

**Department of Public Service  
and  
Administration**

**Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation**

**January 2024**

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Faculty Tracks and Ranks.....	4
3.	Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1).....	4
3.1	Teaching .....	4
3.2	Research .....	5
3.3	Service .....	5
4.	Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness .....	6
4.1	Indicators of Excellence in Teaching include, but are not limited to: .....	6
4.2	Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching include, but are not limited to:.....	7
4.3	Indicators of Excellence in Research include, but are not limited to:.....	7
4.4	Indicators of Effectiveness in Research include, but are not limited to:.....	7
4.5	Indicators of Excellence in Service include, but are not limited to: .....	8
4.6	Indicators of Effectiveness in Service include, but are not limited to:.....	8
5.	Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure .....	8
5.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty .....	8
5.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track).....	9
5.3	Promotion and/or Tenure Review Process .....	10
6.	Annual Review .....	10
6.1	Purpose.....	10
6.2	Focus.....	11
6.3	Time Period of Review.....	11
6.4	Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance .....	11
6.5	Required Components.....	12
6.6	Assessment outcomes that require action.....	14
6.7	Time-Line .....	15
6.8	Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:.....	15
7.	Mid-Term Review .....	16
7.1	Purpose.....	16
7.2	Process.....	17
7.3	Feedback from midterm review .....	17
8.	Post-Tenure Review.....	17

8.1	Purpose.....	17
8.2	Peer Review Committee .....	17
8.3	Process.....	18
8.4	Professional Development Review.....	19
8.5	The Professional Development Plan.....	20
8.6	Appeal.....	20
8.7	Voluntary Post-Tenure Review.....	21
9.	Granting Faculty Emeritus Status .....	21

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Public Service and Administration (PSAA) in the Bush School of Government and Public Service is to inspire excellence in public service by:

- preparing individuals for impactful careers as thoughtful, objective, effective, and ethical public servants;
- producing theoretical and applied research that addresses the critical issues of the day and advances the understanding of public service;
- engaging with the community to serve the changing needs of society locally, regionally, nationally and globally; and
- fostering an interdisciplinary environment that stresses the development of critical thinking skills, and an appreciation for the benefits of diversity and inclusion.

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 PSAA Department 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. Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the PSAA Department; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document articulates general PSAA 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
<b>12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure</b>	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs</a>
<b>12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (including Appendix I)</b>	<a href="#">University Rule 12.01.99.M1</a>
<b>12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review</b>	<a href="#">University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01</a>
<b>Faculty Affairs Guidelines for Annual &amp; Mid-Term Review</b>	<a href="#">Faculty Affairs Intranet/Faculty Evaluation and Development</a>
<b>Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)</b>	<a href="#">Faculty Affairs Intranet/Promotion &amp; Tenure</a>

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

A faculty member in the PSAA Department holds one of the following appointments: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor; Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Assistant Lecturer, Senior Professor, Senior Associate Professor, Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Assistant Professor. The voting faculty of the PSAA Department consists of all individuals with full-time academic appointments in the Department. The Department's non-voting faculty includes Adjunct Faculty, Associated Faculty, those research faculty in the institutes or centers holding a doctorate or equivalent degree, and persons appointed as Visiting faculty or with equivalent non-tenured titles.

Unless specified otherwise in an individual's appointment letter, PSAA faculty members are expected to contribute to the department through teaching, research and service. Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty are expected to contribute to the Department primarily through instruction and service, whereas all tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and understanding through research and publication as well as through teaching and service.

## 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 and service. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty performance are presented below. Alternate work assignments (such as administration, etc.) may replace one or more areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

### 3.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

- 3.1.1 A thorough and up-to-date knowledge of the subjects taught.

- 3.1.2 A recognition that teaching ability can be improved by a conscious effort to learn good pedagogical practices and a commitment to acquire such teaching skills in a variety of ways. These include feedback from peers on one's current teaching practices, participation in various teaching excellence programs, and consideration of student evaluations.
- 3.1.3 The use of good skills in the planning, organization, and presentation of course material.
- 3.1.4 A commitment to provide effective advisement and direction of students in their academic work.
- 3.1.5 A commitment to offering educational material most suited to the needs of students in professional degree programs.
- 3.1.6 As appropriate, the incorporation of interdisciplinary/ multidisciplinary knowledge and of perspectives that enhance students' appreciation of the role of cultural diversity and globalization in public affairs; and
- 3.1.7 Classroom performance in which the candidate demonstrates a high degree of competence regarding the subject matter; stimulates students' interest, participation, and critical thinking; presents material in such a way as to enhance students' understanding; effectively answers questions from students; demonstrates a style that is appropriate given the size and nature of the class.

