

Department of International Affairs

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by Department of INTA January 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties February 9, 2021

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction p. 3**
- 2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks p. 3**
- 3. Areas of Faculty Performance p. 3**
- 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness p. 6**
- 5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure p. 6**
- 6. Annual Review p. 7**
- 7. Mid-Term Review p. 12**
- 8. Post-Tenure Review p. 13**
- 9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status p. 17**

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of International Affairs in the Bush School of Government and Public Service is to educate principled leaders in public and international affairs, conduct policy-relevant research, and perform service for our profession, our University, our country and the world. The Bush School's Department of International Affairs prepares students for careers of public service in government, private and nonprofit sectors and advances our knowledge of the theory and practice of international affairs. 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 International Affairs 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. ([SAP 12.01.99.M2, 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
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Faculty-Evaluation-Guidelines
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/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.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2.01](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). In the Department of International Relations, faculty ranks in the tenured and tenure-track are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Colleagues in these ranks are expected to teach their assigned classes, publish research in their fields of study and provide service at the department, School, University, and professional levels. In the Department of International Relations, faculty ranks in the Academic Professional Track include assistant professor of the practice, associate professor of the practice, professor of the practice and executive professor of the practice; assistant instructional professor, associate instructional professor and instructional professor; research assistant professor, research associate professor and research professor.

Colleagues in the Academic Professional Track ranks that are “of the practice” and “instructional” are expected to



teach their assigned classes and provide service at the department, School, University, and professional levels. Colleagues in the Academic Professional Track ranks that are “research” are expected to conduct research, teach classes as assigned when necessary and provide service at the department, School, University, and professional levels. From time to time the Department will appoint lecturers and visiting professors at various ranks for short periods, who are expected to carry out the duties detailed in their appointment letters.

3. *Areas of Faculty Performance* (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2.01](#), 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: teaching, research, and service. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance 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 **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 for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- 1) A thorough and up-to-date knowledge of the subjects taught.
- 2) A recognition that teaching ability can be improved by a conscious effort to learn good pedagogical practices and a commitment to acquire such teaching skills in a variety of ways. These include feedback from peers on one’s current teaching practices, participation in various teaching excellence programs, and consideration of student evaluations.
- 3) The use of good skills in the planning, organization, and presentation of course material.
- 4) A commitment to provide effective advising and direction of students in their academic work.
- 5) A commitment to offering educational material most suited to the needs of students in professional degree programs
- 6) As appropriate, the incorporation of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary knowledge and of perspectives that enhance students’ appreciation of the role of cultural diversity and globalization in public affairs.
- 7) Classroom performance in which the candidate demonstrates a high degree of competence regarding the subject matter; stimulates students’ interest, participation, and critical thinking; presents material in such a way as to enhance students’ understanding; effectively answers

questions from students; demonstrates a style that is appropriate given the size and nature of the class.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and understanding through research and publication. Research accomplishment is demonstrated by publication of original scholarship in books and in the leading peer-reviewed journals in one's substantive field, in the field of international affairs, or in relevant disciplines. Though the number of publications is taken into account, the quality and impact of publications, as demonstrated, for example, by citations and the reputation of the journals, matter more. The Department strongly encourages colleagues to have books published by the time of reviews. If a book is in pre-publication stage, with page proofs available for Department assessment, this will be considered as published. The Department may accept a book manuscript with assurances from the publisher that the manuscript is the final, accepted version for publication, in extraordinary circumstances.

Additional considerations in assessing research activities may also include:

- 1) Published review essays, book reviews, symposia proceedings, including publications in more policy-oriented outlets;
- 2) Grants received from external agencies to support research activities;
- 3) Citations and references to the candidate's published work;
- 4) Works in progress (e.g., unpublished conference papers) giving evidence of an ongoing research program likely to lead to substantial scholarly contributions; and
- 5) Honors and awards conferred on the scholar or their publications by organizations or authorities qualified to appraise the significance of the particular work.

3.3 Service:

Faculty members are expected to engage in an appropriate mix of service activities consistent with their teaching and research responsibilities.

- 1) Faculty service includes assistance given to the University, Professional/Disciplinary Organizations, and to the public. Faculty members are expected to share their professional expertise with civic organizations and/or governments.
- 2) University service includes assisting the Department, the Bush School, and the University through such contributions as active participation in the Department's and School's administration and operation (e.g., faculty meetings, committees, and support of student activities) as well as service on University committees, boards, and councils. It also includes advising students in the selection of courses and in their efforts to secure jobs and internships.
- 3) Professional service includes such efforts as active participation in scholarly and professional societies, both national and international. Such participation might include service as an association officer, as a journal editor, or editorial board member, as a member of peer-review panels, as a member of major professional committees or task forces, such as those of the National Academy of Sciences, as appointee to a gubernatorial commission, or as participant in professional development and training programs.
- 4) Faculty, university, and professional service can include efforts to promote interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaboration and to enhance an appreciation for diversity and globalization within the IA Department, the Bush School, the university, and the outside community.

