

Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on June 14, 2024

Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on June 13, 2024

Approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Office on May 26, 2023

Approved by the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on March 1, 2023

Guidelines approved by faculty vote on August 31, 2020 and revisions approved January 14, 2023

Revisions made and approved by faculty vote on January 30, 2023

Additional revisions proposed by Faculty Affairs, BCBP voted to approve revisions on August 28, 2023

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	3
2.	FACULTY TRACKS AND RANKS.....	3
3.	AREAS OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	5
3.1.	<i>Teaching</i>	5
3.2.	<i>Research, scholarly activity or creative work</i>	6
3.3.	<i>Service</i>	7
3.4.	<i>Administration</i>	8
4.	INDICATORS OF FACULTY EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	9
4.1.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Teaching</i>	10
4.2.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching</i>	10
4.3.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	10
4.4.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work</i>	11
4.5.	<i>Indicators of Excellence in Service</i>	11
4.6.	<i>Indicators of Effectiveness in Service</i>	11
5.	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.....	12
5.1.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty</i>	12
5.2.	<i>Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)</i>	13
6.	ANNUAL REVIEW	15
6.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	15
6.2.	<i>Focus</i>	16
6.3.	<i>Time Period of Review</i>	16
6.4.	<i>Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance</i>	16
6.5.	<i>Required Components</i>	16
6.6.	<i>Assessment outcomes that require action</i>	17
6.7.	<i>Timeline</i>	18
6.8.	<i>Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines</i>	18
7.	MID-TERM REVIEW	18
7.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	18
7.2.	<i>Process</i>	19
7.3.	<i>Feedback from midterm review</i>	19
7.4.	<i>Mid-term review for Academic Professional Track and agency Assistant Professors</i>	19
8.	PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW	19
8.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	19
8.2.	<i>Process</i>	19
9.	POST-TENURE REVIEW.....	21
9.1.	<i>Purpose</i>	21
9.2.	<i>Peer Review Committee</i>	22
9.3.	<i>Process</i>	22
9.4.	<i>Professional Development Review</i>	23
9.3.	<i>The Professional Development Plan</i>	24
9.4.1	<i>Appeal</i>	24
9.4.2	<i>Voluntary Post-Tenure Review</i>	25
10.	GRANTING FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS.....	25
10.1.	<i>Procedure for consideration for Emeritus Faculty</i>	25

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences is to create and disseminate science-based solutions at the nexus of agriculture, human health, and environmental sustainability to positively impact lives and to provide hands-on, first-hand learning opportunities and experiences to each student, preparing them to go beyond College Station to reach every Texan and to develop solutions for urgent global and local challenges in agriculture, health, education, public policy, economics, and the environment. The Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics of Texas A&M University seeks to offer curricula leading to Bachelor of Science degrees in Biochemistry, Biophysics and Genetics, to the Master of Science degree in Biochemistry and Biophysics, and to the Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Biophysics. In accordance with this mission, the Department serves as the primary university home department for teaching and research in biochemistry, biophysics, and molecular genetics. The mission of the graduate program of the Department is to enable students to understand, plan, execute and communicate the results of scientific research in biochemistry, biophysics, and molecular genetics. 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 College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines (University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.2.2). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the University and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Faculty Affairs 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. Departments and Colleges may describe here categories of performance (section 4.4.1 of UR 12.01.99.M1) associated with each title within their unit.

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

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

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

Principal Lecturer. The Principal Lecturer will participate in classroom teaching, primarily at the undergraduate level, in support of the educational goals of the Department for both departmental majors and non-majors in topics related to biochemistry, biophysics and genetics; supervise and train graduate teaching assistants; contribute to student mentorship through office hours and other outside-the-classroom teaching opportunities as appropriate. Participate in occasional committee service both in the department and in the larger university community. A sustained record of excellence in teaching and a broad contribution to mentorship of APT faculty and the general curriculum of the Department mark this most senior Lecturer rank.

Senior Lecturer. The Senior Lecturer will participate in classroom (lecturer or laboratory) 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 biochemistry, biophysics and genetics; supervise and train graduate teaching assistants;

contribute to student mentorship through office hours and other outside-the-classroom teaching opportunities as appropriate. Participate in occasional committee service both in the department and in the larger university community.