### 3.2 Research

All tenured and tenure-track faculty in the PSAA Department are expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and understanding through research and publication. Research accomplishment is demonstrated by publication of original scholarship in books and in the leading peer-reviewed journals in one's substantive field, in the fields of public or international affairs, or in relevant disciplines. Journal articles will be considered published when they are accepted for publication without further revisions. Books will be considered published when they are in galley proofs. Though the number of publications is taken into account, the quality and impact of publications, as demonstrated, for example, by citations and the reputation of the journals, matter more.

Additional considerations in assessing research activities may also include:

- 3.2.1 Published review essays, book reviews, symposia proceedings.
- 3.2.2 Grants received from external agencies to support research activities.
- 3.2.3 Citation and references to the candidate's published work and other professionally accepted measures of scholarly and practical impact.
- 3.2.4 Work in progress (e.g., unpublished conference papers) giving evidence of an ongoing research program likely to lead to substantial contributions; and
- 3.2.5 Honors or awards conferred on the scholar or his/her publications by organizations or authorities qualified to appraise the significance of the particular work.

### 3.3 Service

The PSAA Department's faculty members are expected to be engaged in an appropriate mix of service activities consistent with their teaching and research responsibilities.

- 3.3.1 Faculty service includes assistance given to the University, Professional/Disciplinary Organizations, and to the public. PSAA faculty members are expected to share their professional expertise with civic organizations and/or governments.
- 3.3.2 University service includes assisting the PSAA Department, the Bush School, and the University through such contributions as active participation in the Department's and School's administration and operation (e.g., faculty meetings, committees, and support of student activities) as well as service on University committees, boards, and councils. It also includes advising students in the selection of courses and in their efforts to secure jobs and internships.
- 3.3.3 Professional service includes such efforts as active participation in scholarly and professional societies, both national and international. Such participation might include service as an association officer, as a journal editor, or editorial board member, as a member of peer-review panels, as a member of major professional committees or task forces, such as those of the National Academy of Sciences or National Academy of Public Administration, as appointee to a gubernatorial commission, or as participant in professional development and training programs.
- 3.3.4 Faculty, university, and professional service can include efforts to promote interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaboration and to enhance an appreciation for diversity and globalization within the PSAA Department, the Bush School, the university, and the outside community.
- 3.3.5 Public and civic service is illustrated by such activities as authorized consulting with civic and governmental groups, participation in public policy forums, analyses for the media including preparation of op-ed articles, testimony before governmental bodies, and volunteer activities with students intended to confirm the commitment of the PSAA Department to promoting a life-long commitment to public service and to enhance the reputation and visibility of the Department and the Bush School.

#### 4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The PSAA Department recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations.

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

- 4.1.1 Outstanding teaching performance over a significant time period as evidenced by measures such as peer-evaluation, University student course evaluation, and faculty portfolios.
- 4.1.2 Student course evaluations (i.e., University required student evaluations) that are outstanding as evidenced by overall scores and student comments, and in comparison to evaluations for similar courses at the Bush School.
- 4.1.3 Peer evaluations that are outstanding.
- 4.1.4 Departmental, college-level, or university-level teaching awards.
- 4.1.5 Regional, national, or professional society outstanding teacher award; and
- 4.1.6 The development of innovative pedagogical methodologies.

