Teaching, and Service components.
- The written annual evaluation from the Department Head along with any supplemental written responses from the faculty member or Department Head from the past 6 years, or since the time of the last Periodic Peer Review. These will be submitted on behalf of the faculty member by the Department Head to the Committee.

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.

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

By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice Provost of 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.
- 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.

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Contact Office

Department of Food Science and Technology, Office of the Interim Department Head, e-mail alauter@tamu.edu111.