

Landscape Architecture & Urban Planning Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties June 21, 2021

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.
--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#).
- Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:
 - Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
 - Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks 3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance 3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness 3-4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 4
6. Annual Review 4-9
7. Mid-Term Review 9-10
8. Post-Tenure Review 10-13

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University College of Architecture Department of Landscape Architecture & Urban Planning (LAUP) is to create and disseminate knowledge and skills to enhance functional, healthy, sustainable, and resilient human environments through instruction, research, professional practice, and service based in landscape architecture, urban planning, land development, and allied disciplines. 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 **LAUP** for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.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	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	https://rules-saps.tamu.edu/rules-saps-library/
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	https://dof.tamu.edu/Career/Promotion-and-Tenure

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

2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.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.

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; 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 assignments 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:

- Course syllabi
- Teaching evaluation scores
- Participation in university organized workshops and seminars
- Graduate student advising and participation on graduate committees

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work

Research, scholarly activity or creative work is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in these areas is required of all tenure-track faculty. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in the field through research, scholarly activity or creative work in one or multiple areas of scholarship, including discovery, creativity, application and teaching. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating performance in research, scholarly activity, and creative work are:

- Contribution
- Impact
- Support

3.3 Service

Service is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to participate in regular, active, and constructive service to both the university and the profession/community. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating performance in service are:

- University service
- Professional service

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)).

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

- Mentor students and/or leaders of an active student organization
- Receive a Department teaching or mentoring award
- Receive a College or University teaching or mentoring award
- Receive a teaching or mentoring award from a nationally/internationally known discipline-related organization
- Publish peer-reviewed papers related to instruction, mentoring, advising, or pedagogy
- Conduct a departmental teaching, advising, or mentoring workshop
- Conduct a teaching, advising, or mentoring workshop for a discipline-related organization

Excellent teaching is above and beyond effective teaching, demonstrated by at least two of the above indicators.

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

- Instruction and graduate advising at a load that is approved by the department head.
- Instructors should have a syllabus that clearly articulates student learning outcomes, lists relevant readings and activities contributing to the student learning outcomes,
- Instructors course(s) should have logical learning sequence and workload, and use effective assignments and assessment tools for all courses that he/she teaches.
- Teaching evaluation scores should be on par with or better than the discipline average in LAUP.
- Evidence of voluntary participation in university organized workshops and seminars (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence, University Writing Center, Information Technology Service, etc.) for instructional improvement further attests the instructor's willingness to improve teaching skills and/or adopt innovative teaching methods.
- Effective advising includes chairing multiple graduate committees that result in timely graduation per program expectation and production of peer-reviewed deliverables such as posters, presentations, and papers.
- Serving as a member in multiple graduate committees is also expected for effectiveness.

4.3 Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include significant achievements in one or multiple areas of scholarship, including discovery, creativity, application, and teaching. Evaluation of faculty research and creative scholarship performance will be based on the following expectations in research *contribution, impact, and support*. Equal weight will be given to each of the three areas.

Contribution: Intellectual contribution that is original, significant, and rigorous, demonstrated by the following (a through d):

- a) Make significant intellectual contribution to the body of knowledge (e.g., theory, methods, integration, creativity, pedagogy)
- b) Demonstrate a continuous and growing record of intellectual contribution
- c) Establish a unique and independent research agenda
- d) Develop a coherent area of expertise respected and recognized by the peers in the relevant research/professional community

Impact: Impact of research on the larger research/academic/professional community and the general public; External reputation and acceptance of research among relevant research, academic, and/or professional communities, demonstrated by the following (a through c):

- a) Demonstrate high quality of the scholarly outputs (e.g., number of citations or downloads, rigor of research method, competitiveness of outlets/media/exhibition)
- b) Have sufficient quantity of the scholarly outputs (e.g., two peer-reviewed publications or creative works per year including at least one as the first author, on average)
- c) Demonstrate national or international level scholarly significance through one or more of the following:
 - Deliver an invited talk at a recognized national or international venue
 - Publish an invited or commissioned work in a reputable journal or other venue
 - Publish a book through a reputable academic press
 - Engage in translation of scholarship making significant impact on state, federal or international policy or practice
 - Receive an award or recognition from a reputable research, academic, or professional entity

Support: Support an expansion of scholarly activities, demonstrated by at least two of the following:

- a) Receive external and competitive funding as a PI
- b) Conduct collaborative and interdisciplinary research or creative work, involving students and investigators from multiple disciplines
- c) Support initiation of new scholarly or creative directions or innovations
- d) Hold a research-related leadership role in relevant research, academic, or professional community (e.g., serving on the editorial board of reputable journals, serving on federal grant or other national review panels, editing journal special issues, chairing a national/international conference track)

4.4 **Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** include indicators of *contribution, impact, and/or support*. Excellence (described above) is not needed in all three areas. Effectiveness may be demonstrated, but is not limited to, by the following:

Contribution: Intellectual contribution that is original and rigorous, demonstrated by consistent scholarly output (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, peer-reviewed creative works)

Impact: Impact of scholarship on the larger research/academic/professional community and/or general public, demonstrated by citations, competitiveness of venue (journal or exhibition), invited talks, or awards

Support: Support of scholarly activities through receipt of internal or external funding, grant-writing, collaborations, or leadership within a larger community (editorial boards, review panels, committee chair or member)

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

Academic service: Service at the university level, such as:

- a) Service on a university committee or task force
- b) Service as an elected or appointed representative to a university body or board (e.g., senate, council, network)
- c) Special service toward meeting unit needs such as chairing a college or departmental committee or leading an initiative for a major administrative or service project/effort

Professional service: Leadership in service to the profession or community in a professional capacity, such as:

- a) Journal editorship
- b) National conference or meeting convener/organizer
- c) National conference track chair
- d) Office held in national professional association or community organizations
- e) Delivery of testimony to a state or federal legislative body

- f) Invited reviews of major national or international grant, research, or policy programs
- g) Board membership on a state, national or international professionally-related organization

Excellent service is above and beyond effective service, demonstrated by achieving at least two of the above indicators.

4.6 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** includes regular, active, and constructive service to both the university and the profession/community. It is demonstrated, but is not limited to, by the following:

Academic service: Service on departmental, college, or university committees, task forces, special service related to meeting unit needs, and mentorship of junior faculty, when appropriate.

Professional service: Service to the profession or community. Professional service may include ad hoc reviewing, grant reviews, panel/meeting/session organizer at a state or national level, continuing education teaching, organizing workshops, and offices held in professional associations. It will also include community engagement as a professional, such as service on boards, committees, or task forces within the local community, region, state, or nation.

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 is as follows:

- 5.1.1 Assistant Professor: Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor requires **effective** teaching; **excellent** research as demonstrated in Contribution and Impact; and **effective** service, in accordance with the indicators listed in section 4.
- 5.1.2 Associate Professor: Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires **excellent** teaching; **excellent** research demonstrated in Contribution, Impact, and Support; and **excellent** service, in accordance with the indicators listed in section 4.

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.

See Appendix for descriptions of the different Academic Professional Track appointments in LAUP: Lecturer track, Professor of the Practice track, Instructional Professor track, and Research Professor track.

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

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

6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: “Unsatisfactory,” “Meets expectations/Satisfactory,” “Exceeds Expectations.” A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: “Unsatisfactory,” “Needs Improvement,” “Satisfactory,” “Exemplary”, and “Most Meritorious” based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

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

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

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

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

and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**

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

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

6.5 Required Components

The 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 include the following:

- The report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, and an expanded window (e.g., three years), if that is the unit's practice, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

Examples of possible content for the report are:

TEACHING

- Teaching evaluation scores and comments

- List and brief summary of graduate students mentored and their progress during the previous year
- Service Learning Projects
- Teaching awards or honors received

RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

- Peer-reviewed publications
- Grant activity
- Honors or awards received
- Citation analysis

SERVICE

- Department, College, or University committees served on
- Service to the Discipline
- Service to the Community

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

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

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

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

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

6.5.3 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, patient care...), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty performance.

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

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 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. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

6.8 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 Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.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.

7.1 Purpose

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit’s P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the dean, department head (supervisor/unit director), and departmental faculty.

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

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

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

8.1 Purpose

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

Each year the Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will elect two Peer Review Committees, one to review Tenured Faculty for post-tenure review, one to review APT candidates for post-promotion review. The APT subcommittee shall consist of one non-voting liaison from the P&T and five APT faculty. The Post-Tenure peer review subcommittee shall be at least 3 members of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. These committees shall dissolve upon completion of the faculty review for that current year.

The Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee shall consist of tenured faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed. The Peer Review Committee for professional track faculty members will consist of professional track faculty members at the same rank or higher than the faculty member being reviewed.

If there are an insufficient number of professional track faculty members of the department to form a complete committee, the balance of the committee will consist of tenured faculty members elected by the professional track faculty members on the committee.

For both Peer Review Committees, one committee member may be from outside of the department. Those faculty members being reviewed are not eligible to be selected as part of that year's Peer Review Committee. All the P&T Committee members irrespective of their rank and track vote in the election of both Peer Review Committees. One of the elected Peer Review Committee members will serve as the Chair to coordinate the committee's activities.

8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 The faculty member's Annual Review Packet for the previous year,
- 8.3.2 The Department Head's Annual Review for the previous year,
- 8.3.3 The faculty member's current Curriculum Vitae.
- 8.3.4 In addition, the peer committee may consider the following sources of information for their evaluation of the faculty member:

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

- 8.3.4.1 Other prior Annual Review Packets and Annual Evaluation Reviews of the faculty member,
 - 8.3.4.2 Personal observation by the peer committee members,
 - 8.3.4.3 Discussions with and input from faculty, staff, and colleagues,
 - 8.3.4.4 Discussions with and input from students and former students, including student evaluations and comments.
 - 8.3.4.5 Any Plan of Action triggered by a previous Annual Evaluation or Post Tenure Review in which the faculty member received a “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” rating in teaching, research/creative scholarship and/or service.
- 8.3.5 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.6 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.
- 8.3.7 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5. A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6. A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31st**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

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

8.4 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). 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.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head/ director/supervisor shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

8.5 The Professional Development Plan

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

8.6 Appeal

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

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

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

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review

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

9. **Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

University Rule 31.08.01.M2 states the following: Every individual who, at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least 10 years, must be considered for

emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

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

See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

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

Appendix: Academic Professional Track positions in Landscape Architecture & Urban Planning

1. Lecturer Track

LAUP P&T committee abides by the College and University definitions of the Lecturer track ranks. This guideline is for Assistant Lecturer being considered for promotion to Lecturer, and for Lecturer being considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Assistant Lecturer: *An individual who is a doctoral candidate or who has a terminal degree and/or significant experience to qualify for the position; and who has potential to provide effective teaching. An Assistant Lecturer typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform service activities. Assistant Lecturer is a temporary position.*

Lecturer: *An individual who has a terminal degree or who has significant experience to qualify for the position; and who has demonstrated effective teaching and effective service. A Lecturer typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform service activities.*

Senior Lecturer: *An individual who has a terminal degree or who has significant experience to qualify for the position; who has demonstrated excellent teaching and excellent service; and who has served a minimum of five years at the rank of Lecturer or other professional track position(s). A Senior Lecturer typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform service activities.*

Promotion to Lecturer requires effective teaching and effective service. Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires excellent teaching and effective service.

2. Professor of the Practice Track

LAUP P&T committee abides by the College and University definitions of the Professor of the Practice track ranks. This guideline is for Assistant Professor of the Practice being considered for promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice, and for Associate Professor of the Practice being considered for promotion to Professor of Practice.

Assistant Professor of the Practice: *An individual who is a field-specific expert from outside of academia with significant professional/practice achievements, and who has potential to provide excellent teaching or service. An Assistant Professor of the Practice typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform service activities.*

Associate Professor of the Practice: *An individual who is a field-specific expert from outside of academia with significant professional/practice achievements; who has demonstrated excellent teaching or service; and who has served a minimum of five years at the rank of Assistant Professor of the Practice. An Associate Professor of the*

Practice typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform service activities.

Professor of the Practice: *An individual who is a field-specific expert from outside of academia with significant professional/practice achievements, who has demonstrated excellent teaching and service; and who has served a minimum of five years at the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice. A Professor of the Practice typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and may also perform significant service activities.*

Promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice requires excellence in either teaching or service, and effectiveness in the other, if appropriate. Promotion to Professor of the Practice requires excellence in teaching, and effectiveness in other dimensions which are part of the faculty member's contractual obligations.

3. Instructional Professor Track

LAUP P&T committee abides by the College and University definitions of the Instructional Professor track ranks. This guideline is for Instructional Assistant Professor being considered for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, and for Instructional Associate Professor being considered for promotion to Instructional Professor.

