

Department of Agricultural Economics Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation: Tenure Track and Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

**Approved by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on 6/21/2024
Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on 6/21/2024
Approved by faculty vote on 1/24/2023. Minor revisions approved on 6/18/2024**

1. Introduction	3
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	3
2.1. Tenured Professor	3
2.2. Tenured Associate Professor	4
2.3. Tenure-Track Assistant Professor	4
2.4. Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice	5
2.5. Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice	5
2.6. Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice	5
2.7. Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Lecturer	6
3. Areas of Faculty Performance	6
3.1. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work	6
3.2. Teaching	6
3.3. Service	7
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	7
4.1. General Indicators	7
4.2. Indicators for Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work	7
4.3. Indicators for Teaching	8
4.4. Indicators for Service	9
5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure	10
5.2. Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)	10
6. Annual Review by Department Head/Director/Supervisor	11
6.1. Purpose	12
6.2. Focus	12
6.3. Time Period of Review	12
6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance	12
6.5. Required Components	13
6.6. Assessment outcomes that require action	14
6.7. Timeline	15
6.8. Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:	15
7. Mid-Term Review	15
7.1. Purpose	15
7.2. Process	15
7.3. Feedback from mid-term review	16
8. Promotion and Tenure Review	16
8.1. Purpose	16
8.2. Process	16
9. Post-Tenure Review	19
9.1. Purpose	19
9.2. Peer Review Committee	19
9.3. Process	19
9.4. Professional Development Review	20
9.5. The Professional Development Plan	21
9.6. Appeal	21
9.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review	21
10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status	21
11. Contact Office	22

1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Texas A&M University is to engage people in the use of applied economic analysis for making decisions involving agribusinesses, natural resources, and communities through the pursuit of learning, leadership, professional development, and excellence. 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 for our faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service, where applicable, to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom; thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Department of Agricultural Economics; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01 - Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

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

2.1. Tenured Professor

The tenured Professor should be a recognized scholar and typically an accomplished teacher in a work area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating many of the following:

- National and international recognition/dissemination of scholarly work as reflected by publications in refereed journals, publications in profession-leading journals, invited presentations at regional, national and international meetings, citations to work, participation in peer review, editorial roles, research/publication awards, and observed national/international or multidisciplinary reliance on developed scholarly materials.
- Participation in national and international scientific groups through authorship on publications, invited presentations, meetings presentations, leadership activities, developed national/international contacts, roles in program design and policy deliberations and other activities.
- Evidence of effective collaboration and leadership within scholarly programs outside of the Department in AgriLife Research or more broadly in work-area-related scholarly activities carried out by university, industry, or other groups.
- Sustained record of securing external funding supporting one's program.

Contributions to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department and University through development and teaching of courses of high quality, advising and mentoring of students, participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by student groups, chairing graduate student committees, widespread membership on graduate student committees and related activities.

- Collaboration with or active support of outreach programs sponsored by AgriLife Extension or more broadly in work-area-related outreach activities carried out by University, industry, or other groups.
- Leadership, editorial and service roles in activities of disciplinary associations, as well as in activities of interdisciplinary, interagency regional, state, national or international group activities that are related to one's work area.
- Service and leadership roles on committees in the Department, College, University, or other AgriLife agencies as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the tenured Professor will contribute to an environment of scholarship, teaching excellence, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.2. Tenured Associate Professor

The tenured Associate Professor should exhibit emergence as a recognized scholar and typically be an accomplished teacher in a work area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating some of the following:

- Growing regional, national and international recognition/dissemination of scholarly work as reflected by publications in refereed journals, publications in profession-leading journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings, citations to work, participation in peer review, research/publication awards, and observed national/international or multidisciplinary reliance on developed scholarly materials.
- Participation in national and international scientific groups through activities like authorship on publications, presentations, meetings attendance, developed regional/national contacts and other activities.
Collaboration with scholarly programs outside of the Department in AgriLife Research or more broadly in work-area-related scholarly activities carried out by university, industry, or other groups.
- Record of participation in research grant proposals and success in obtaining external funding supporting one's program.
- Contributions to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department and University through development and teaching of courses of high quality, advising and mentoring of students, participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by student groups, membership on graduate student committees and related activities.
- Collaboration with outreach programs sponsored by AgriLife Extension, external universities, industry, or professional associations.
- Active participation in activities of and service to disciplinary associations and work-area-related activities of other interdisciplinary, interagency regional, state, national or international groups.
- Service roles on committees in the Department, College, University, or other AgriLife agencies as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the tenured Associate Professor will contribute to an environment of scholarship, teaching excellence, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.3. Tenure-Track Assistant Professor