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

Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor. Historically, the Department has not utilized the Instructional Professor Track but will consider appropriate appointments. Duties, responsibilities and expectations parallel the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments, but entail some administrative and/or service responsibilities as defined by the Department Head.

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

3. Areas of Faculty Performance

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

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (**teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; administration**). 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 as follows:

A rating of 'Excellent' can be achieved with broad instances of evidence such as:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student evaluations, and/or student outcomes
- Outstanding direction of undergraduate and/or graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award

- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional material
- Developing a new course that fills an identifiable need in the curriculum
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University honors program; advising student organizations)
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
- Selection for a college or departmental excellent teacher award

A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Effective direction of undergraduate and/or graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Chair of doctoral research committees

A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Little evidence of improvement of low classroom performance despite efforts to do so
- Students in laboratory not making normal progress
- Little participation in graduate or undergraduate programs and/or student advisory committees

A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Poor classroom performance with no effort to improve
- No students being trained in the laboratory
- No service on graduate student advisory committees

3.2. Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research/scholarly/creative activity is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in activities associated with research/scholarly work is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to; 1) conduct

research/scholarly activity, 2) continuously strive to improve research effectiveness and impact, and 3) produce, publish and communicate the results of research/scholarly/creative work. This involves sustained external research funding.

Evaluation of research/scholarly/creative activity using metrics such as publication output, research funding, presentations at national and international meetings, intellectual property disclosures and awarded patents, membership on editorial boards and grant review panels, and research awards.

A rating of 'Excellent' can be achieved with broad instances of evidence such as:

- High impact publications as evidenced by citation, profile of journal within and outside the specific discipline
- Sustained and superior levels of funding to fully support a leading research program
- Receiving major award recognition
- Oral presentations of research results at National or International meetings
- Invited research seminars at other institutions
- Faculty whose research program does not lend itself to these conventional means for dissemination of research results should present alternative evidence

A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Continued progress towards developing or sustaining peer recognition and leadership through peer-reviewed publications, reviews, presentation of research results at a regional or national or international meetings
- External research funding sufficient to maintain a core research program
- Appropriate career-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, designed to increase research productivity
- Presentation of seminars at academic or industrial institutions

A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Core research funding is lacking
- Proposals to sustain core research funding are in preparation but have not been submitted or repeated unsuccessful applications for funding
- Peer-reviewed publications are insufficient to maintain a national profile within the discipline
- Attendance at research conferences or national meetings, but without presentation of research results

A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- No peer reviewed publications
- Prolonged absence of external research funding
- Very little if any research or scholarship actively being conducted
- No research grant proposals under development
- Minimal or no attendance at research conferences or national meetings

3.3. Service

Service is central to the mission of the College and University. All faculty are expected to serve on departmental committees as requested by the Department Head as well as to provide service as appropriate at the College, University levels and National levels. Evidence of service is expected of all faculty and senior faculty are expected to seek leadership roles.

Evaluation of service does not lend itself to simple quantitative measurement since effective and excellent service can take many forms. Examples include serving as a reviewer for journals or funding agencies, service in professional organizations, service on committees, task forces, or as a consultant, being an advisor to student organizations, and serving in administrative roles in the Department, College or University.

A rating of 'Excellent' can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Serving as a standing or frequent ad hoc member of a peer-review committee for a national granting agency such as NIH or NSF
- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board (e.g. NIH study section)
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
- Serving as an officer in the faculty Senate
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service.
- Performing in multiple service roles or providing significant leadership in one or more roles in the Department, University, and Profession. These expectations are normalized to academic rank; i.e. less service is expected for assistant professors, etc.

