

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Department of Political Science

Approved by the Department of Political Science on June 30th, 2021

Approved by the College of Liberal Arts July 7, 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties August 30, 2021

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
3.	Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1)	3
3.1	Teaching.....	3
3.2	Research, scholarly activity, or creative work	4
3.3	Service.....	4
4.	Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness.....	4
4.1	Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to	4
4.2	Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to.....	5
4.3	Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to	5
4.5	Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to.....	5
4.6	Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to	5
4.7	Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to	6
5.	Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure	6
5.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	6
5.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)	8
6.	Annual Review	10
6.1	Purpose	10
6.2	Process.....	11
6.3	Focus	11
6.4	Time Period of Review	11
6.5	Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	11
6.6	Required Components.....	12
6.7	Assessment outcomes that require action	14
6.8	Time-Line	14
6.9	Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines	14

7.	Mid-Term Review.....	14
7.1	Purpose.....	16
7.2	Process.....	17
7.3	Feedback from midterm review	17
8.	Post-Tenure Review	17
8.1	Purpose.....	17
8.2	Peer Review Committee	17
8.3	Process.....	18
8.4	Professional Development Review	18
8.5	The Professional Development Plan.....	19
8.6	Appeal.....	20
8.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	20
9.	Granting Faculty Emeritus Status.....	20

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Political Science is to:

- Encourage the discovery, development & dissemination of scientific knowledge about politics.
- We do this through our research, teaching, and various forms of outreach.
- Through the teaching of the scientific method, we hope to imbue future generations of citizens with the ability to critically evaluate claims made in their political environment and contribute effectively to national and international discourse.
- In addition to contributing to scientific knowledge today, we hope to contribute to future advances through innovations in political methodology and through the training of the next generation of scholars.

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 Political Science 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. (UR 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	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/

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](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#). Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M2) associated with each title within their unit.

The Department of Political Science has faculty in three tracks: Lecturer, Instructional Professor, and Tenure-Track Professors. The Instructor track contains ranks of Instructor and Senior Instructor, the Instruction Professor track contains the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full. The Tenure-track contains the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full. Lecturer track faculty have responsibilities related to teaching, Instructional track faculty have responsibilities related to teaching and service, and Tenure-track faculty have responsibilities involving research, teaching, and service. These responsibilities are defined in detail below.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2, 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, 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:

For tenure-track faculty the Department of Political Science provides annual reviews that cover teaching, research, and service.

Part 8.4 of the Department of Political Science By-Laws explains evaluation criteria. It states: Faculty members are evaluated on their teaching, research, and university and professional service. Retention or advancement within the faculty depends upon high performance in all three categories. Exceptional performance in one category cannot substitute for inadequate performance in another.

8.4.1 Teaching -- Faculty are expected to maintain a high standard of scholarship for themselves and for their students. This will be reflected by:

- a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of his/her field of specialty;
- good skills in the planning, organization, and presentation of course material;
- ability to stimulate participation, thought, and inquiry by students; and
- ability to provide effective advisement and direction of students in their academic work and in their research tasks (e.g., through the directing of senior honors theses, integration with an ongoing research project, co-authoring of papers with students, directing dissertations, participating on dissertation committees)
- contributions to mentoring of graduate students in the department, especially when considering promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

Research conducted by Lecturer and Instructional track faculty is evaluated only in the context of its contribution to teaching. They are not evaluated as research per say.

Research conducted by Tenure-track Faculty is evaluated in terms of its contribution to the development of the discipline, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, through research and publication. Quality and quantity of effort will be considered. Both the advancement of knowledge and its professional dissemination are crucial. (According to the Department of Political Science By-Laws, point 8.4.2)

For tenure-track faculty the Department provides annual reviews that cover teaching, research, and service. As stated in the Department By-Laws 6.1.

3.3 Service:

According to the Department of Political Science By-Laws, point 8.4.3 -- University and Professional Service

8.4.3.1 Evidence of service to the profession shall include the following:

- Active participation in scholarly and professional societies, such as service as an officer, editorial board member, or major committee member;
- service as a consultant to or member of national, state, or local agencies, or other public bodies.