The tenure-track Assistant Professor should exhibit potential for emergence as a recognized scholar and typically be an improving teacher in a work area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating or exhibiting potential for some of the following:

- Evidence of potential for attaining regional and national recognition of one's scholarly work as reflected by publications in refereed journals, publications in profession-leading journals, presentations at regional, national and international meetings, participation in peer review, research/publication awards and observed external professional reliance on developed scholarly materials.
- Efforts to participate in national and international scientific groups related to one's work area through meeting attendance, presentations, authorship on publications, roles in program design and policy deliberations, contact building and other activities.
- Participation in scholarly programs inside of the Department, and /or those in AgriLife Research or more broadly in work-area-related scholarly activities carried out by university, industry, or other groups.
- Record of participation in research grant proposals and some success in obtaining external funding supporting one's program.

- Productive contribution to the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department and University through teaching of courses of high quality, course development or revision, advising and mentoring students, limited participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by the teaching program, participation on graduate committees and related activities.
- Participation in outreach programs sponsored by AgriLife Extension, external universities, industry, or professional associations.
- Participation within work-area-related professional societies, interest and stakeholder groups that support the discipline, and building of professional connections and relationships.
- Limited service roles on committees in the Department, College, University, or other AgriLife agencies as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the tenure-track Assistant Professor will contribute to an environment of scholarship, teaching excellence, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.4. Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice

The Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice should be an accomplished teacher and lead a teaching program in an area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating many of the following:

- Provide leadership and demonstrate a sustained record of teaching excellence, contributing primarily to the Departmental undergraduate programs through development and teaching of courses of high quality, advising and mentoring of students, and participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by the undergraduate program.
- Leadership contributions to the programmatic matters regarding the overall Departmental teaching program, Significant contributions in one other area; either the area of scholarly research, or the area of service.
- Service to and leadership in professional societies and other groups that support teaching programs in the discipline.
- Service on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice will contribute to an environment of teaching excellence, scholarship, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.5. Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice

The Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice should exhibit emergence as an accomplished teacher and leader of a teaching program in an area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating some of the following:

- Demonstrated record of teaching excellence and contributions primarily to the Departmental undergraduate programs through development and teaching of courses of high quality, advising, and mentoring of students, and participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by the undergraduate program.
- Contributions to the programmatic matters regarding the overall Departmental teaching program,
- Significant contributions in one other area; either the area of scholarly research, or the area of service. Service to professional societies and other groups that support teaching programs in the discipline. Service on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice will contribute to an environment of teaching excellence, scholarship, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.6. Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice

The Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice should exhibit potential to be an accomplished teacher and leader of a teaching program in an area which falls in the domain of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this status would include a record demonstrating or exhibiting potential for some of the following:

- Emerging record of teaching excellence and contributions primarily to the Departmental undergraduate programs through development and teaching of courses of high quality, advising, and mentoring of students, and participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by the undergraduate program.
- Participation in deliberations on directions for the overall Departmental teaching program.

- Significant contributions in one other area; either the area of scholarly research, or the area of service.
- Service to professional societies and other groups that support teaching programs in the discipline.
- Service on committees in the Department and other college, university, and interdisciplinary programs as appropriate.

Through these and other efforts, the Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice will contribute to an environment of teaching excellence, scholarship, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

2.7. Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Lecturer

The **Principal Lecturer**, Senior Lecturer and Lecturer will exhibit effective classroom teaching, primarily at the undergraduate level, in support of the educational goals of the Department for both departmental majors and non-majors in topics related to agricultural and applied economics. Accomplishments relative to attaining and maintaining this position would include a record exhibiting the following:

- Demonstrated teaching excellence in course offerings
- Contributions to student advising and mentoring through advising, office hours, and through participation in out-of-classroom activities sponsored by the undergraduate program as appropriate.
- Participation in occasional committee service both in the Department and in the larger university community.

Through these and other efforts, the Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Lecturer will contribute to an environment of teaching excellence, collegiality, and collaboration within the Department.