A rating of ‘Satisfactory’ can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Service as a reviewer for major journals
- Service as an ad hoc reviewer for national granting agency such as NIH or NSF
- Being an officer in national or international professional organization
- Being an officer in regional or state professional organization
- Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
- Serving in an elected role in a national, regional, or international professional organization
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Serving on University, college, and departmental committees and task forces
- Serving as a consultant
- Being an advisor to student organizations
- Serving in administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

A rating of ‘Needs Improvement’ can be achieved by evidence such as:

- Minimal service on Departmental and University committees
- Limited involvement with reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals
- Limited professional involvement

A rating of ‘Unsatisfactory’ can be achieved with evidence such as:

- Absence of significant service on departmental committees
- Paucity of manuscripts or grant proposal reviews
- Paucity of service in professional organizations

3.4. Administration

3.4.1. Department Head

The Professor and Head will serve as the chief administrative officer of the Department and as an advocate for the disciplines that it represents. The Head reports to the Vice Chancellor and Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station. The position provides leadership and support for numerous faculty initiatives including: enhancing and expanding undergraduate and graduate education; increasing contributions to knowledge and science through extramurally funded research; fostering collegiality and interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty;

conducting outreach programs; securing additional resources through development; strengthening relationships with diverse stakeholder groups; and promoting communication of science-based findings to inform public policy and private decision makers.

Evaluation and Retention

An evaluation of the Department Head that includes faculty input should be conducted at or before the midpoint of the first term of appointment and prior to any decision to reappoint the Department Head, but can be initiated by the college Dean at other times. This review does not replace the annual review which the college Dean conducts concerning the Department Head's performance but will inform the annual evaluation.

The evaluation of the Department Head should serve to improve performance and engage professional development. In addition, it should promote a sense of shared values between the faculty, Department Heads, Deans, and the University administration.

- The Dean, with notification to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Office, shall initiate a preliminary review of a new Department Head at or before the midpoint of the first term of appointment that includes faculty input. Thereafter formal reviews to solicit faculty input should occur at least every fifth year of the Department Head's term in office and a summary of the review shall be shared with the faculty.
- All reappointment reviews shall include a comprehensive opportunity for college faculty members and other stakeholders to present their views to the college Dean regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the Department Head.
- Faculty participation in reviews for the evaluation and retention of Department Heads will be carried out as described in the Standard Administrative Procedure [12.99.00.M0.03, Appendix A](#).
- A recommendation for approval of the reappointment by the Dean shall be made to the Provost and Executive Vice President through the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

3.4.2 Associate Head for Undergraduate Programs

The Head appoints the Associate Head for Undergraduate Programs. The Associate Head for Undergraduate Programs will oversee the administrative and academic operations of the Biochemistry and Genetics undergraduate programs, including serving as Chair of the Undergraduate Program Committee. In consultation with the Head, provides leadership for the continuous improvement of the undergraduate program. Notwithstanding these duties, the Associate Head is expected to fulfill the obligations, duties and expectations of his or her rank with respect to teaching and research.

3.4.3 Associate Head for Graduate Programs

The Head appoints the Associate Head for Graduate Programs. The Associate Head for Graduate Programs will oversee the administrative and academic operations of the Biochemistry Graduate Program, including serving as Chair of the Graduate Program Committee. In consultation with the Head, provide leadership for the continuous improvement of the graduate program. Notwithstanding these duties, the Associate Head is expected to fulfill the obligations, duties and expectations of his or her rank with respect to teaching and research.

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.

4.1. Indicators of Excellence in Teaching

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

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student evaluations, and/or student outcomes.
- Outstanding direction of undergraduate and/or graduate research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional material.
- Developing a new course that fills an identifiable need in the curriculum.
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the University honors program)
- Outstanding performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor

4.2. Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching

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

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Effective direction of graduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a college or departmental outstanding teacher award
- Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research
- Member of graduate student advisory committees
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate)
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Chair of doctoral research committees

4.3. Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

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

- High impact publications as evidenced by citation, profile of journal within and outside the specific discipline

- Sustained and superior levels of funding to fully support a leading research program
- Receiving major fellowship or research award
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
- Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities
- Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Sustained and significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research)
- Publications with teaching focus in leading refereed journals
- Evidence of creative professional practice (including patents and disclosures)

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

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

- Publication of scholarly book(s)
- Publications in refereed journals
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Editing a scholarly book
- Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
- A record of successful doctoral dissertations
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals
- Sustained external funding to maintain a core research program

4.5. Indicators of Excellence in Service

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

- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Serving as a standing or frequent ad hoc member of a peer-review committee for a national granting agency such as NIH or NSF
- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting
- Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee
- Performing in multiple service roles or providing significant leadership in one or more roles in the Department, University, and Profession. These expectations are normalized to academic rank; i.e. less service is expected for assistant professors, etc.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service

4.6. Indicators of Effectiveness in Service

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

- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations.