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

- 4.2.1 The employment of pedagogically sound techniques for the education of students.
- 4.2.2 The presentation of academically sound courses incorporating current knowledge about the course subject matter.
- 4.2.3 Accessibility to students on a regular basis to discuss academic issues, career and professional matters.
- 4.2.4 Assignment of equitable final grades to students in a timely fashion based on reasonable expectations and a fair professional assessment of student performance.
- 4.2.5 Teaching that promotes interdisciplinary perspectives and that furthers an understanding of and appreciation for the role of diversity and globalization in public affairs.
- 4.2.6 Course materials that are thorough, clear, and useful to students.
- 4.2.7 The development of new courses or instructional material that fill an identified need in the curriculum.
- 4.2.8 Incorporating projects that are relevant to students and their career goals.
- 4.2.9 Student course evaluation results that are consistently adequate or improving over time as evidenced by overall scores and student comments, and in comparison to evaluations for similar courses at the Bush School.
- 4.2.10 A peer review of course material, instruction, and portfolio finds that courses are taught at a level appropriate for graduate study; and
- 4.2.11 Effective advising and mentoring for graduate students.

#### 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research include, but are not limited to:

- 4.3.1 Publishing or having accepted for publication without further revisions, manuscripts in scholarly book presses or in leading peer-reviewed journals in one's substantive field, in the fields of public or international affairs, or in relevant disciplines.
- 4.3.2 Receiving and accepting invitations to present at peer and /or aspirant schools and/or programs.
- 4.3.3 Awards for research excellence from professional organizations and/or scholarly journals.
- 4.3.4 Receiving a competitive research grant as a principal investigator or co- principal investigator; and
- 4.3.5 Evidence of upward trajectory in impact metrics for scholarly work.

#### 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research include, but are not limited to:

- 4.4.1 Active pursuit of a program of scholarship related to one's substantive field; in the fields of public or international affairs; or in relevant disciplines.
- 4.4.2 Active pursuit of competitive grants as a principal investigator or co- principal investigator.
- 4.4.3 Dissemination of research findings and engagement with professional colleagues through such activities as participation at professional meetings, publication, and presentation of recent research materials to civic and public organizations; and
- 4.4.4 As appropriate, research that promotes interdisciplinary perspectives and that furthers an understanding of and appreciation for the role of diversity and globalization in public affairs.

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

- 4.5.1 Service in the Faculty Senate, Council of Principal Investigators, Institutional Review Board (IRB); or similarly time-consuming university obligations.
- 4.5.2 Service as a member of a major Texas A&M University committee or serves on major boards, commissions, or task forces.
- 4.5.3 Participation in a responsible manner in a disproportionately large fraction of the department's service obligations.
- 4.5.4 Service as a voting board member or other executive in nonprofit organizations or regional or national professional organization.
- 4.5.5 Service as an association officer, as a journal editor, or editorial board member, as a member of peer-review panels, as a member of major professional committees or task forces, such as those of the National Academy of Sciences or National Academy of Public Administration, as appointee to a gubernatorial commission, or as participant in professional development and training programs.
- 4.5.6 Receiving service awards or other similar recognitions from professional, nonprofit, academic, or governmental organizations.

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

- 4.6.1 Participation in a responsible manner in the activities of the School and the University, including the reasonable fulfillment of requested service.
- 4.6.2 Evidence of a commitment to the provision of sound professional expertise to civic and public organizations.
- 4.6.3 Serving in a way that promotes interdisciplinary perspectives and that furthers an understanding of and appreciation for the role of diversity and globalization in public affairs.
- 4.6.4 Service as a representative of the Bush School in national and regional meetings, conferences, or committees.
- 4.6.5 Serving on doctoral committees.
- 4.6.6 Mentoring colleagues.
- 4.6.7 Creating and sustaining internal or external partnerships; and
- 4.6.8 Participating in student recruiting and selection.

### 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 PSAA Department are as follows:

- 5.1.1 At a minimum, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must be engaged in a research program that culminates in a series of peer-reviewed articles, chapters, monographs, or books indicating that the candidate's work is earning a national reputation in his or her field. In other words, candidates should have produced ideas and findings that are recognized by others in

the field as advancing knowledge. The PSAA Department encourages publications based on the Ph.D. dissertation and, in addition, expects original research that has moved beyond the specific dissertation topic or question. Journal articles will be considered published when they are accepted for publication without further revisions. Although the department may consider book manuscripts at earlier stages of publication, books will not be considered published until they are in galley proofs. Faculty members who have been granted a tenure clock extension for any reason should not be expected to produce more than would have been expected for a standard probationary period.