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories (research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; teaching; and service as applicable). 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 assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

3.1. Research, scholarly activity, or creative work

Research is critical to the mission of the College and a defining element of our University as a Research I institution. All faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to be nationally/internationally recognized leaders in their areas of study with demonstrated impact that advances their field or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status in the case for tenure-track faculty members. Effectiveness and excellence in research significantly affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion for faculty members with research appointments.

The evaluation of research considers publications and other examples of creative work along with the impacts of professional program activities. The evaluation considers the volume of outputs and their quality plus external measures of their effect/contribution. Examples of specific research activities include: (1) original peer-reviewed scientific publications; (2) popular press articles, newsletters, and social media products; (3) research bulletins and reports for industry; (4) products of research experiences, technology transfer; (5) development of extramural funding activities; (6) participation in professional meetings, invited seminars, and related activities; (7) peer recognition, awards, and commendations; and (8) solicitation of scientific expertise. Other relevant measures of research output and productivity relating to impact of scholarly activity that may be considered include: (1) scientific citations, (2) clear evidence of reliance on research products by stakeholders or scientists, (3) professional or stakeholder advisory positions related to research program, (4) contacts from scientists nationally/internationally on research issues, and (5) professional or stakeholder group use of research program related results and advice.

3.2. Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. Performance in teaching is demonstrated by faculty activities that are centered on student learning success, curriculum advancement and pedagogy grounded in the professional disciplines in the Department. 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 which will be taken into account in evaluating teaching include: 1) self-evaluation, 2) peer-evaluation, and 3) formal teaching recognition. Other measures of teaching excellence and effectiveness that can be considered include but are not limited to: 1) student feedback through surveys of student opinions; 2) evidence of effective student learning; 3) documented accomplishments of students; and 4) creativity in programmatic development. Feedback from former students on how their learning experience has advanced them professionally will be solicited to the extent possible.

3.3. Service

Service is essential to the mission of the College and Department, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to engage effectively in service to the Department, College, and University, to their profession, and to society. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service focuses on the significance and impact of the service provided. Excellence in service must be documented demonstrating how service rendered has contributed to the national and international reputation and recognition for the faculty member and Texas A&M.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Agricultural Economics recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, accomplishments most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations are indicated by representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area below (see examples in [Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)). Criteria in bold italics are generally essential for a judgment of merit by category.

4.1. General Indicators

4.1.1. General Indicators of EXCELLENCE that Apply to all

- A record that exhibits strong evidence of continuous contributions in your appointed areas since last promotion.
- A record that exhibits strong evidence of a national or international reputation in your focus areas.
- A record that exhibits strong evidence of a focus on an important area of professional work that is appropriate to your appointed area of work.

4.1.2. General Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS that Apply to all

- A record that shows continuous contributions in your appointed areas since last promotion.
- A record that exhibits evidence of a regional and emerging national or international reputation in your focus areas. This is essential for promotion to full professor.
- A record that exhibits evidence of a focus in your stated professional work area.

4.2. Indicators for Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

4.2.1. Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:

Publications

- ***Publications in leading refereed journals relative to one's work area***
- Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
- Participation in major governmental, professional, or international books or reports
- Consistent levels of high-quality publications across one's career

Presentations

- Presentation of invited papers at major international and national professional or government meetings

Impact

- Awards received for publications or scholarly activities from national or international professional organizations
- Clear evidence of professional reliance and or contribution of publications through high levels of citations or published statements by others recognizing the contributions
- Evidence of national or international impact of research (legislation, government agencies or panels, congressional testimony, advisory boards, etc.)

- Statements attesting to outstanding contributions and professional reputation from external unbiased peers

Service and editorial work

- Serving as editor or co-editor of a major professional journal
- Serving as a member of a review panel for a national or international research organization or professional society

Grantsmanship

- Leadership role in significant external peer-reviewed research projects
- Substantial role in significant publications and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with other researchers.
- Consistent record of significant funding for years since last promotion
- Consistent record of participation in major interdisciplinary funding efforts

4.2.2. Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work include, but are not limited to:

Publications

- Publication of scholarly book(s)
- Publications in refereed journals
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized outlets
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Publication of research reports to industry/government resulting from competitive grant process.