- 5) Public and civic service is illustrated by such activities as authorized consulting with civic and governmental groups, participation in public policy forums, analyses for the media including preparation of op-ed articles in major national and international outlets, testimony before governmental bodies, and volunteer activities with students intended to confirm the commitment of the IA Department to promoting a life-long commitment to public service and to enhance the reputation and visibility of the Department and the Bush School.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of International Affairs 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.

- 4.1** Indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* include, but are not limited to receipt of a teaching award, very high student evaluations, exemplary peer evaluations, engagement with high-impact learning experiences and/or efforts that go beyond the ordinary for the benefit of students, the Department and the School.
- 4.2** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching* include, but are not limited to, acceptable student evaluations and evidence of professionalism in the classroom.
- 4.3** Indicators of *Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* include, but is not limited to, publication of a book by a leading academic press, publication of an article or articles in first-rank journals, receipt of a major external research grant and/or receipt of a major research award.
- 4.4** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* include, but are not limited to, publications that goes beyond shorter (1,500 words or less) articles regarding current events. Such publications could be in journals, edited volumes, respected on-line outlets, research institutions' outlets, government publications and the like. Editing a volume and publishing a book with a second-tier press are also indications of effectiveness in research.
- 4.5** Indicators of *Excellence in Service* include, but are not limited to, a level of effort well above the norm at the Department, School, University and/or professional levels. The leadership of a campus-wide organization or a national or international professional organization is one example of an indicator of excellence in service.
- 4.6** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* include, but are not limited to, a normal amount of effort at the Department, School, University and/or professional levels. Such effort is represented particularly in work on committees at those levels.

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 (teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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 unit are as follows:

- 5.1.1** Assistant Professor: Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must be engaged in a research program that culminates in a series of peer-reviewed articles, chapters,

monographs, or books indicating that the candidate's work is earning a national reputation in his or her field. In other words, candidates should have produced ideas and findings that are recognized by others in the field as advancing knowledge. (Please see 3.2 for definition of a "book.") The Department encourages publications based on the Ph.D. dissertation and, in addition, expects original research that has moved beyond the specific dissertation topic or question.

- 5.1.2** Associate Professor: Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must complete an additional research program that culminates in a major book or series of articles or monographs that are judged to have "some measure of national recognition" ([University Rule 12.01.99.M2.01](#)). (Please see 3.2 for definition of a "book.") Evidence that the candidate is providing intellectual leadership within the Department, the Bush School and the University and is contributing to the development of younger scholars will be taken into account.
- 5.1.3** Professor: Candidates for promotion to either Associate Professor or Full Professor must, as an important but not sufficient indicator of the quality of their work, place a significant portion of their published articles in peer-reviewed professional journals related to public affairs, international affairs, public policy, or the candidate's field of academic expertise. Publications in important but not peer-reviewed policy journals are also considered an integral part of a candidate's research portfolio in the review process but cannot substitute for peer-reviewed work. Research monographs or books should be published with a university press or recognized publisher of quality professional scholarship. Chapters in edited volumes will be given more weight if the candidate provides clear evidence that a peer review process has been followed. Publications should include single-authored works, but evidence of joint contributions with co-authors is also given due weight, though the precise contribution of the faculty member to the co-authored work must be spelled out and confirmed.
- 5.1.4** Promotion and tenure decisions will consider the merit of scholarly work that incorporates interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary perspectives, including research published in interdisciplinary outlets.
- 5.1.5** Additional considerations in assessing research activities may also include:
- Published review essays, book reviews, symposia proceedings, including publications in more policy-oriented outlets.
 - Grants received from external agencies to support research activities
 - Citations and references to the candidate's published work
 - Work in progress (e.g., unpublished conference papers) giving evidence of an ongoing research program likely to lead to substantial scholarly contributions
 - Honors or awards conferred on the scholar or his/her publications by organizations or authorities qualified to appraise the significance of the particular work
- 5.1.6** Faculty are expected to maintain a high standard of learning for themselves in terms of keeping current with the latest developments in their fields of study, to work continuously to share their knowledge in an effective way with their students, and to strive for excellence in pedagogy. See Section 3.1 of these guidelines for details.
- 5.1.7** Department faculty members are expected to be engaged in an appropriate mix of service activities consistent with their teaching and research responsibilities. See Section 3.3 of these guidelines for details.
- 5.1.8** Colleagues are directed to consult the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Sections III.D.12 through III.D. 14 for further discussion of evaluation criteria.