8.4.3.2 In evaluating the contribution of a faculty member to University governance, the following criteria shall be used:

- active participation in University and College-wide councils, boards, and committees;
- service to the department by participation in departmental committees, student committees, and departmental student activities.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit 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. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)).

Information about indicators of excellence and effectiveness in each of the below categories are taken from the Department of Political Science Rubric for Evaluation of Faculty Annual Reviews

4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

Satisfactory - Outstanding — In addition to excellent reviews, "some" of the following: (O).

- Teach lots of students
- Central Role in Grad Program (Teach more than 1 grad seminar, Methods course, or serve on lots of dissertation committees, Grad Placements)
- Pedagogic Innovation.
- National-level teaching panels, conferences, awards
- Significant teaching award with detailed and formalized review process.
- Teach more than 1 "W" course
- Significant Teaching-related grants
- 1 or more new course proposals
- Lots of 685s, honors theses; lots of 485s
- Organizes study abroad opportunities (could be on annual basis).

Satisfactory - Exceeds expectations — in addition to good reviews, "a few" of the following: (EE)

- Central Role in Grad Program (Teach more than 1 grad seminar, Methods course, or serve on lots of dissertation committees)
- Teach lots of students
- 1 "W" course;
- Grad seminar

- 685s; 485s;
- Teach study abroad
- Teaching-related grant

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

Satisfactory Meets expectations (ME)

- No reports of problems; competent syllabi; implementing university objectives (e.g., learning objectives on syllabi), little else

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

In terms of the rubric for research and the journals, the top journals are the consensus top general journals (British Journal of Political Science, American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, Journal of Politics, and Political Science Research and Methods), plus the top subfield journals (PA, International Organizations, Comparative Political Studies, Political Behavior, Politics & Gender, Political Theory).

Priority placed on original research, peer reviewed and written for peer scholars. Most of the weight comes from work published in that academic year with the work that is still forthcoming counting less but used as a leading indicator.

Satisfactory -Outstanding — (O+, O, O-)

- Article in top journal; book placed with top university press. (Journal ranking listed as above or objective evidence of prominence & selectivity provided by faculty member; top university presses include Cambridge, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Oxford, or objective evidence of prominence & selectivity provided by faculty member).
- Huge external grant (\$500,000+; multiple years; pays overhead; peer reviewed).
- Significant award for research by major political science organization or organization in cognate discipline (e.g., lifetime achievement award by APSA section).

Satisfactory - Exceeds expectations (EE+, EE, EE-)

- 2d-tier journal article or book
- Significant external grant (peer-reviewed and pays overhead).
- Significant internal grant for research (not for travel)
- Award for research by major political science organization. (E.g., "best paper" at conference award.
- Multiple invited talks at prestigious places

4.5 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

Satisfactory - Meets expectations (ME+, ME)

- Conference paper; discernable progress on credible research agenda with an eye to publication (e.g., evidence that previous conference paper(s) are under active revision or in the review process), book chapter.

4.6 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

Satisfactory - Outstanding (O)

- Significant service w/ national association (officer; section organizer for conference)
- Journal editor
- Service on at least 2 departmental standing committees
- Significant university-level service (or service along with one or more of the above)
- Reviewed a lot of tenure/promotion cases for other universities and colleges.

Satisfactory - Exceeds expectations — Service in at least two of the following areas unless evidence of very significant service in one area (EE)

- Service on 1 standing committee
- Lots of reviewer work for journals, NSF, etc. Service on active editorial board
- Some modestly significant university or college service
- Mentors faculty (in addition to above)
- External reviewer for tenure cases

- Service on promotion committee 3d year; 6th year.
- Search committee service
- Significant service to educational mission of university-related student group (advisor with significant involvement and time demands).

4.7 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:

Satisfactory - Meets expectations(ME)

- Departmental service appropriate to rank (e.g., attends meetings, responds to occasional service requests, serves on one committee if requested);
- Computer committee
- Chair or discussant at conference
- Reviews for journals
- Mentors less senior faculty
- Service to educational mission of university-related student group (e.g., advisor).