Presentations

- Presentation of invited professional papers
- Presentation of peer-reviewed selected papers at national or international professional meetings
- Invited presentations of scholarly work before government and industry groups

Impact

- Awards for publications or research productivity from regional professional organizations
- Numerous citations of publications taking into account time since publication
- Evidence of state or regional impact of research
- Evidence of professional reliance and or contribution of publications through citations

Service

- Editing a scholarly book
- Chair of graduate student research committees
- Activities as listed for merit under service

Grantsmanship

- Principal investigator in peer-reviewed research projects
- Co-investigator role in significant funded research projects

4.3. Indicators for Teaching

4.3.1. Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Teaching

Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

Course development and delivery

- Outstanding development, substantiated by multiple sources, of courses, course materials, seminars and learning situations that help students in exceptional ways to identify career opportunities which match industry needs.
- Delivery of a well-received class on a repeated basis as evidenced by student evaluations, former student comments or comments of peers
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student evaluations, and student learning outcomes
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Feedback from former students as to contributions to their learning that helped said former student advance professionally

Scholarship

- Publication of widely adopted textbooks and acclaimed instructional materials

- Publication of numerous materials about teaching, advising, education program and student issues
- Invited national presentations about teaching, advising, education program and student issues

Advising

- Working with undergraduate honors students, student organizations and groups to develop research papers, participate in national competitions and other scholarly activities.
- Outstanding direction of graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions

Awards

- Receiving a university, national, international, or professional society outstanding teacher award

Grantsmanship

- Receiving substantial external grant support for teaching/learning projects

External recognition

- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence · Leadership
- Leadership of major professional instructional endeavors

4.3.2. Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Teaching

Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Teaching include, but are not limited to:

Course development and delivery

- ***Delivery of an effective class on a repeated basis as evidenced by student evaluations, former student comments, student numbers or comments of peers***
- Development of courses, course materials, seminars and learning situations that help students identify career opportunities which match industry perceived needs.
- Developing and successfully implementing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student evaluations, and student outcomes
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, industry participation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Major revision of existing courses to better deliver materials or meet needs
- Evidence of high-quality class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course

Scholarship

- National or regional presentations about teaching, advising, education program and student issues

Advising

- Substantial role as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
- Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of networking activities that inform students of industry needs and/or associated employment opportunities
- Participation in university honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Development of courses, course materials, seminars and learning situations that help students identify career opportunities which match industry perceived needs.

Awards

- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award

Grantsmanship

- Receiving competitive grant support for teaching/learning projects

Teaching improvement

- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness

4.4. Indicators for Service

4.4.1. Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Service

Indicators of EXCELLENCE in Service include, but are not limited to:

- Officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving in an editorial position for a professional journal

- Serving as a program organizer or chair for a national, or international professional program
- Chairing a major committee for the university, college, or industry
- Serving on a major commission, committee, task force, or board that is related to the candidates work area. This can be in association with professional societies, governments, NGOs, or industry

4.4.2. Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Service

Indicators of EFFECTIVENESS in Service include, but are not limited to:

- Officer in a regional or state professional organization
- Serving an administrative function in the department, college, or university
- Serving as an officer for a state or regional professional organization
- Serving as a program organizer or chair for a regional or state professional program
- Serving on an editorial board for a professional publication
- Serving as a reviewer for professional journals
- Serving as a program chair for a state or regional professional organization
- Serving as a consultant to government agencies or private business
- Serving on a University or college committee or task force
- Being an advisor to student organizations
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large
- Chair of Departmental and/or project group committees or sub-committees

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/creative work, 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

Faculty members holding a tenure-accruing appointment with the rank of Instructor will be promoted to the rank of assistant professor upon the receipt of the terminal degree.

5.1.2. Associate Professor

- Performance in several of the indicators of effectiveness (Section 4) in areas relevant to the faculty member's appointment as described in the position description, and as judged sufficient by the Tenure and Promotion Committee with indication of potential for achieving excellence.
- Must have achievements judged as meeting the essential criteria for effectiveness indicated in Section 4 relative to the faculty member's work areas (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service).

5.1.3. Professor

- Performance in many of the indicators of effectiveness (Section 4) in areas relevant to the faculty member's appointment as described in the position description, and as judged sufficient by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- Performance in several of the indicators of excellence (Section 4) in areas relevant to the faculty member's work area appointment in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service with effective performance across all the categories in the general 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. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

5.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development

and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 4.3.