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. For details on appointment in Academic Professional Track ranks and expectations of colleagues in those ranks, see the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Sections III.H.1-III.H. 3. 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 (see Section 3.2 and 5.1 of these guidelines for details). For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty. For academic professional track faculty in the instructional ranks, promotion requires outstanding performance as an instructor (see Section 3.1 of these guidelines), significant service to the School and beyond (see Section 3.3 of these guidelines) and evidence of the Department's continuing need for instruction in the candidate's areas of expertise.

5.2.1 Criteria and procedures for promotion in the Academic Professional Track ranks are found in the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Section III.H.4.

5.3 Promotion and Tenure Review Process

The Promotion and Tenure review process in the Department of International Affairs is governed by University Rule 12.01.99.M2.01. and by the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Section III.D for tenured and tenure track colleagues and Section III.H for Academic Professional Track colleagues.

5.3.1 Timeline: A candidate for promotion and/or tenure in any rank will meet with the Department Head and the Chair of the Department's Promotion and Tenure committee in the semester before such consideration occurs. During that meeting the Department Head and the Chair of the committee will provide the candidate with the most recent copy of the Dean of Faculties' Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and of the Department's bylaws, indicating the responsibilities of the candidate in preparing their dossier and the timeline for submitting that material. In normal circumstances, the candidate submits their material by mid-August. Consideration of promotion and tenure within the Department occurs in the fall semester in the normal course of events. The Evaluation Sub-Committee or Faculty Review Committee (in the case of Academic Professional Track colleagues) prepares its report during September. The Department Promotion and Tenure committee meets with sufficient time to allow the Department Head, School Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean to complete their work by the deadline set by the Dean of Faculties. Normally, the Department committee will meet in October. The Department Head will forward their report and the Department Committee report to the School Committee by the end of October. The School Committee will meet in November. The Dean will report to the Dean of Faculties by the deadline set by the latter, normally in early December.

5.3.2 Criteria: The criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure in the Department of International Affairs are found in the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Sections III.D.1 through III.D.15. The criteria and procedures for promotion in the Academic Professional Track ranks are found in the Department of International Affairs bylaws, Section III.H.4.

5.3.3 Department and School Promotion and Tenure Committees: The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all the tenured members of the Department. The Department Head appoints the Chair of the Committee. The School Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of equal numbers of members of the two departments of the Bush School, normally two from each department. The Dean appoints its members, upon the advice of the Department Heads, and appoints its Chair. The procedures of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee are found in the Department of International Affairs bylaws, sections III.D. 4 through III.D.10.

6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion). In the Department of International Affairs, annual reviews are conducted by the Department Head.

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.M2](#) 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.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured 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 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.M2](#) (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. For research evaluation of colleagues with tenure or a tenure track appointment, there is an expanded window of three years. Colleagues are encouraged to explain the status of long-term projects and the context in which annual activities have occurred in their annual report to the Department Head.

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 as “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, “Good” (which mirrors the University rating of “Satisfactory”), or “Excellent” (which mirrors the University ratings of “Exemplary” or “Most Meritorious”) based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.4.1 *Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:*

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or teaching.
- Good – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **good 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.

6.4.2 *Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity are*

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- 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 funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- Good – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- Excellent – 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.

6.4.3 *Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:*

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. 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.
- Good – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. 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.
- Excellent – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. 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 would be typical.

6.5 Required Components

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

The exact form of the faculty member's report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must include the following:

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

Examples of possible content for the report are:

- Full citations to published work;
- Status reports on work currently under review;
- Status reports on current projects, including a description of research activities during the review period;
- Descriptions of presentations at scholarly meetings;
- Research grants and contracts won;
- Scholarly plans for the next reporting period;
- Report in tabular form of courses taught, enrollments and student evaluation scores;
- Efforts made to improve pedagogy;
- Teaching awards;
- Descriptions of service activities at the department, college, university, and professional levels; and
- An up-to-date copy of the faculty member's CV.

6.5.2 Review of assistant and associate professors by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department Promotion and Tenure committee will review the annual report of each assistant professor in the tenure track every year and report to the Department Head the committee's judgment as to whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward tenure and whether the faculty member's appointment should be renewed. The members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee with the rank of Professor will review the annual reports of Associate Professors every other year (the Bi-Annual Mentoring Review), but not in the year of the scheduled post-tenure review (the 6-year Post-Tenure Periodic Peer Review). The review committee will report to the Department Head their advice on the faculty member's progress toward promotion to Professor. This process for Associate Professors is designed to provide collegial mentorship to support the path toward promotion and is fundamentally developmental in nature, rather than evaluative. The Department Head, as part of the annual review, will report these findings to the faculty member.