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 is as follows:

Item 8.4 in the Department By-Laws explains that, Tenure- track faculty members are evaluated on their teaching, research, and university and professional service. Retention or advancement within the faculty depends upon high performance in all three categories. Exceptional performance in one category cannot substitute for inadequate performance in another.

8.4.2 Research

All faculty are expected to contribute to the development of the discipline, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, through research and publication. Quality and quantity of effort will be considered. Both the advancement of knowledge and its professional dissemination are crucial.

At a minimum (necessary, but not necessarily sufficient conditions), candidates are expected to have the following:

8.4.2.1 For tenure and promotion to the Associate rank: the completion of a research program culminating as a series of articles published in major political science journals, or in major journals in cognate multidisciplinary areas, or as a book published by a university press or reputable academic publisher. The Department does not discourage work from the dissertation but expects in addition peer-reviewed publications beyond the dissertation. Faculty who achieve excellence in cognate multidisciplinary areas will be rewarded no differently from faculty who make equivalent contributions to disciplinary research or teaching.

For promotion to Professor: the completion of a substantial research program, culminating in the publication of a scholarly book or articles in the discipline's major journals, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, the theoretical and empirical significance of which will be evaluated in light of its impact on the discipline or in cognate multidisciplinary areas.

The research file and report should also give evidence of independent scholarly abilities through single authored publications or substantial contributions in co-authored research activities.

Assistant Professor:

(Taken from the Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation College of Liberal Arts) Assistant Professor: Assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.

(Political Science By-Laws) 6.2.2 Instructors are expected to show satisfactory progress toward completion of the Ph.D., which would normally be completed within the first year of probationary status.

Associate Professor:

According to the By-Laws of the Department of Political Science, Item 8.4 Criteria -- For promotion to Associate Professor, the normal minimum time in rank prior to consideration is four years.

8.4.1 Teaching -- Faculty are expected to maintain a high standard of scholarship for themselves and for their students. This will be reflected by:

- a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of his/her field of specialty;
- good skills in the planning, organization, and presentation of course material;
- ability to stimulate participation, thought, and inquiry by students; and
- ability to provide effective advisement and direction of students in their academic work and in their research tasks (e.g., through the directing of senior honors theses, integration with an ongoing research project, co-authoring of papers with students, directing dissertations, participating on dissertation committees)
- contributions to mentoring of graduate students in the department, especially when considering promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

8.4.2 Research -- All faculty are expected to contribute to the development of the discipline, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, through research and publication. Quality and quantity of effort will be considered. Both the advancement of knowledge and its professional dissemination are crucial.

At a minimum (necessary, but not necessarily sufficient conditions), candidates are expected to have the following:

8.4.2.1 For tenure and promotion to the Associate rank: the completion of a research program culminating as a series of articles published in major political science journals, or in major journals in cognate multidisciplinary areas, or as a book published or in production by a university press or reputable academic publisher. The Department does not discourage work from the dissertation but expects in addition peer-reviewed publications beyond the dissertation. Faculty who achieve excellence in cognate multidisciplinary areas will be rewarded no differently from faculty who make equivalent contributions to disciplinary research or teaching.

The primary indicators of professional progress for promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor include, but are not necessarily limited to, published or in press scholarly monographs, refereed articles in professional journals, or in major journals in cognate multidisciplinary areas, and chapters in scholarly books in which peer review played a substantial role in accepting the publication.

Additional considerations in assessing research activities may also include:

- Published review essays, book reviews, and symposia proceedings.
- Grants received from external agencies to support disciplinary research activities, or research in cognate multidisciplinary areas.
- Reviews and favorable references to the faculty member's published work
- Work in progress (e.g., unpublished conference papers) giving evidence of an ongoing research program leading to substantial contributions to the discipline, or in cognate multidisciplinary areas.

The research file and report should also give evidence of independent scholarly abilities through single authored publications or substantial contributions in co-authored research activities.