5.2.2. For Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Principal Lecturer. Teaching excellence can be demonstrated with outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by peer reviews, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; innovations in pedagogical/course design; development and effective implementation of high impact learning experiences; presentations on teaching and learning at academic institutions and professional conferences; recognition of excellence by internal and external teaching awards; continued professional development in teaching, and other appropriate indicators as described in 4.3. Excellence and impact in teaching should grow throughout the faculty member's career.

5.2.3. For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor (or Assistant Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice)

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 4.5.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.9 and 4.10) are an expectation of Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these contributions can often have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching.
- **Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors or Assistant Professors of Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

5.2.4. For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor (or Associate Professor of the Practice) to Instructional Professor (or Professor of the Practice)

- **Teaching:** Excellence in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence are expected of an Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professor of the Practice seeking promotion to Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice, respectively. Teaching excellence should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators described in 4.5. Leadership and impact in teaching and scholarship of teaching should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.9 and 4.10) are an expectation of Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom service is the assigned secondary duty. Service efforts may involve curriculum development, program supervision, ensuring program accreditation and other service activities that are critical to the teaching mission of the department or program. Significant service contributions to the institution and profession are expected and these service contributions should have strong synergies with their efforts in teaching. Leadership and impact of service should grow throughout the faculty member's career.
- **Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.3 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors or Associate Professors of the Practice seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. Leadership and impact in research should grow and broaden in scope throughout the faculty member's career.

6. Annual Review by Department Head/Director/Supervisor

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

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

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

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

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

6.1. Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant. See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). For tenured associate professors, the process helps identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review is 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 serves 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 varies 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.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3. Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar.

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 in five categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," "Exemplary," and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. In the Workday system where faculty annual evaluations are loaded, the five ratings are equivalent at "Does Not Meet Expectations," "Partially Meets Expectations," "Meets Expectations," "Exceeds Expectations," and "Significantly Exceeds Expectations," respectively.

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

- Unsatisfactory - no progress in research/scholarly activity accomplishments can be documented based on the indicators described in 4.4.
- Needs Improvement - only minimal progress in the form of contributions, new drafts, submissions relying on work, or other research related activity can be documented based on the indicators described in 4.4.
- Satisfactory - clear evidence of quality contributions/accomplishments based on the indicators described in 4.4.

- *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 and other indicators described in 4.3.
- *Most Meritorious* - those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member based on indicators described in 4.3. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

6.4.2. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching

- *Unsatisfactory* – a lack of progress or accomplishment with respect to the appropriate teaching criteria described in 4.6.
- *Needs Improvement* – weak performance in one or more appropriate evaluation criteria described in 4.6.
- *Satisfactory* – demonstration of effective teaching performance based on the evaluation criteria in 4.6.
- *Exemplary* – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, trainee accomplishments and other indicators described in 4.5. 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 based on indicators described in 4.5. 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.

6.4.3. Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service

- *Unsatisfactory* – appropriate service efforts as described in Section 4.10 cannot be documented.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal engagement in service activities (Section 4.10) can be documented.
- *Satisfactory* – clear evidence of **effectiveness** in service based on the indicators in 4.10. 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.

6.5. Required Components

The Department Head initiates the annual review process in the spring semester of each year. The annual review considers the three functional areas of teaching, research and service. Each faculty member is evaluated based on the appropriate weight of responsibility in each functional area.

The annual review must contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

Faculty must complete a standardized annual activity report in Interfolio Faculty180. The Department normally requests additional documentation annually, such as a Faculty Performance Review, a plan of work, and an indicator form, which may be uploaded into Interfolio Faculty180 as well.

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

- The report should include the faculty member's short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

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

The Department Head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member via the Workday system. The faculty member acknowledges receipt within Workday and may 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 Department's personnel file for the faculty member. 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, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review will also 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 acknowledgement in the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and must be initialed by the faculty member.

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

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

The Department Head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year.

6.5.4. Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and Department Head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Department Head, director, or supervisor may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

6.6.2. Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their Department Head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory". The rating of "Needs Improvement" should be changed to "Satisfactory" when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7. Timeline

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

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

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).

7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), 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.

The mid-term review process for Assistant Professors in Texas A&M AgriLife Research follows that for tenure-track faculty.

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. Assistant Professors, Assistant Professor of the Practice and other tenure-track faculty members appointed at higher ranks who do not have tenure typically go through a mid-term review after three years in rank.
- 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 mimics 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 Department rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the department'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 mid-term (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 and December. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2020.

