

# Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

## Marine Engineering Technology Department

*Revised: September-September 2020*

*Reviewed by Department Faculty: November 2020*

*Approved by Chief Academic Officer, TAMUG: March, 2021*

*Approved by Dean of Faculties of TAMU: March, 2021*

*Next Scheduled Review: March 2024*

### 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 3-6
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure 6-8
6. Annual Review 8-13
7. Mid-Term Review 13-14
8. Post-Tenure Review 14-18
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status 18

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Department of Marine Engineering Technology at Texas A&M University Galveston is to prepare students to perform engineering work in the maritime sector, or marine-related shore-based sector, involving the design, production, operation, maintenance, and management of engineering systems and projects. 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 the stability of employment.

Please also refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines which supplements this document (<https://www.tamug.edu/AcademicAffairs/FacultyEvaluation.html>). “P&T review process” is addressed in sections 5.1 - 5.12 of the college guidelines.

Current document is based on the departmental guidelines approved by faculty in 2017. During the deliberations for this document, concern was expressed that the guidelines for “Instructional Professors” are lumped together with “Professors of the Practice.” Marine Engineering Technology administration and faculty will continue to modify the document to address the above issue during next year.

The expectations of the Department of Marine Engineering Technology for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)) Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the Unit; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

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

Table 1: University documents describing the requirements and guidelines for faculty evaluations

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</a>
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-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

Definition of faculty ranks and tracks can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) and [University Guidelines to Faculty titles](#).

2.1 Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members. All faculty members in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or development leave appointments).

2.2 Instructional Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Assistant Professor are non-tenure track appointments. Faculty in these appointments will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and service.

2.3 Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, and Assistant Professor of the Practice are non-tenure track appointments. These appointments are normally for faculty members who have had or maintain a primary employment in a profession outside of academia.

## 3. Areas of Faculty Performance (Reference [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.1)

Decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned categories of performance (teaching, research, scholarly activity, and license preparation). 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: Self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student feedback, and evidence of student learning.

### 3.2 Research, scholarly activity, or creative work:

The category of Research and Scholarly Activities normally involves original scientific, engineering research and publication of such research results in peer-reviewed journal and proceedings, and invited talks. In all cases, it consists of the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities. The critical element of primary importance is peer review. Hence, weight is given to those research activities that have elements of peer review included in their assessment, such as peer reviewed publications that involve the creation and dissemination of new knowledge via research, patents, publication and/or presentation at professional meetings.

### 3.3 Service:

This includes service to the institution, the profession, and external constituencies. The category of service includes service to the institution (to students, colleagues, Department, and TAMUG/TAMU) as well as service beyond the

campus, including service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

### 3.4 Licensing:

This includes participation in assessments, administration, training, and training cruises involving Marine Engineering Technology license option students.

## 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. The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with the faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)). The section that follows provides representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each of the three dimensions of performance (Teaching, Research, Service and Licensing) discussed above. Some indicators do not clearly fall into a single area. For instance, successfully working with undergraduate students as they seek to complete an undergraduate research experience has both teaching and research components, while involvement in assessment has both teaching and service components. These activities are classified into a single area, but their relation to other areas should be recognized as appropriate.

### 4.1 Indicators of Excellence in Teaching:

Indicators include but are not limited to: A high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance excellence described below. It is explicitly recognized that scholarly, archival journal publications are not the only indicators of professional accomplishment and excellence for the Marine Engineering Technology faculty. Other appropriate indicators of professional accomplishments may include:

- Evidence of continuous teaching improvement based on student evaluation
- Invitations to teach/speak at domestic or international institutions
- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Direction of graduate or undergraduate student research or creative activity is encouraged
- Developing a new course or laboratory experiment(s) that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Integration of research activities with engineering classroom teaching
- Chair and/or membership of doctoral research committees
- Placement of undergraduate/graduate students into fellowship, local industrial tours, significant academic, scholarly or professional positions
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Contributing to the department's growth by conceiving and enacting programs that will advance the
- Evidence of advancing the Department of Marine Engineering Technology's mission and educational objectives.
- Evidence of continued Performance as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor.
- Developing new courses in continuing education courses.
- Teaching Awards

### 4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching:

Indicators include but are not limited to: Acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance effectiveness described in the next section.

- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses
- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Coordination of multi-section courses
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate research advisor
- Participating in the professional development of students through advising
- Teaching Awards

#### 4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work:

Indicators include but are not limited to: A high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance excellence. Since there is no research oriented graduate program in MARE, all tenure track faculty whose appointment or reappointment letter is research-oriented are expected to be active in developing research capacity and pursuing a research agenda that leads to at least one collaborative or single publication of work in professionally recognized outlets and attendance to meetings and conferences every other year. Factors that provide evidence of efforts in research and scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, journal publication, conference publication, and collaborative research activities, funded research projects are encouraged, individual or collaborative proposals submission for funded research projects, and professional interaction with industry and the private sector. In addition, because there are no graduate students or graduate programs, integrating undergraduate students into the research endeavor is highly encouraged and will be incorporated positively in the assessment of research productivity. Research productivity will not be judged by quantity alone but will take into account the quality of work performed, as determined by such measures as professional standing of journals, appropriateness of journals, impact factor of the journal, citation of published papers and other evidence of positive impact in the discipline:

- Publications in refereed journals as the lead scientist or collaborative
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of a scholarly book or a book chapter
- Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities
- Writing and submission of individual or collaborative grant proposals for funding
- National and international collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings
- Presentation of invited talks and seminars either at the local or international Universities
- Establishment of a collaborative industrial research and training program
- Publication in leading educational journals
- An established reputation as verified through local and national media
- Prestigious awards
- Reviewing other's work from journals, conferences, books, research proposals etc.
- Editing experience and awards from journals, conferences and books etc.

#### 4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work:

Indicators include but are not limited to: Acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance effectiveness described below:

- Publications in refereed journals as an author or co-author
- Publication of a scholarly book or a book chapter
- Service as a reviewer for refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
- Presentation of papers at national/international meetings
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty summer research programs at the national laboratories that enhance research and publication effectiveness

- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Writing and submission of proposal/ white papers
- Proposal panel reviewer

#### 4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service:

Indicators include but are not limited to: A high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance excellence described below. Every faculty member is expected to participate constructively in the life of the department and in service to the profession. Such participation is normally demonstrated by regular attendance at meetings, constructive participation in decision-making and other aspects of the functioning of the department, constructive collegiality (i.e., mentoring or assistance of others in fulfilling their duties and maturing as scholars), and service on elected and/or appointed committees. It may also be demonstrated by service on the Faculty Senate or on College or University committees and service to the profession (such as reviewing papers for journals, conferences and books, editing for journals, participating at conferences, or serving as a member of professional society). Positive indicators of service activity shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Membership in a national or international professional organization with increasing seniority
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Administrative leadership role at TAMUG/TAMU
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Reviewing other's work from journals, conferences, books, research proposals etc.
- Editing experience and awards from journals, conferences and books etc.
- Chair a national or international level conference
- Chair of a major standing or ad hoc TAMUG/TAMU committee
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large

#### 4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service:

Indicators include but are not limited to: Acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance effectiveness described below:

- Participation at national or international conferences
- Membership in regional or state professional organization
- Service on University, college, and departmental committees and task forces
- Service as consultant to business or governmental agencies
- Administrative roles within the department
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

#### 4.7 Indicators of Excellence in Licensing:

Indicators include but are not limited to: Acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance excellence described below:

- Evaluating USCG skills assessment
- Membership on a major governmental commission, task force, or board
- Administrative leadership role at TAMUG/TAMU
- Service as consultant to business or governmental agencies

#### 4.8 Indicators of Effectiveness in Licensing:

Indicators include but are not limited to: Acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, as reflected by the substantive indicators of performance effectiveness described below:

- Participation in USCG skills assessment
- Documenting and reporting the assessment results

- Participation in coordination meetings for summer cruises
- Supervising cadets during summer cruises
- Advising students in license option program
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced licensing effectiveness