8.4.3 Service

8.4.3.1 Evidence of service to the profession shall include the following:

- Active participation in scholarly and professional societies, such as service as an officer, editorial board member, or major committee member;
- service as a consultant to or member of national, state, or local agencies, or other public bodies.

8.4.3.2 In evaluating the contribution of a faculty member to University governance, the following criteria shall be used:

- active participation in University and College-wide councils, boards, and committees;
- service to the department by participation in departmental committees, student committees, and departmental student activities.

Professor:

According to the By-Laws of the Department of Political Science, Item 8.4 Criteria -- For promotion to Professor, the normal minimum time in rank prior to consideration is four years.

- 8.4.1 Teaching -- Faculty are expected to maintain a high standard of scholarship for themselves and for their students. This will be reflected by:
- a thorough and up-to-date knowledge of his/her field of specialty;
 - good skills in the planning, organization, and presentation of course material;
 - ability to stimulate participation, thought, and inquiry by students; and
 - ability to provide effective advisement and direction of students in their academic work and in their research tasks (e.g., through the directing of senior honors theses, integration with an ongoing research project, co-authoring of papers with students, directing dissertations, participating on dissertation committees)
 - contributions to mentoring of graduate students in the department, especially when considering promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
- 8.4.2 Research -- All faculty are expected to contribute to the development of the discipline, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, through research and publication. Quality and quantity of effort will be considered. Both the advancement of knowledge and its professional dissemination are crucial.

At a minimum (necessary, but not necessarily sufficient conditions), candidates are expected to have the following:

- 8.4.2.1 For promotion to Professor: the completion of a substantial research program, culminating in the publication of a scholarly book or articles in the discipline's major journals, or cognate multidisciplinary areas, the theoretical and empirical significance of which will be evaluated in light of its impact on the discipline or in cognate multidisciplinary areas.

The primary indicators of professional progress for promotion to Associate Professor or to Professor include, but are not necessarily limited to, published or in press scholarly monographs, refereed articles in professional journals, or in major journals in cognate multidisciplinary areas, and chapters in scholarly books in which peer review played a substantial role in accepting the publication.

Additional considerations in assessing research activities may also include:

- Published review essays, book reviews, and symposia proceedings.
- Grants received from external agencies to support disciplinary research activities, or research in cognate multidisciplinary areas.
- Reviews and favorable references to the faculty member's published work
- Work in progress (e.g., unpublished conference papers) giving evidence of an ongoing research program leading to substantial contributions to the discipline, or in cognate multidisciplinary areas.

The research file and report should also give evidence of independent scholarly abilities through single authored publications or substantial contributions in co-authored research activities.

8.4.3 Service

8.4.3.1 Evidence of service to the profession shall include the following:

- Active participation in scholarly and professional societies, such as service as an officer, editorial board member, or major committee member;
- service as a consultant to or member of national, state, or local agencies, or other public bodies.

8.4.3.2 In evaluating the contribution of a faculty member to University governance, the following criteria shall be used:

- active participation in University and College-wide councils, boards, and committees;
- service to the department by participation in departmental committees, student committees, and departmental student activities.

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 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.

Political Science Department By-Laws item 7 states: Annual Reviews of Non-Tenure-track Faculty

Those in non-tenure-accruing positions (e.g., visiting appointments) shall have their status considered by the Head annually with no presumption of reappointment.

Additional information regarding promotions follows the documentation of the College of Liberal Arts: CLLA Guidelines for Faculty Titles & CLLA Faculty Academic Professional Track Guidelines

Instructional [Rank] Professor: Mainly dedicated to teaching, the appointment differs from lectureships in that it must also involve substantial committee work, curriculum development, training, advising, or other administrative duties. Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor normally requires at least five years in the Instructional Assistant Professor rank and strong evidence of quality performance in teaching and service. Depending on departmental requirements, promotion may also hinge on the evidence of professional development of a kind designated in the letter of appointment. Promotion to Instructional Full Professor would involve evidence of quality performance, and some indication of recognition at the university or professional level. All promotions must be approved through the same administrative channels that tenure-track promotions follow.