- 5.1.2 At a minimum, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must complete an additional research program that culminates in a major, published book or series of articles or monographs that are judged to have “some measure of national or international recognition” (University Rule 12.01.99.M1, 4.4.3.3). Evidence that the candidate is providing intellectual leadership within the Bush School and the University and is contributing to the development of younger scholars will be taken into account.
- 5.1.3 Candidates for promotion to either Associate Professor or Full Professor must, as an important but not sufficient indicator of the quality of their work, place a significant portion of their published articles in peer-reviewed professional journals related to public affairs, international affairs, public policy, or the candidate’s field of academic expertise. Research monographs or books should be published with a university press or recognized publisher of quality professional scholarship. Chapters in edited volumes will be given more weight if the candidate provides clear evidence that a peer review process has been followed. Publications should include single-authored works, but evidence of joint contributions with co-authors in is also given due weight.
- 5.1.4 Promotion and tenure decisions will consider the merit of scholarly work that incorporates interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary perspectives, including research published in interdisciplinary outlets. Decisions may consider the merit of scholarly work that enhances our understanding of the role of diversity and globalization in public affairs.
- 5.1.5 Faculty are expected to remain up-to-date in their field, to work continuously to share their knowledge in an effective way with their students, and to strive for excellence in pedagogy.
- 5.1.6 Department’s faculty members are expected to be engaged in an appropriate mix of service activities consistent with their teaching and research responsibilities.

## 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. Annual reviews of APT faculty will follow the guidance laid out in Section III.B of the PSAA Department Bylaws. The Promotion and Tenure process for APT faculty will follow the guidance laid out in Section III.I of the PSAA Department Bylaws. Unless specified otherwise in an individual’s appointment letter, Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty are

expected to contribute to the Department primarily through instruction and service, which will be evaluated using the criteria described above.

### 5.3 Promotion and/or Tenure Review Process

In all respects, the review for tenure and/or promotion in the professional ranks will conform to University Rule 12.01.99. M1 and annual procedural directives from Faculty Affairs. The Promotion and Tenure process will follow the guidance laid out in Sections III.E and III.F of the PSAA Department Bylaws.

## 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). The annual review process will follow the guidance laid out in Sections III.B and III.C of the PSAA Department Bylaws.

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.

- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations. 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. See [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#). Merit salary increases will be consistent with the overall evaluation rating of the annual review. The distributions of the overall evaluation ratings shall be made available to faculty upon request.

## 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

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year. However, reviews for tenured or tenure-track faculty will take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three-to-five-year horizon may be necessary for accurate evaluation.

## 6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, the department head will evaluate performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated using the following four rating categories: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", and "Exemplary" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

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

- *Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.*
- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.*
- *Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.*

- *Exemplary* – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research are:

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- *Satisfactory* – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- *Exemplary* – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

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

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- *Satisfactory* – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- *Exemplary* – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

## 6.5 Required Components

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

6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.
- Examples of possible content for the report include:
  - Full citations to published work.
  - Status reports on work currently under review.
  - Status reports on current projects, including a description of research activities during the review period.
  - Descriptions of presentations at scholarly meetings.
  - Scholarly plans for the next reporting period.
  - Descriptions of service activities at the department, college, university and professional levels; and
  - An up-to-date copy of the faculty member's CV.

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

The department head, director, or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The evaluation memo will explicitly give an overall evaluation rating for the year, as well as individual ratings for each category of evaluation using the rating system described above in Section 6.4. 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 PSAA Department 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 Review of assistant and associate professors by the PSAA Promotion and Tenure Committee

#### 6.5.3.1 Assistant Professors Annual Reviews

With the exception of formal promotion and tenure reviews, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct annual reviews of tenure-track junior faculty in late March or early April. Reviews of faculty being considered for tenure and for promotion to associate or full professor will be conducted according to university timelines. The Department Promotion and Tenure committee will review the annual report of each assistant professor on the tenure track every year and report to the Department Head the committee's judgment as to whether the faculty member is making adequate progress toward tenure and whether the faculty member's appointment should be renewed. A narrative will be provided to capture the overall sense of the committee about the candidate's progress.