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, 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:** During their probationary period, the work of Assistant Professors is expected to display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At the point of their mandatory mid-term review, they will need to show effectiveness in all three dimensions of their dossier, and a clear trajectory of acceleration towards establishing a productive pattern of scholarly and creative activities and publications.
- 5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** Associate Professors should meet the minimum University requirements for that rank and will typically have at least three additional years of professional experience to include (but not limited to) teaching at the university level, and consulting activity. University Rule 12.01.99.M2 provides the University Criteria, i.e., minimum requirements for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor:
- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field.
  - Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of TAMU.
  - An area of specialization germane to the programs of TAMU, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
  - Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.
  - Professional Integrity: The faculty must demonstrate the highest level of academic honesty and professional integrity. Respect and consideration for and by staff, students, and colleagues with whom the faculty has contact, are important. The faculty should take a leadership role within the Department, TAMU/TAMUG, and the scientific community.
  - Collegiality: The faculty's professional goals must be compatible with the goals of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. The faculty is expected to actively participate in the academic life of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU.
- 5.1.3 **Professor:** Appointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor for tenure track requires evidence of sustained performance in teaching, research and service. In particular, the combination of the two principal academic functions of teaching and research, at a level of superiority and as appropriate to the appointment, is required of Full Professor. University Rule 12.01.99.M2 provides the University Criteria, i.e., minimum requirements for promotion to Full Professor, some of which include the following:
- Continuing accomplishment in teaching
  - Continuing accomplishment and some measure of national recognition in research
  - Evidence of professional service

- iv. **Professional Integrity:** The faculty must demonstrate the highest level of academic honesty and professional integrity. Respect and consideration for and by staff, students, and colleagues with whom the faculty has contact are important. The faculty should take a leadership role within the Department, TAMU/TAMUG, and the scientific community.
- v. **Collegiality:** The faculty's professional goals must be compatible with the goals of the Department and TAMU/TAMUG. The faculty is expected to actively participate in the academic life of the Department and TAMU/TAMUG.

**Additional questions to be considered when evaluating a faculty for promotion to Full Professor in MARR are:**

- vi. Does the candidate's professional experience, abilities, and standards of professional integrity compare favorably with professors at TAMU's Engineering Technology and other peer institutions?
- vii. Has the candidate made significant contributions to the Department and to the engineering technology community?
- viii. Does the candidate's record provide evidence for continued scholarship and academic leadership?

**5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track):**

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

- 5.2.1 **Senior Lecturer:** The quality and impact of teaching activities will be given primary emphasis for the granting of promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to maintain effectiveness in instruction/teaching at TAMUG and/or TAMU. The granting of promotion to Senior Lecturer will demonstrate, over time, excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching.
- 5.2.2 **Instructional Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor of the Practice:** The work of Assistant Professors of the Practice is expected to display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professors of the Practice. Assistant Professors of the Practice must have a 2nd Assistant's USCG license and be familiar with the program's STCW requirements and Associate Professors of the Practice must have a 1st Assistant's USCG license and also be familiar with the program's STCW requirements. Extensive experience may be substituted in lieu of a license. These faculty members bring real maritime expertise into the classroom and laboratories and ensure that our programs conform to international standards. US Navy or USCG active duty experience as chief engineer on board a vessel may substitute for the USCG 1st Assistant license.
- 5.2.3 **Instructional Associate Professor or Associate Professor of the Practice:** Associate Professors should meet the minimum University requirements for that rank and will typically have at least three additional years of professional experience to include (but not limited to) teaching at the university level, and consulting activity. University Rule 12.01.99.M2 provides the University Criteria, i.e., minimum requirements for tenure with promotion to Associate Professor:
  - i. An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field.
  - ii. Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of TAMU.
  - iii. An area of specialization germane to the programs of TAMU, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and



- iv. Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.
- v. Professional Integrity: The faculty must demonstrate the highest level of academic honesty and professional integrity. Respect and consideration for and by staff, students, and colleagues with whom the faculty has contact are important. The faculty should take a leadership role within the Department, TAMU/TAMUG, and the scientific community.
- vi. Collegiality: The faculty's professional goals must be compatible with the goals of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. The faculty is expected to actively participate in the academic life of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU.

**Instructional Professor or Professor of the Practice:** The Marine Engineering Technology Professor of the Practice requires five additional years of teaching experience beyond the Associate Professor of the Practice and a USCG Chief Engineer's license steam and diesel unlimited. The Chief Engineer of the training ship will have the faculty rank of Professor of the Practice. US Navy or USCG active duty experience as chief engineer on board a vessel may substitute for the USCG Chief Engineer license. Appointment or promotion to the rank of Full Professor for tenure track requires evidence of sustained performance in teaching, research and service. In particular, the combination of the two principal academic functions of teaching and research, at a level of superiority and as appropriate to the appointment, is required of Full Professor. University Rule 12.01.99.M2 provides the University Criteria, i.e., minimum requirements for promotion to Full Professor, some of which include the following:

- i. Continuing accomplishment in teaching
- ii. Continuing accomplishment and some measure of national recognition in research
- iii. Evidence of professional service
- iv. Professional Integrity: The faculty must demonstrate the highest level of academic honesty and professional integrity. Respect and consideration for and by staff, students, and colleagues with whom the faculty has contact are important.
- v. The faculty should take a leadership role within the Department, TAMU/TAMUG, and the scientific community.
- vi. Collegiality: The faculty's professional goals must be compatible with the goals of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU. The faculty is expected to actively participate in the academic life of the Department and TAMUG/TAMU.