A. The annual evaluation should be guided by the professional duties specified in the letter of appointment or annual renewal letter, and any specific expectations or criteria for evaluation described there.

- i. Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and faculty in Instructional track titles should be evaluated on the quality of their teaching and work they have done to enhance instructional effectiveness. This evaluation should take into account everything that faculty members have done to improve their performance in the classroom and to enhance the learning experience for students. Examples might be:
 - disciplinary scholarship and research that informs teaching directly
 - scholarship and research on pedagogy
 - incorporating instructional technology into pedagogy
 - developing innovative course materials
 - developing new teaching skills and techniques
- ii. Faculty in titles including the modifier “Instructional” should also be evaluated on their service contributions.

Criteria for promotion are laid out in the CLLA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Process

In all cases of evaluation for promotion the candidate submits materials, and according to item 8 in the Political Science Department By-Laws: The Department Head shall prepare a dossier for each candidate undergoing formal college-level review. Each dossier must include the following:

- A curriculum vitae of the candidate
- A teaching report
- A research report
- A service report
- A summary report that summarizes the deliberation, recommendation, and vote of the personnel committee
- External letters evaluating the candidate's research (required for promotion to Associate or Full; optional for mid-term reviews)
- Personal recommendation of the department head

Department By-Laws 8 “College Level Reviews – Mid-term, Tenure and Promotion” states that The Department Head shall prepare a dossier for each candidate undergoing formal college-level review. This dossier is to include a research report.

For promotions this dossier includes:

- External letters evaluating the candidate's research. (Item 8.3.2 in the By-Laws says that in cases of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, at least three letters from scholars outside the university must be obtained to assist in the committee's evaluation. External reviewers are to be selected in accordance with University and College of Liberal Arts policies. At least one of the letters should be solicited from a person on a list submitted by the candidate if the candidate so chooses. Unless the candidate's list preempts all qualified persons, two referees should be independently designated by the Head in consultation with the Personnel Committee. The candidate may also submit a list of individuals who should not be asked to serve as external reviewers.) Item 8.3.2 in the By-Laws further explains that, Comments of the outside referees should be limited to the candidate's research unless other information is requested by the Department.

Item 8.1.1 in the By-Laws explains that the candidate for review or promotion provides materials for review to the Department Head and the Personnel Committee.

- All reviews require the submission of a complete, up-to-date vita which includes published works which distinguishes between books, articles, book chapters, etc. and between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications; an educational summary; professional employment history; fellowships, grants, or other awards; courses taught; university and departmental responsibilities; professional association memberships, activities, and achievements; research consulting; complete citations (including coauthors) for chapters in books, journal articles, monographs, book reviews, and grant reports; a list of unpublished research such as convention papers, unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals, and occasional papers; and an enumeration of research in progress with an indication of the stage of completeness.
- The file should also contain copies of publications, teaching scores and other teaching-related data as mentioned below, plus any additional supporting evidence, such as letters, documents, or syllabi. In addition, candidates for midterm, or end-of-term tenure and promotion should submit a brief personal statement.

8.3.2 Research Report

- The Research Committee should personally examine research materials (publications, professional papers, grant applications, etc.) of the candidate. Factors to be considered by the Committee relate to the general criteria listed in 8.4. The committee's evaluation should include an assessment of the quality, quantity, and placement of the candidate's research.

Item 8.3.6 in the By-Laws explains that, The Teaching, Research and Service Committees shall also prepare final drafts of their respective reports consistent with the Personnel Committee's vote.

Item 8.3.7 in the By-Laws explains that, The Department Head shall prepare an independent personal recommendation regarding the candidate for the Dean. In addition, The Department Head shall inform candidates of decisions made at each step in the review process. In consultation with the Personnel Committee, the Head will normally provide all successful candidates for mid-tenure review with a written performance report within 60 days of the mid-term review meeting. This report should include observed strengths and areas of performance where particular improvement in the next two years is expected. The report should contain the kind of detail that will assist a candidate in demonstrating appropriate accomplishment at the next formal college-level review.

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).