- Being a committee chair in national or international professional organization
- Being an officer in regional or state professional organization
- Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting
- Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Serving on University, college, and department committees and task forces
- Serving as consultant
- Being an advisor to student organizations
- Serving in administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1. Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, 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

Assistant Professors are recruited into our department based on the following criteria:

- Number and quality of research papers published
- Evaluations provided by letters of recommendation received
- Quality of written materials including a proposed research plan provided by the candidate
- Communication and organizational skills such as, but not restricted to presentations at faculty meetings, and organization of departmental events, for example.
- Potential contribution to the research programs and profile of the department
- Potential to obtain federally funded research grants
- Potential for teaching excellence
- Demonstration of collegiality through inter-faculty interactions and cooperative activities and contribution to the general well-being of the Department and to its goals

5.1.2. Associate Professor

Except in unusual circumstances, the decisions to recommend the awarding of tenure and the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are made concurrently. The decision to recommend the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor derives from whether, in the separate judgment of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department as a whole, and that of the Head, the candidate has established a record that allows for the confident prediction that academic success and positive contributions to the broad and complex mission of the Department will continue and grow. This determination is made by referencing measures of success in research, teaching, and service. The terms of appointment of Assistant Professors reflect a balance of research, teaching and service. Research holds the predominant weight while service has the least. Given that initiative, creativity and independence are essential characteristics for success as a faculty member, no fixed rubric to define the terms of promotion is possible, but the following guidelines are established.

The quality and strength of the candidate's research program will receive the greatest consideration. Criteria include:

- a. Creation of a leading-edge research program relevant to biochemistry or biophysics
- b. Acquisition of adequate external research funding including from federal agencies by peer review

- c. An increasing trajectory of peer-reviewed publications and invited reviews of work undertaken while at Texas A&M
- d. An increasing trajectory of national recognition as evidenced by citation metrics, invitations to present at local, regional and national meetings
- e. Successful mentoring of graduate and undergraduate student research
- f. Strong confidential evaluations by leaders in the relevant disciplines at peer and aspiring institutions

The quality of the candidate's teaching is a critical element of the decision to recommend tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Criteria include:

- a. Effectiveness as established by the results of student evaluations, which must be conducted for every course taught
- b. Peer examination of coursework materials
- c. Peer evaluation of lectures as viewed by recording or in person
- d. A positive trajectory of improvement in all of these criteria over the term of appointment

Expectations for service to the Department, COALS, AgriLife, and the University will initially be kept to a minimum for Assistant Professors. Some service through thesis committees, research mentoring at the graduate and undergraduate levels and occasional committee assignments or other instances of service will be expected and evaluated. Service to the candidate's discipline through peer review is anticipated but more extensive service to societies and journals is not.

5.1.3. Professor

In consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor, all the expectations cited above are enhanced and broadened, as indicated below. Research accomplishments continue to be central, with particular attention paid to accomplishments following promotion to Associate Professor. Importantly, these accomplishments should lead to international as well as national recognition and leadership.

- a. Creation of a leading-edge research program relevant to biochemistry and/or biophysics
- b. Sustained and significant external research funding including from federal agencies through peer-review
- c. A history of evolving research interests, collaboration and interdisciplinary research that broadens the research profile of the candidate and the Department
- d. Clear evidence of national and international leadership through broad participation in journal peer review, editorial positions on journals, or participation in national or international peer review panels
- e. A trajectory of increasing impact on the candidate's research area as measured, for example, by the breadth and depth of citations in the peer-reviewed literature
- f. Evidence of impact by numerous presentations at national and international meetings
- g. A strong and extensive record of didactic and laboratory teaching at Texas A&M at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Evidence of self-criticality, creativity, adaptability, innovation in pedagogy is essential.
- h. A strong and broad history of leadership and service to the Department through committees and administrative tasks particularly to the graduate program. Service to professional societies and organizations at the regional and national levels is also anticipated

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 Professor in their title are expected to make significant contributions in one area of teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service or administration. Lecturers and faculty with Instructional in their title will be evaluated for promotion with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their teaching. Lecturers can be laterally reclassified as Instructional Assistant Professors and Senior Lecturers can be laterally reclassified as Instructional Associate Professors if their appointment responsibilities are expanded beyond the area of teaching (and non-substantive service). 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. During the annual evaluation, performance in their assigned areas of teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service or administration will be rated as described in Section 3.