6.5.3 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 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. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. 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.

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.

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

The department head, director, or supervisor may 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.

6.5.5 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), 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 6.4). 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 8.2 and 8.3) 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 8) 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 8), 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 predetermined 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 Dean of Faculties’ *Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews* states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.” Faculty will submit annual reports early in spring semester to cover the preceding calendar year. Annual review will take place during the spring semester with department head reports submitted to the Dean before the end of May at the latest.

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

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department’s 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 Dean of Faculties. 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 Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

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.M2.01](#)

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2.01](#) (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 teaching, research/scholarly activity, 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 midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

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

The timetable presented here represents the latest that the University allows for midterm reviews. The Department of International Affairs conducts the mid-term review in the fall semester of the candidate's third year. In the example presented above, the Department would conduct the midterm review in the fall semester of 2021. The Department Head meets with candidates for third year review in the spring semester of their

second year to discuss the review process and set out a timeline for classroom observations and submission of materials.

Mid-term reviews for tenure-track assistant professors in the Department of International Affairs mirror the promotion review process, with the exception that the Department does not seek external evaluation letters. The chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the chair's designate (which could be the Department Head), appoints an Evaluation Sub-Committee (ESC) to collect information on the research, teaching and service of the colleague under review. ESC members are required to visit at least one class session being taught by the colleague under review. The ESC writes a report to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee on the colleague's teaching, research, and service. The Committee assesses this report, making changes as it sees as fit, and adds a summary of its discussion and its vote on whether the colleague is making adequate progress toward tenure and on whether the colleague's contract should be renewed. Criteria for making this assessment are found in the Department's bylaws, Sections III.D.13, III.D.14 and III.D.15. A finding that the colleague is not making such progress could be grounds for non-renewal of contract. The Committee sends its report to the Department Head, who composes an independent report on the colleague's teaching, research, and service, concluding with an independent assessment of adequate progress toward tenure and a recommendation on contract renewal. The Committee's report and the Department Head's report are sent to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee, which reviews them and makes an assessment of adequate progress toward tenure and a recommendation to the Dean on contract renewal. The Dean then decides on contract renewal, based upon the reports from the Department committee, the Department Head, and the School committee.

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm 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. *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 8.2).

8.1 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.

8.2 Peer Review Committee

Reviews will be conducted by ad hoc committees consisting of at least two other tenured faculty members. The Department Head will appoint the Peer Review Committees. To the extent possible and subject to practical constraints that may exist, a Peer Review Committee should consist of individuals of equal or greater rank to the

person under review.

8.3 Process

- 8.3.1** Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- CV of the faculty member under review – required
 - Table of faculty member’s courses taught during the period, including course name, semester, enrollment and student evaluation numbers (overall average, “good course” and “good instructor”), to be prepared by the Department office – required
 - Classroom observations by members of the Peer Review Committee of the faculty member’s teaching – required
 - Annual reviews prepared by the Department Head of the faculty member during the period under review, if requested by the Peer Review Committee
 - Materials chosen by the faculty member to submit, including if desired a summary of activity in the period
 - Materials requested by the Peer Review Committee of the faculty member (e.g. published work, research work in process)
- 8.3.2** 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 each of the categories of assigned responsibilities (normally research, teaching and service), as well as an overall evaluation. That report will be submitted to the Dean. 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 three ratings that the Peer Review Committee may assign are “unsatisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and “good” (corresponding to the University rating of “satisfactory”).
- 8.3.3** If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4** A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in these guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5** A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in these guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6** 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.
- 8.3.7** 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. 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. It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.
- 8.3.8** **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who, during that academic year, 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.

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 6.6.1) or an "Unsatisfactory" Periodic Peer Review (see Section 8.3.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, 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.

- 8.4.1** 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.
- 8.4.2** 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.
- 8.4.3** The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Development 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
- 8.4.4** The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 8.4.5** 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:
 - 8.4.5.1** 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,

- 8.4.5.2** Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan,
- 8.4.5.3** 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 8.5.) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 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)

8.6 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 Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost 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 Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

8.7 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](#)).

9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

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

The emeritus title is intended to honor those who have produced significant contributions to the Department through teaching, research, service, administration, and engagement. Faculty members who at the time of their separation are following a Professional Development Plan because a Professional Development Review Committee found substantial or chronic deficiencies are not eligible for emeritus status. The tenured faculty of the Department must vote on the decision to recommend emeritus status but may do so electronically at the discretion of the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Contact Office

Department of International Affairs, Office of the Department Head, e-mail: plhosea@tamu.edu