Instructional Assistant Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position; and who has potential to provide excellent teaching. An Instructional Assistant Professor typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and is expected to make additional contributions to the education mission of the Department beyond classroom instruction. An Instructional Assistant Professor may also perform service activities.*

Instructional Associate Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position and who has demonstrated excellent teaching and effective service. An Instructional Associate Professor typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and is expected to make additional contributions to the education mission of the Department beyond classroom instruction. An Instructional Associate Professor may also perform service activities.*

Instructional Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position and who has demonstrated excellent teaching and excellent service. An Instructional Professor typically has teaching duties that include primary responsibility for one or more courses, and is expected to make significant additional contributions to the education mission of the Department beyond classroom instruction. An Instructional Associate Professor may also perform service activities.*

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor requires excellence in one of the two areas indicated in the contract. Promotion to Instructional Professor requires excellence in both areas that are indicated of the contract.

4. Research Professor Track

LAUP P&T committee abides by the College and University definitions of the Research Professor track ranks. This guideline is for Research Assistant Professor being considered for promotion to Research Associate Professor, and for Research Associate Professor being considered for promotion to Research Professor. Evaluation and promotions will be made in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the Dean of Faculties: https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/research_positions/research_professor_positions_guidelines.pdf

Research Assistant Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position; and who has potential to provide excellent research. A Research Assistant Professor engages primarily in research activities, but may also be involved in teaching or co-teaching a course. A*

Research Assistant Professor is expected to perform service activities, and make additional contributions to the academic mission of the Department and/or the research center/institute.

Research Associate Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position and who has demonstrated excellent research and effective service. A Research Associate Professor engages primarily in research activities, but may also perform service and teaching/mentoring activities. A Research Associate Professor is expected to make additional contributions to the academic mission of the Department and/or the research center/institute.*

Research Professor: *An individual who has a terminal degree in the field of specialization or has significant experience to qualify for the position and who has demonstrated excellent research, effective teaching, and effective service. A Research Professor engages primarily in research activities, but may also perform service and teaching/mentoring activities. A Research Professor is expected to make additional contributions to the academic mission of the Department and/or the research center/institute*

Promotion to Research Associate Professor requires excellent research or creative scholarship and effective service, if service is required. Promotion to Research Professor requires excellence in research or creative scholarship and effectiveness in other areas of contribution.

Appendix. DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN PLANNING PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

October 2019

The Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning Promotion and Tenure (LAUP P&T) guidelines for Academic Professional Track (APT) positions are based on the following minimum expectations which are consistent with the University and the College requirements: Teaching *effectiveness or excellence*, and Service *effectiveness or excellence*. This document describes expectations and performance criteria that LAUP P&T will use to evaluate effectiveness and excellence in Teaching and Service for LAUP faculty with APT appointments.

Promotion to Research Associate Professor requires excellent research or creative scholarship and effective service, if service is required. Promotion to Research Professor requires excellence in research or creative scholarship and effectiveness in other areas of contribution.

TEACHING

Effective Teaching

Effective teaching in LAUP includes instruction and graduate advising at a load that is approved by the department head. An effective instructor should have a syllabus clearly articulating student learning outcomes, list relevant readings and activities contributing to the student learning outcomes, have logical learning sequence and workload, and use effective assignments and assessment tools for all courses that he/she teaches. Teaching evaluation scores should be on par with or better than the discipline average in LAUP. Evidence of voluntary participation in university organized workshops and seminars (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence, University Writing Center, Information Technology Service, etc.) for instructional improvement further attests the instructor's willingness to improve teaching skills and/or adopt innovative teaching methods.

Effective advising also includes serving as a member of one or more graduate committees that result in timely graduation per program expectation.

Excellent Teaching

Excellent teaching is above and beyond effective teaching, demonstrated by at least two of the following:

- Mentor students and/or leaders of an active student organization
- Serve as a chair or a co-chair of a graduate committee
- Receive a Department teaching or mentoring award
- Receive a College or University teaching or mentoring award
- Receive a teaching or mentoring award from a nationally/internationally known discipline-related organization
- Publish peer-reviewed papers or conference proceedings related to instruction, mentoring, advising, or pedagogy
- Conduct a departmental teaching, advising, or mentoring workshop
- Conduct a teaching, advising, or mentoring workshop for a discipline-related organization
- Complete a comprehensive training or workshop on teaching or instructional technology
- Receive an internal or external grant on teaching or course development
- Develop innovative pedagogical methods and materials
- Be invited to teach at a reputable institution

SERVICE

Effective Service

Effective service in LAUP includes regular, active, and constructive service to both the university and the profession/community, demonstrated by the following:

Academic service: Service on departmental, college, or university committees, task forces, special service related to meeting unit needs, and mentorship of junior faculty, when appropriate.