5.2.1. For Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Effectiveness in teaching and a high potential for excellence in teaching 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 such as those described in 4.1 and 4.2.

5.2.2. For Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

- **Teaching:** Sustained excellence in teaching is 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 such as those described in 4.1. In addition, promotion to the Principal Lecturer rank recognizes broad contributions to the Academic Professional faculty community through mentorship and curriculum development. Generally, a minimum of five years at the Senior Lecturer rank will be required to establish the excellence in teaching criterion. In exceptional circumstances, as determined by the Head, promotion to Principal Lecturer may be considered with less time at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

5.2.3. For Promotion from Instructional Assistant Professor) to Instructional Associate Professor

- **Teaching:** Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness 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 and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators such as those described in 4.1 and 4.2.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of Instructional Assistant Professors 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 examples of indicators in sections 4.3 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Assistant Professors seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty.

5.2.4. For Promotion from Instructional Associate Professor to Instructional Professor

- **Teaching:** Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and a high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness are expected of an Instructional Associate Professors seeking promotion to Instructional Professor. Teaching excellence and effectiveness should be demonstrated based on appropriate indicators such as those described in 4.1 and 4.2. In addition, there should be demonstrated capacity for leadership in teaching and scholarship of teaching, with potential for growth in scope and national impact.
- **Service:** Effectiveness in service and a commitment to excellence in service (see indicators described in 4.5 and 4.6) are an expectation of Instructional Associate Professors 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. In addition, there should be potential for leadership and national impact in service.
- **Research:** Effectiveness in research and a commitment to excellence in research (see indicators described in 4.31 and 4.4) are an expectation of the Instructional Associate Professors seeking promotion for whom research is the assigned secondary duty. There should be potential for leadership and national impact in research.

6. Annual Review

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

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

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

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

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

6.1. Purpose

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.

- See University Rule 12.01.99.M1. For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2. Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

6.3. Time Period of Review

The Department Head will conduct faculty performance annually, usually during the Spring semester. The evaluation will be based primarily upon data and metrics pertaining to the previous calendar year, but trends extending into the recent past and/or into the current year may be considered. This data will be obtained from the faculty and a variety of other sources.

6.4. Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of research/scholarship, teaching and service contributions of faculty performance will be rated on four performance ratings as described in Section 3: "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," and "Excellent" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence** as described in section 4.1. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

6.5. Required Components

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

6.5.1. Faculty member's report of previous activities.

The exact form of the faculty member's report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College, but must be submitted via Interfolio Faculty 180 and include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar, however, trends extending past the previous year, and into the current year will also be factored in as appropriate, 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.
- Complete the Department's "Supplemental Information for Faculty Review" which will provide the opportunity to add additional material needed for the evaluation. On this document Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

The faculty member will be asked to supply relevant information, including: a complete and up to date CV; germane grant proposal activity not adequately summarized in the CV; reprints of up to 5 papers published during the previous calendar year (Associate Professors can include preprints of manuscripts in press; Assistant Professors can include manuscripts submitted); teaching summary for the previous calendar year, including summary of classroom teaching, research students (including postdoctoral researchers) and any materials that might speak to the quality of teaching; and any additional activities, accomplishments, awards, etc. that the faculty member might feel is inadequately described in the other submitted materials.

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. This document also provides an opportunity for the Department Head to offer advice. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the Department Head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the Department Head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

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

6.5.3. 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. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the Department Head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4. Performance Assessment

In assessing performance, the weights given to 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.

6.6. 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 Department Heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Faculty Affairs’ 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.”

6.8. 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.

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.

7.4. Mid-term review for Academic Professional Track and agency Assistant Professors

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

The mid-term reviews for AgriLife Research Assistant Professors will be conducted following the policies and guidelines of the respective agencies.