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

The mid-term review in the Department of Agricultural Economics is conducted in April each year. The Department Head will notify the faculty member and their Annual Review Committee (ARC) as discussed in Section 8.2.1 when the Mid-Term Review will occur and requests the faculty member to prepare the required Mid-Term Review Dossier consistent with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences promotion and tenure guidelines. The Department Head provides the Mid-Term Review Dossier prepared by the faculty member to the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC; Section 8.2.2) for review. The FEC conducts mid-term reviews for ALL candidates for promotion who have any combination of research and teaching appointment. The FEC generates a written Mid-Term Review Assessment evaluating the candidate's progress toward promotion for review and comment by the Tenure and Promotion Committee (Section 8.2.3). The FEC subsequently conducts a vote of the P&T Committee members to determine their evaluation of whether the faculty member is making sufficient progress toward promotion to associate professor. The voting process should follow the procedures outlined in Section 8.2.3. After revising the Mid-Term Review Report to reflect the opinions and suggestions of the P&T Committee, the FEC forwards the Report, the ballots, and the tabulated vote of the P&T Committee to the Department Head who discusses them with the faculty member and then forwards them to the next level in the promotion process along with the other elements of the Mid-Term Review Dossier in conformance with AgriLife guidelines for Mid-Term Reviews.

7.3. Feedback from mid-term review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through mid-term review. Feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the Dean, Department Head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8. Promotion and Tenure Review

8.1. Purpose

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated and continued leadership and impact in a research field nationally and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. Promotion to Professor is granted for continued national/international leadership and impact in a research field and demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and service. In exceptional and rare cases, national/international leadership and impact in teaching and service can be the basis for promotion from associate to full professor (see [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

8.2. Process

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

Two main Departmental committees provide guidance and assistance to the Department Head in the promotion evaluation process: (1) the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and (2) the Tenure and Promotion Committee (P&T Committee). These committees are formed from faculty with Full Professor rank within the Department and function as described below. In addition, each faculty members with a rank below Full Professor or Senior Lecturer will be assigned by the Department Head an Annual Review Committee (ARC), which plays a mentoring role.

8.2.1. Annual Review Committee (ARC)

An ARC of full professors (normally three) is appointed by the Department Head for all candidates eligible for promotion soon after the individual has been hired. The chair of each ARC is appointed by the Department Head. For tenure-track faculty, the chair of the ARC will be a tenured faculty member.

- Committee membership will be held as stable as possible throughout the promotion and tenure process for each individual but can be changed at the discretion of the Department Head. This committee will contain members drawn from the department's full professor group who collectively have similar subject matter interest and appointment characteristics. Also, this committee should reflect the breadth within the faculty wherever possible.
- The role of the ARC is to mentor the faculty member. To this end, the committee participates in the initial orientation of the candidate as directed by the Department Head, meets with the individual at least annually as a committee to review their progress, counsels the individual on their program direction, reviews and

makes suggestions on the individual's draft promotion documents, and, in general, acts as a mentoring group in assisting the individual to prepare for the promotion and tenure process. No voting is required.

- The Chair of the ARC will deliver a written report to the Department Head and the candidate following the annual review meeting summarizing the guidance provided.

8.2.2. Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

The FEC is a six-member committee of full professors with tenure appointed by the Department Head. Members of the committee normally each serve a term of two years. Terms are staggered with half the committee members rotating off the committee each year. Consecutive terms should not be allowed except in extenuating circumstances as determined by the Department Head. Appointments to the committee to fill the vacancies of members whose terms are expiring will be made by December of each year with terms beginning on January 1 of the following year. The chair and vice-chair of the committee each year are selected by the Department Head. The vice-chair should be one year behind the chair in their tenure on the committee. When the chair rotates off the committee, the vice-chair normally rotates into the responsibility of chair of the committee. For the evaluation Lecturers, Instructional Professors or Professors of the Practice, a Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice may be added to the FEC by the Department Head.