Professional service: Service to the profession or community. Professional service may include ad hoc reviewing, grant reviews, panel/meeting/session organizer at a state or national level, continuing education teaching, organizing workshops, and offices held in professional associations. It will also include community engagement as a professional, such as service on boards, committees, or task forces within the local community, region, state, or nation.

Excellent Service

Excellent service is above and beyond effective service, demonstrated by achieving at least two in each of the following:

Academic service: Service at the university level, such as:

- d) Service on a university committee or task force
- e) Service as an elected or appointed representative to a university body or board (e.g., senate, council, network)
- f) Special service toward meeting unit needs such as chairing a college or departmental committee or leading an initiative for a major administrative or service project/effort

Professional service: Leadership in service to the profession or community in a professional capacity, such as:

- h) Journal editorship
- i) National or international conference or meeting convener/organizer
- j) National or international conference track chair

- k) Office held or other evidence of excellent service in national professional association or community organizations
- l) Delivery of testimony to a state or federal legislative body
- m) Invited reviews of major national or international grant, research, or policy programs
- n) Board membership on a state, national or international professionally-related organization

RESEARCH OR CREATIVE SCHOLARSHIP

Excellent Research or Creative Scholarship

Excellent research and creative scholarship in LAUP includes significant achievements in one or multiple areas of scholarship, including discovery, creativity, application, and teaching. Evaluation of faculty research and creative scholarship performance will be based on the following expectations in research *contribution*, *impact*, and *support*. Equal weight will be given to each of the three areas.

Contribution: Intellectual contribution that is original, significant, and rigorous, demonstrated by the following (a through d):

- a) Make significant intellectual contribution to the body of knowledge (e.g., theory, methods, integration, creativity, pedagogy)
- b) Demonstrate a continuous and growing record of intellectual contribution
- c) Establish a unique and independent agenda for research and/or creative scholarship
- d) Develop a coherent area of expertise respected and recognized by the peers in the relevant research/professional community

Impact: Impact of research on the larger research/academic/professional community and the general public; External reputation and acceptance of research among relevant research, academic, and/or professional communities, demonstrated by the following (a through c):

- a) Demonstrate high quality of the scholarly outputs (e.g., number of citations or downloads, rigor of research method, competitiveness of outlets/media/exhibition)
- b) Have sufficient quantity of the scholarly outputs (e.g., two peer-reviewed publications or creative works per year including at least one as the first author, on average)
- c) Demonstrate national or international level scholarly significance through one or more of the following:
 - ☐ Deliver an invited talk at a recognized national or international venue
 - ☐ Publish an invited or commissioned work in a reputable journal or other venue
 - ☐ Publish a book through a reputable academic press
 - ☐ Engage in translation of scholarship making significant impact on local, state, federal or international policy or practice
 - ☐ Receive an award or recognition from a reputable research, academic, or professional entity

Support: Support an expansion of scholarly activities, demonstrated by at least two of the following:

- a) Receive external and competitive funding as a PI
- b) Conduct collaborative and interdisciplinary research or creative activity, involving students and investigators from multiple disciplines
- c) Support initiation of new scholarly or creative directions or innovations
- d) Hold a research-related leadership role in relevant research, academic, or professional community (e.g., serving on the editorial board of reputable journals, serving on federal grant panels or other national review or design jury panels, editing journal special issues, chairing a national/international conference track)

While there are specific expectations for teaching, service, and research or creative scholarship, the body of work will be taken in its entirety and on a case-by-case basis. Excellence at the time of promotion or tenure does not require an excellent annual evaluation each year of the time at rank.

Contact Office

Departmental Office, Landscape Architecture & Urban Planning, Thena Morris, tmorris@arch.tamu.edu

Promotion & Tenure Guidelines for Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Approved by Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty on March by a vote of 14 to 1.

Guidelines for Promotion for Academic Professional Track Faculty Approved by all Faculty on October 18, 2019, by a vote of 22-4.

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties June 21, 2021