8. Promotion and Tenure Review

8.1. Purpose

Tenure is granted to recognize demonstrated national leadership and impact in a research field and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence and outreach/service. Promotion to Professor is granted for 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

Any individual hired in a tenure-track position will be required to submit his/her dossier for tenure review during the academic year prior to the year of mandatory consideration. Such reviews may be made earlier and are, in fact,

encouraged whenever it appears appropriate. If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for promotion or tenure, a review will be conducted again at the mandatory time. In exceptional circumstances, a person not recommended for tenure in the mandatory year may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the Department Head and with the agreement of the Dean, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Provost. The sole ground on which a Department Head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mandatory Review (at all levels) will occur:
Calendar Year 2014	7 years	2019-2020

Procedures for the development of the candidate’s dossier can be found on the website of [the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#). The candidate should order the CV so that the primary area upon which they are being evaluated is listed first. Tenure-track faculty should put research/scholarly activity/creative work as the first section.

For a promotion case with a negative outcome, a minimum of ONE YEAR must elapse before resubmission is allowed (e.g. if a candidate was not recommended for promotion during the academic year 2018-2019, the earliest they can submit the dossier again is academic year 2020-2021). Requests for an exception can be made to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs only with concurrence of the Department Head and Dean.

8.2.1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee

- a. The Committee will evaluate all candidates for promotion, including APT faculty, or tenure, as applicable according, to the guidelines specified by the Department, the College, and the University. The recommendation of the Committee with regard to tenure or promotion will be made to the Head of the Department.
- b. The Committee will consider all nominees for joint appointments and make a written recommendation to the whole Faculty for vote. All joint appointments will require two-thirds approval of the votes cast by the committee. If so, recommended, general faculty voting will also require two-thirds approval by the ad-loc tenure or tenure track faculty. Voting is not rank on rank. All ad loc T/TT faculty may vote on any joint appointment candidate. Recommendation of candidacy for joint appointment to the Head requires two-third approval. The final decision at the departmental level rests with the Head. Appointments are for a five year term and renewal will follow the same procedures.
- c. The Committee shall consist of seven Full Professors; one member appointed by the Head of Department and six members elected by the Faculty of Biochemistry and Biophysics. The Head of Department and other Members of any Faculty at Texas A&M holding administrative positions of Head or higher shall not be members of this committee. No more than one Joint faculty shall serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee at any one time.
- d. The period of service on the Committee shall be six years. The period of service on the Committee for the appointed member shall be three years. The appointed member may be reappointed for a consecutive three-year term. The Chair of the Committee will be elected by the membership of the Committee and serve as Chair for a period of two years. An individual serving as Chair may be reelected for one consecutive two-year term as Chair as long as the reappointment does not extend the individual’s period of service on the Committee beyond six years. Individual tenures on the

Committee shall be staggered so that one new member is elected each year to ensure continuity. After completion of a six-year term (or two consecutive three-year terms), members will be eligible for election or appointment to a new term on the Committee after two years.

- e. Nominations for the unfilled elected position each year shall be solicited by electronic ballot from the faculty. Voting shall be by electronic ballot. Voting shall close one week after distribution of ballots. The nominee receiving a majority of the votes cast will be elected. If no one receives a majority, the two nominees receiving the most votes will stand for a runoff election. Voting in the runoff election shall be by electronic ballot, and voting shall close one week after distribution of the ballots. The nominee receiving the most votes in the runoff election will be elected. The term of the appointment shall begin on January 1, following the election.
- f. In the event a member is forced to resign from the Committee before the expiration of his/her term, the position will be refilled as follows:
- g. Replacements will be selected by the same process that was used to fill the term originally. In the case of an elected member, an election should be held according to the procedures outlined above as soon as is practicable after the Department Head declares the vacancy.
- h. A replacement once elected or appointed will begin service on the Committee immediately.
- i. The replacement will serve out the original term (i.e., not start a new 6-year or 3-year term).
- j. Replacements that serve longer than 3 years will not be eligible for re-election or reappointment for 2 years after the expiration of the term.