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 Process

All members of the faculty are reviewed annually by the Department Head. Each member of the faculty submits a report summarizing their research, teaching and service activities for the year. The Department Head evaluates performance in each of the three areas of responsibility dividing performances into three broad categories: Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory. The Satisfactory category is further divided into categories of descending performance: Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations and Meets Expectations. Because some laudable projects take time to reach fulfillment, annual fluctuations in research output are unavoidable. For this reason, each faculty member's performance in a given year is based on a 3-year average.

Non-tenure track members are reviewed in a similar fashion, though their job description typically does not include research activity. Accordingly, Academic Professional Track faculty with "instructional" in their title are evaluated in terms of teaching and service, while lecturers and senior lecturers are evaluated in terms of teaching alone. .

Tenure-track members of the faculty submit materials for evaluation by all tenured faculty. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty in a meeting, conducts first, second, fourth, and fifth-year reviews of all untenured tenure-track faculty members for purposes of judging satisfactory performance relevant to contract renewal. The consultative faculty shall consist of the tenured faculty above the ranks of the individual being reviewed. Faculty vote on whether they believe the faculty member being reviewed is making adequate progress toward tenure and whether their contract should be renewed.

If the Head's decision on contract renewal is contrary to that of the consultative faculty, then, prior to transmittal of a recommendation to the Dean, the consultative faculty shall be convened for further consultation. A written evaluation by the head summarizing the evaluation is given to the candidate as soon as possible, but no later than 60 days after the faculty meeting.

6.3 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).

6.4 Time Period of Review

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

6.5 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 at least three categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Meets expectations/Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations." A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" 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.

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 didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

- Exemplary – 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.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational 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.

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work 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, for example, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, for example, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. 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.

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.
- Satisfactory – 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.
- Exemplary – 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.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

6.6 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).

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 or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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:

All faculty in the Department of Political Science submit annually "Faculty Annual Review Information". This form must be submitted by the end of January to the Department Head, and it contains information about accomplishment in the previous calendar year for Research, Teaching and Service. This document requests information about:

- Research, including published articles, books, book chapters, works accepted for publication, works under review, conference papers, grant proposals, invited research presentations, fellowships
- Teaching, including courses taught (including W courses), enrollment and evaluations, service on dissertation committees, publications co-authored with students, new course development, advising for graduate students, textbooks published, lectures given on pedagogy, teaching awards.
- Service, including compliance with University training programs, administrative roles in the Department, direction of a Department research colloquia program, work on Department, College, or University committee, work as a journal editor, membership on an editorial board, work as an advisor to a student organization, roles in professional organizations, work organizing conference programs, journal reviewing, service awards, non-university service. Tenured faculty also provide information about mentoring work, service as a reviewer for tenure or promotion cases.

In addition to the required "Faculty Annual Review Information" form:

- Tenured faculty supply brief summaries (250 words) of research in progress. Tenured faculty may also explain how their teaching work contributes to interdisciplinarity/multidisciplinary, collaborative work, and/or internationalization. Tenured faculty may also explain how their service contributes to interdisciplinarity/multidisciplinary, or internationalization.
- Tenure-track faculty provide a personal statement, conforming to DOF guidelines (3 pages) describing their research, teaching and service.
- Both tenured and tenure-track faculty may also explain on their "Faculty Annual Review Information" form any accomplishments that have contributed to national prominence, internationalization that were not covered elsewhere in the form.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

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.

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.

Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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.

6.7 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:

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 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).

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.

6.8 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.”

6.9 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

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

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (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.

Procedure used in the Department of Political Science as stated in the Department of Political Science By-Laws 6.1,

Faculty in the tenure-track are appointed on a year-to-year probationary basis in anticipation of more formal reviews during the third and sixth years. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty in a meeting, shall conduct first, second, fourth, and fifth-year reviews of a less formal nature (in comparison to those for mid-term and promotion and tenure) of all untenured tenure-track faculty members for purposes of judging satisfactory performance relevant to contract renewal.