- This committee should, to the extent possible, reflect the breadth of subject matter expertise and appointments of the Department's faculty.
- Tasks of the FEC:
 - (1) Assist the Department Head in reviewing the files of all candidates for promotion to identify individuals for whom complete promotion dossiers (including outside letters) should be prepared.
 - (2) Review the completed promotion dossier prepared by each candidate to ensure that they adhere to College of Agriculture and Life Sciences promotion and tenure guidelines and are ready for the evaluation process.
 - (3) Assist the Department Head in developing a list of potential outside reviewers to write letters of evaluation for each candidate for whom outside letters are required as determined by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs promotion and tenure guidelines.
 - (4) Develop biographies for selected outside reviewers to include with promotion and tenure dossiers.
 - (5) Conduct mid-term reviews for ALL candidates for promotion who have any combination of research and teaching appointment (Section 7).
 - (6) Prepare Quality Assessment (QA) Reports for all candidates for promotion to the rank of associate or full professor when their promotion dossiers are complete. The Committee generates written QA Reports for each candidate for promotion evaluating the quality of the candidate's activities, accomplishments, and contributions in teaching, research, and service as appropriate. Separate QA reports for each candidate are required for teaching, research, and service as appropriate. The draft QA Reports are provided to the P&T Committee for their review and comment (see discussion of P&T Committee responsibilities). In preparing the Quality Assessment Reports for each candidate, the FEC should follow the Quality Assessment Report Outline in the Appendix. Once the P&T Committee has provided its input through the process described in the section on "Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee," the FEC makes changes in the mid-term and QA Reports to reflect the opinions and suggestions of the P&T Committee and forwards the reports to the Department Head to be included with each candidate's promotion dossier.
 - (7) On request of the Department Head, consider and recommend the appropriate rank and tenure status for prospective faculty members (including adjunct faculty) whose experience potentially calls for rank advancement other than the entry level.
 - (8) On request of the Department Head, review appointment renewal of those with probationary appointments.
 - (9) On request of the Department Head, assist in developing recommendation dossiers for promotion of faculty members to University Distinguished Professor and to Emeritus Professor.
 - (10) As requested by the Department Head, assist in maintaining and updating the promotion file which provides a listing of all faculty members, their respective promotion clock, and promotion progress.
 - (11) Maintain all deliberations of the FEC relating to the evaluation of faculty confidential.

8.2.3. Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (P&T Committee)

- The chair of the P&T Committee is the Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Vice-Chair of the P&T Committee is the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

- The P&T Committee in the Department of Agricultural Economics consists of all teaching and research faculty who hold the title of full professor who are employed full-time for at least nine months annually and who are administratively located in the Department of Agricultural Economics or hold a position for which the Department has primary responsibility for promotion evaluation. For the evaluation Lecturers, Instructional Professors or Professors of the Practice, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Instructional Professors and Professor of the Practice are also included in the P&T Committee. Adjunct faculty are not eligible to vote.
- Only tenured TAMU faculty are eligible to evaluate and vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion. To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must also hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate. Both tenure track and APT faculty members who hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to evaluate and vote on APT promotion cases. Committee members with conflicts of interest (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or postdoc advisor of the candidate) must recuse themselves from voting on that specific candidate's case.
- The duties of the Department of Agricultural Economics P&T Committee are to:
 - (1) Hold an annual meeting in which the FEC presents and discusses all mid-term reviews and Quality Assessment Reports they have prepared. The P&T Committee Chair conducts the meeting. The Vice-Chair takes notes so that the mid-term and QA Reports can be subsequently modified to reflect the opinion and suggestions of the P&T Committee. Prior to this meeting, the Department Head and the FEC will make available to all P&T Committee members for their review the promotion and tenure dossiers and the corresponding Mid-Term Reports and Quality Assessment Reports of all those subject to Mid-Term Review and all candidates for promotion. Except in the case of unavoidable conflicts, all eligible members should participate in the meetings of the P&T Committee; remote participation is permitted.
 - (2) As a part of the annual P&T Committee meeting, conduct a sealed ballot vote of the P&T Committee to record the Committee's vote regarding: (1) support or lack of support for tenure and promotion for corresponding candidates and (2) whether each Mid-Term Review candidate's performance to date exhibits sufficient progress toward promotion. Electronic voting is permitted provided that the integrity and anonymity of the vote is preserved.
 - (a) The vote count on promotion and tenure decisions must report the total number of faculty eligible to vote and must report the number voting Yes/No/Absent. Ballots, therefore, will be prepared accordingly.
 - (b) All completed ballots must be accompanied by a signed statement indicating that the committee member submitting the ballot has reviewed the credentials for, evaluated, and voted on all candidates.
 - (c) Absentee voting will be permitted for committee members who cannot attend the evaluation meeting in person.
 - (d) The P&T Committee chair will select a teller subcommittee of two members who will be responsible for tabulating results while preserving anonymity. The teller subcommittee will submit the tabulated results, all ballots and related material to the P&T Committee chair.
 - (3) In cooperation with the Department Head, the Chair of the P&T Committee will prepare a written report of the Department's P&T Committee vote with discussion appropriate to explain the Yes/No vote. Justifications for any negative votes must be stated in the report. The report will be forwarded to the Department Head as required in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences promotion and tenure guidelines. The P&T Committee Chair will also turn over all ballots and related materials to the Department Head in a sealed envelope.
 - (4) Recommend any improvements in promotion and tenure dossiers for those subject to Mid-Term Review or for candidates for promotion as needed.
 - (5) Vote on whether or not to recommend Emeritus status for retiring faculty (Section 10).
 - (6) Maintain all deliberations of the P&T Committee confidential except for the outcome of any vote taken, which must be conveyed by the P&T Committee Chair to the Department Head in the written report.