#### 6.5.3.2 Associate Professors Three-year Progress Reviews

The full professors on the PSAA Promotion and Tenure Committee will review associate professors at three-year intervals to assess their progress towards promotion. The purpose of the progress reviews is to provide advice as informed by the full professors' assessment of the individual's career trajectory. The progress reviews will take the form of a memorandum that is drafted by the Chair of the PSAA P&T Committee and approved by the other tenured full professors. Progress reviews will be shared with the Department Head, but they are for informative purposes and will be independent of the annual reviews conducted by the Department Head. This review is not required; as a result, Associate Professors have the option to opt out of the progress review process.

### 6.5.4 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member.

The department head 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 or faculty member.

### 6.5.5 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

## 6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

### 6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the PSAA Department’s established criteria (see Section 6.4). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head, director, or supervisor may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (see Section 8) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of “Unsatisfactory” for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an “Unsatisfactory” periodic peer review (see Section 8) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

#### 6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see Section 8), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near-term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

### 6.7 Time-Line

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. 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 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 Faculty Affairs. Section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M1](#).

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

## 7. Mid-Term Review

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

Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member, recommendation by the department head and dean, and approval by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. An extension granted prior to the midterm review also extends the midterm review timeline. Candidates can choose to undergo the midterm review on the original timeline and maintain the extended timeline for the mandatory tenure review.

### 7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the PSAA Department rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the PSAA 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 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 process will follow the guidance laid out in Section III.C of the PSAA Department Bylaws. 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 2026 and December 2026. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2023.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2023	7 years	Mar – Dec 2026 (due before December 2026 of AY 2026-2027)

## 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, and departmental faculty.

## 8. Post-Tenure Review

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

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2).

### 8.1 Purpose

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

### 8.2 Peer Review Committee

Reviews will be conducted by ad hoc committees consisting of three other tenured faculty members appointed by the Dean of the Bush School in consultation with the Department Head. If no more than two faculty members are eligible to serve on the ad

hoc committee, the Department Head may request authorization from the Dean to convene a two-person committee.

### 8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 Reviews will be based on the indicators of effectiveness listed in Sections 4.2, 4.4 and 4.6 of this document.
- 8.3.2 The peer review ad hoc committee will prepare a report to be submitted to the Dean through the Department Head that evaluates the person being reviewed in terms of these criteria and that arrives at an overall assessment of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance.
- 8.3.3 The ad hoc committee will rely on materials used by the Department Head to conduct annual reviews. In addition, it will rely on classroom observations as part of its teaching evaluation.
- 8.3.4 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the PSAA Department guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.5 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.6 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the PSAA Department guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.7 A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the PSAA Department guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.8 A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near-term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.9 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.<sup>1</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.10 **By no later than May 31st**, the PSAA Department will provide to the dean and 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

---

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

underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee's written evaluation and the faculty member's post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

## 8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall "Unsatisfactory" annual reviews (see Section 6) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 8.3.6 & 8.3.7) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.6). 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.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/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" acceptable to the dean.

- 8.4.1 The purposes of Professional Development Review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.
- 8.4.2 The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member to be reviewed and shall consist of faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed. Faculty members who have the appearance of a conflict of interest (such as relatives or co-authors) are not eligible to serve. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.
  - 8.4.2.1 The PSAA Department Head will provide the dean and the faculty member to be reviewed with a list of faculty members eligible to serve on the ad hoc review committee, and specific recommendations as to the membership of the ad hoc committee. The faculty member to be reviewed shall have up to five business days in which to provide the dean with an alternative slate of possible committee members who also satisfy the eligibility requirements. The dean will make the final committee appointments.
- 8.4.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum

current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

- 8.4.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.
- 8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan of Section 8.3.8,

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see Section 8.4) acceptable to the dean.

## 8.5 The Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the PSAA 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 PSAA Department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

## 8.6 Appeal

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the 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](#)).

### 8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

## 9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status

[University Rule 31.08.01.M2](#) states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the [Faculty Affairs website](#) for procedures and forms for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

## **Appendix**

Initial approval by PSAA Department faculty: October 23, 2020.

Revised: December 4, 2020.

Revised: January 29, 2021.

Revised: January 29, 2024

---

## **Contact Office**

---

PSAA Department, Office of the Department Head, e-mail: [bushschoolpsaa@tamu.edu](mailto:bushschoolpsaa@tamu.edu)