6.1.1 explains that -- For Instructors and Assistant Professors, the consultative faculty shall consist of tenured Associate Professors and Professors.

6.1.5 explains that -- Candidates should be informed as soon as possible after the meeting of the faculty vote and the head's recommendation. A written evaluation by the head summarizing the evaluation shall be given to the candidate as soon as possible, but no later than 60 days after the faculty meeting.

6.2 explains that -- The annual review of untenured tenure-track faculty aims to gauge and monitor the progression of a candidate through the probationary period in terms of the criteria applicable to the eventual granting of promotion and tenure.

Department By-Laws 8 "College Level Reviews – Mid-term, Tenure and Promotion" states that The Department Head shall prepare a dossier for each candidate undergoing formal college-level review. This dossier is to include a teaching report. [and research and service reports]

8.1.1 Materials for Review Provided by the Candidate. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide as complete a documentation or file as possible in light of the policies, procedures, and criteria described below. This information shall be provided to the Department Head and Personnel Committee. All reviews require the submission of a complete, up-to-date vita which includes published works which distinguishes between books, articles, book chapters, etc. and between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications; an educational summary; professional employment history; fellowships, grants, or other awards; courses taught; university and departmental responsibilities; professional association memberships, activities, and achievements; research consulting; complete citations (including coauthors) for chapters in books, journal articles, monographs, book reviews, and grant reports; a list of unpublished research such as convention papers, unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals, and occasional papers; and an enumeration of research in progress with an indication of the stage of completeness. Candidates should read and abide by the College of Liberal Arts guidelines on preparation of the vita. The file should also contain copies of publications, teaching scores and other teaching-related data as mentioned below, plus any additional supporting evidence, such as letters, documents, or syllabi. In addition, candidates for midterm should submit a brief personal statement. This statement must follow the requirements for the "Candidates' Statement(s)" in the Dean of Faculties' document, Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines, for the current year, and may place the above materials and the faculty member's own career in whatever perspective the individual sees fit.

8.1.2 When the individual submits the file to the Department Head, he or she will include a signed cover memo indicating that the file includes all the materials the candidate wishes to be considered by the Committee in deciding promotion and tenure.

8.1.4 Draft reports from the teaching, research, and service subcommittees will be placed in the promotion and tenure file one week prior to the Committee Meeting, and the Head will inform the individual under review that the reports are in the file.

8.1.5 The Department Head will make available to the individual under review, upon written request, copies of the external letters and draft reports to be reviewed by the Committee in the course of making its decision.

8.1.6 Once the individual under review has assembled the promotion and tenure file, the Department Head will inform all members of the Committee and the individual under review if material is added to the file prior to the Personnel Committee's meeting to vote on the case. This material may include additional information about publications, teaching activities, or service activities, or additional memoranda clarifying material in the file.

8.1.7 After the Personnel Committee's vote, additional material, or comments for the file by the individual under review should be directed to the individual responsible for the file at the next stage of review, namely the Department Head, Dean of the College, Dean of Faculties, Provost, or President. 6

8.1.8 Members of the Personnel Committee shall maintain confidentiality with respect to comments in the Departmental Personnel Committee meeting regarding the candidate and elements of the file.

8.2 Review Committees

8.2.1 Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee for mid-term reviews shall consist of all department faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with tenure.

8.2.2 Responsibilities

The Personnel Committee is responsible for the preparation of four reports: a summary report, and one each in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The Department Head will appoint evaluation sub-committees for each type of personnel decision (i.e., midterm review, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure if appropriate, and promotion to Professor with tenure if appropriate). Evaluation subcommittees shall prepare first drafts of the teaching, research, and service reports for review by the appropriate Personnel Committee. The evaluation sub-committees shall revise the report consistent with the Faculty's vote and incorporating comments from the Faculty. The summary report will be prepared after the meeting as described below. Evaluation sub-committee members shall sign the report as preparers of the report.

8.3 Preparation of Reports

Item 8.3.1 in the By-Laws explains that The Department Head shall appoint a Teaching Review Committee. The committee shall prepare a written report after reviewing relevant materials provided by the candidates and the department in accordance with procedures described below.