8.2.4. Calendar

To complete the Mid-term Review/Promotion process in sufficient time for the appropriate documents to be forwarded from the Department to the next level in the process, strict adherence to the department and College calendars is required. An annual calendar of deadlines for the promotion and tenure process is maintained by and can be requested from the Department Head's office.

9. Post-Tenure Review

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

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6) conducted by the Department Head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 9.2).

9.1. Purpose

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

9.2. Peer Review Committee

Subcommittees of the Tenure and Promotion Committee (Section 8.2.3) are appointed by the Department Head to serve as Peer Review Committees and conduct reviews of all post-tenure or otherwise appointed tenured Professors and any tenured associate professors who have not otherwise been reviewed in the last six years. As possible, the subcommittees should be the same group for all evaluated Professors but must be composed of no less than three faculty peers of the same (or higher) rank as the faculty member being reviewed. Faculty members on the P&T Committee will not be party to their own individual evaluation.

9.3. Process

Candidates for periodic peer review will submit the following:

- 1) A current C.V., prepared as required for the annual performance evaluation
- 2) Summary tables covering the last 6 years that indicate:
 - Publications
 - Grantsmanship
 - Students advised
 - Presentations
 - Courses taught including student evaluations
- 3) This information will be formatted following the departmental promotion and tenure guidelines.
- 4) An optional statement of no more than 2 pages summarizing major teaching, research, and service program outcomes and demand indicators for the last 6 years.

The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the assigned 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 should be consistent with those used for annual evaluations (section 6.4). The Committee will consider the faculty member's position description when evaluating the faculty member's performance.

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

If the Periodic Peer Review finds "unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category, a Professional Development Review will be triggered/initiated. When this happens, the Professional Peer Review shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the Department guidelines.

If the Periodic Peer Review finds a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories, a Professional Development Review will be triggered/initiated. When this happens, the Professional Peer Review shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines.

A rating of "Needs Improvement" by the Periodic Peer Review, 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. However, a rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category does not require a Professional Development Review.

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the Department Head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other Department Head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

9.4. Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.3) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.7). 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 9.5) acceptable to the Dean.

The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the Department Head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the Department Head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

On behalf of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will solicit a list of names of potential committee members from the faculty member and a list of individuals that should not be contacted. The Department Head will give feedback on the submitted names and have the opportunity to provide additional names. The Dean will appoint the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee based on the input from the faculty member and the Department Head.

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work

The Department Head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member’s academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the Department Head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

- No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, Department Head, and Dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
- Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 2.4.

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

- 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.

9.5. The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the department guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

9.6. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member, Department Head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, Department Head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

9.7. Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to the Department Head, director, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

10. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

The Departmental P&T Committee vote on whether or not to recommend Emeritus status for retiring faculty will follow essentially the same voting procedure as that used for tenure and promotion recommendations considering any information deemed appropriate in judging the individual's contributions to the Department and University. Based on the outcome of the vote, the committee chair will prepare the written recommendation that emeritus status be awarded to those individuals judged to have contributed to the Department and the University and/or system agencies. The Department Head will then make his/her own recommendation and forward it along with the committee recommendations and supporting documents to the appropriate group or individual.

11. Contact Office

Department of Agricultural Economics, Office of the Department Head, e-mail tracy.davis@ag.tamu.edu