8.2.2. Timeline

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs updates guidelines annually (usually February or March). When announced, the guidelines are distributed to all faculty and requests to be considered for promotion are solicited. Mandatory considerations also begin at this time. Candidate dossiers are assembled and submitted to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (PATC) for initial review in May. PATC provides the candidate's suggested reviewers and also suggests reviewers to the Department Head. The Department Head selects a mixture of suggested reviewers from both lists and requests letters of evaluation. This process is completed by June. The candidate gives a public research seminar, generally in late August or early September. PATC reviews the dossier, conducts a vote on a proposal to promote and/or grant tenure and announces their findings to the tenured faculty in September. A vote is taken amongst the tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than rank being sought by the candidate. The Head prepares his/her own evaluation. The Head's evaluation and recommendation along with the evaluation and recommendation of PATC and the result of the vote of the eligible faculty are sent to the AgriLife Peer Review Committee in September. The Head will advise the candidate with recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure at each level of the review (e.g. the decisions of the Dean, the Provost, the President and the Board of Regents). This process can continue into the late Spring.

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

A periodic post tenure peer review will be conducted in the 6th academic year following the last comprehensive peer review conducted since the awarding of tenure. Peer review will be conducted by a committee consisting of 2 elected full professors and 1 full professor appointed by the Department Head, each serving staggered 3-year terms so that one new member is either elected or appointed each year. In those instances when an associate professor with tenure is to be reviewed, the Department Head will appoint a tenured associate professor to serve as an ad hoc member in place of the regular appointed member of the peer review committee to participate in the review.

9.3 Process

A periodic peer evaluation will be conducted no more than 6-years since the awarding of tenure; promotion following the awarding of tenure; receipt of an honor based on peer evaluation of accomplishments, such as University Distinguished Professor, Regent's Professor, endowed professorships, or chairs or a previous Post Tenure Peer Evaluation; whichever has occurred most recently. At the beginning of each academic year the Department Head will notify the members of the faculty who will be subject to the Post Tenure Peer Review, as well as the members of the Post Tenure Peer Review Committee. The faculty to be reviewed will be asked to submit a full CV and any other documents that may be useful for the Committee to address whether the following expectations have been met. The Post Tenure 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 should be consistent with annual evaluations. After the Committee has performed their evaluation, they will communicate to the Department Head the rating (Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory) they have determined for each of the 3 categories; Scholarship, Teaching, and Service; along with a brief statement regarding the reasons for their determination. The results will be communicated to the Dean and to the respective faculty member by the Department Head.

For faculty receiving a rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory", the faculty member will meet with the Department Head to develop a plan for improving the performance. This plan should be developed as much as possible by the faculty member. Should resources be required to meet the plan, the Department Head will make reasonable effort to secure those resources. The plan should articulate specific goals and a timeline for achieving those goals. The faculty member and the Department Head should meet subsequently to evaluate progress being made toward meeting the proposed goals, and the plan revised as necessary if appropriate. These subsequent meetings should take place no less frequently than once every 6-months until the goals have been achieved.

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.

A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the Department Head and the faculty member.

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

By no later than May 31st, each unit will provide to the dean and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

9.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 6) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.4.1). 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 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.MO.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 shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 8.3) 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. 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. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

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

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

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 4 and 6. 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.

9.3. 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, 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. This plan should be developed as much as possible by the faculty member. The plan should articulate specific goals and a timeline for achieving those goals. 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. Should resources be required to meet the plan, the Department Head will make every effort to secure those resources. The faculty member and the Department Head should meet subsequently to evaluate progress being made toward meeting the proposed goals, and the plan revised as necessary if appropriate. These subsequent meetings should take place no less frequently than once every 6-months until the goals have been achieved. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

9.4.1 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](#)).

9.4.2 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 website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Office for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

10.1. Procedure for consideration for Emeritus Faculty

- Nomination for Emeritus Faculty membership can be submitted by any tenured full faculty member to the Executive Committee. The nomination packet should consist of all materials deemed pertinent to the candidacy and, if judged to warrant detailed consideration by the Executive Committee, will be forwarded to PATC.
- PATC will review the nomination packet, vote on the candidacy and report the outcome of the deliberations and vote to the faculty. The main criterion will be a previous five-year record of “satisfactory” or “excellent” annual evaluations.
- After discussion, voting will be conducted in the same way as for full faculty membership. As with full faculty membership, the final decision at the departmental level for offering an Emeritus membership rests with the Department Head.

Contact Office

Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Office of Dr. A. Joshua Wand, e-mail josh.wand@ag.tamu.edu