Evaluation of teaching performance for mid-term review, final tenure review and promotion to ranks above Assistant Professor shall be based upon instructional materials submitted by the faculty member under review and student evaluations. The faculty member may also request peer evaluations as described below or add other relevant information demonstrating teaching performance.

Furthermore, the data relevant to teaching will be accompanied by basic information indicating years of teaching service, grade distributions and student loads as generated by the Teaching Review Committee or as requested of the faculty.

8.3.1.1 Student evaluations from all available years derived from the formal process operative in the College. In evaluating these data, the Teaching Review Committee shall consider scores in light of grades, departmental and college norms, and they may also take into account such factors as course level, number of students, required status of courses, requirements of the course, and types of materials, methods, and examinations. The information in this category, as well as any other basic data, will be assembled by the candidate and forwarded to the Head, who in turn will forward it to the chair of the Teaching Review Committee as part of the candidate's files.

8.3.1.2 Peer evaluations by faculty visitations. Upon consultation with the faculty member being evaluated, members of the Teaching Review Committee may make at least two visits to classes, with the understanding that all courses have at least one visitation from a member of the Committee.

8.3.1.3 Factors to be considered by the Committee relate to the four general criteria (listed in 8.4) as well as to the specifics of course content and presentation, educational management, and the promotion of learning. Where appropriate, the Committee should consider instructional activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

8.3.1.4 The Teaching Review Committee shall provide all information gathered or provided in the above processes plus collectively composed narratives on strengths and weaknesses and any minority narratives to the Personnel Committee. The collective narrative and any minority narratives shall be signed by committee members. The Teaching Review Committee shall also forward recommendations for teaching improvement to the Head, who shall convey the information to the individual being evaluated.

Item 8.3.6 in the By-Laws explains that, The Teaching, Research and Service Committees shall also prepare final drafts of their respective reports consistent with the Personnel Committee's vote.

Item 8.3.7 in the By-Laws explains that, The Department Head shall prepare an independent personal recommendation regarding the candidate for the Dean. In addition, The Department Head shall inform candidates of decisions made at each step in the review process. In consultation with the Personnel Committee, the Head will normally provide all successful candidates for mid-tenure review with a written performance report within 60 days of the mid-term review meeting. This report should include observed strengths and areas of performance where particular improvement in the next two years is expected. The report should contain the kind of detail that will assist a candidate in demonstrating appropriate accomplishment at the next formal college-level review.

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/creative work, patient care, 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)

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 Review¹

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

Describe the unit composition/selection of the Peer Review Committee

A committee comprising five faculty members will constitute the peer review committee for tenured faculty in a given year. The committee will comprise three Full professors and two Associate professors.

- The three Full members of the committee will review Full professors undergoing peer review.

¹ Post-Tenure Review might not be applicable to your unit, especially if you do not have tenured faculty members, e.g., TAMUQ.

- All five committee members will review Associate professors undergoing peer review. The three full professors on the committee will be elected at large by the tenured faculty, and the two associate professors will be elected at large by the tenured faculty, using approval voting and other ballot procedures used for Heads Advisory Committee elections. In any given year, those tenured faculty who are undergoing peer review will not be eligible to be elected to the committee, but all tenured faculty will be eligible to vote on the committee.

8.3 Process

8.1.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:

- Example 1 The Head will provide committee members with the written criteria for meeting the standards of satisfactory performance and the annual review materials turned in by the faculty members to be reviewed, along with annual review forms from the previous 5 years. Faculty members undergoing review may include materials in addition to those called for in the regular annual review process.

8.1.2 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 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.

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

8.1.4 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.

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 the unit 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.² 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.

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 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 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 8.2.) 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

² It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

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 9.4.) 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.

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what "consultation" means.

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 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 of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3
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 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.

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

Contact Office

Political Science Office of William Clark, e-mail carriek@tamu.edu

Approved by the Department of Political Science on June 30th, 2021

Approved by the College of Liberal Arts July 7, 2021

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties August 30, 2021