### 5.3 Departmental Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure:

Faculty are currently working to revise the departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure. In the meantime, please refer to the TAMUG Faculty Evaluation Guidelines sections 5.3-5.12 for the promotion and tenure process.

## 6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

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

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

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

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

#### 6.1 Purpose

- i. Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- ii. Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- iii. Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
  - a. See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors, the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- iv. 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.

- i. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion.
- ii. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion.
- iii. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

#### 6.3 Time Period of Review

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar year.

#### 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:

- i. Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- ii. 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.
- iii. Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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:

- i. Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.
- iv. 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.**
- v. 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:

- i. Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- ii. 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.
- iii. 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.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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.

6.4.4 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **licensing** are: This applies only to faculty who are involved in assessment of STCW requirements and USCG skills assessment.

- vi. Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in licensing.
- vii. Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in licensing. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- viii. Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in licensing. Those in this category will have involvement in USCG assessment **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment**.
- ix. Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in licensing. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful licensing activities such as documenting, reporting, advising and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts.
- x. 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.M2, (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:

- i. 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.
- ii. The report should incorporate teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service as appropriate.
- iii. Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.
  - a) Faculty members should complete the G1 Form with accurate and detailed information for all sections of teaching, scholarly activities (research), and service. Faculty members may obtain permission from the Department Head for a deadline extension in the event of circumstances that impede compliance.
  - b) Faculty members should state goals for the review year and provide evidence to substantiate progress on their stated goals in the Faculty Prospectus (Section D) of the G1 Form. Faculty members should discuss goals for the coming year in Faculty Prospectus. At the annual review meeting with the Department Head, these goals may be amended, deleted, or new goals added.

Annual review for Marine Engineering Technology Department will be based on the following:

- i. Annual Performance Report (G1 Form)
- ii. Curriculum vitae
- iii. Teaching evaluations

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 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 8.2.) 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 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. 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.M2](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#)

## 7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

### 7.1 Purpose

- i. A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- ii. 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.
- iii. This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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.
- vi. 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.
- vii. 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 Review<sup>1</sup>**

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

The Tenure Committee is made up of at least three full tenured professor ranked faculty members in the department.

If there are not enough three (3) full professor ranked faculty members in the department eligible to serve on the committee, then one member from the Engineering Technology Department at TAMU or from the College of Engineering at College Station will be asked to serve on the committee by the DH. In addition, the other committee member(s) may be appointed by DH either from within or outside TAMUG/TAMU who are well versed in the candidate's area of expertise.

If the department has three or more eligible faculty, then Tenure committee will be selected from the faculty in Marine Engineering Technology at TAMUG.

If a committee member has a conflict of interest with the candidate, then that otherwise eligible member must be recused. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (i) Relatives of the candidate (see Section 1 of the System Policy 33.03 "Nepotism" for the definition of the relatives)

### 8.3 Process

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



- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- i. Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, Service & Licensing (if applicable)
  - ii. Curriculum vitae
  - iii. List of all peer reviewed publications
  - iv. List of service activities
  - v. List of all courses taught at TAMUG/TAMU including, at minimum, the following:
    - Course title and number
    - Year/semester the course was taught
    - Credit hours and enrollment
    - Student evaluation ratings
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>2</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.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, 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

---

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

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 8.3.4) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 8.7). The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review 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 8.5.) 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.

To be consistent with the DOF recommendation ([https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-Universal/Recommendation\\_for\\_Emeritus\\_Status-2-27-20.pdf](https://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-Universal/Recommendation_for_Emeritus_Status-2-27-20.pdf)), the faculty member should retire in good standing in order to be positively recommended by the department head.

## Appendix

Units may choose to annotate the revisions to previous versions of their evaluation guidelines

---

## Contact Office

---

Texas A&M -Galveston Office of Marine Engineering Technology Dept., e-mail [averma@tamug.edu](mailto:averma@tamug.edu)