

Department of Anthropology Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

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](#).

Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Anthropology – October 5, 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks	2
3. Areas of Faculty Performance	3
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	4
5. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure	5
6. Annual Review	10
7. Mid-Term Review	16
8. Post-Tenure Review	17
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status	20

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Department of Anthropology is to study what it means to be human in the broadest sense through an examination of culture and society, the biology and evolution of humans and our closest relatives, and the study of past human communities and material culture. As such, we are uniquely situated to provide our students with the means to understand, respect, and engage with the wide variety of human experiences that make up our globalized world, and to esteem and value the broad diversity of physical and cultural differences that comprise our unique species. The critical thinking skills that Anthropology students learn prepare them not only to critically evaluate scientific and non-scientific claims made in academia, in public, and on social media, but to actively participate in well-informed social discourse relating to their own society and its continually evolving stance on public policy and governance. As part of our mission to serve all of the people of the State of Texas, the Department of Anthropology is committed to fostering an inclusive and welcoming workplace and learning environment for all of our faculty, staff, and students, drawing in and supporting individuals who collectively reflect the diversity of our community, our state, and our nation.

Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the Department of Anthropology 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	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdfs
12.01.99.M1 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules
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)	http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/ Promotion-and-Tenure

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

2. Faculty Ranks and Tracks

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.

Faculty ranks and tracks within the Department of Anthropology are as listed and described in the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

Tenured and tenure track faculty include the following titles: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. 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).

Academic professional track faculty are non-tenure track appointments and include the following titles: Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Lecturer. Faculty in appointments with the word Instructional in the title will be expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching and service. Lecturers are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching.

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 in 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 assignment will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments). The standard breakdown of workload effort is 30% teaching, 50% research, and 20% service.

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 (the College of Liberal Arts requires a minimum of two peer assessments of classroom observations for midterm, tenure and promotion, and promotion reviews); 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are as follows. The evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance will be based on course syllabi, student evaluations (both numerical scores and written statements), and in-class peer reviews by Tenure and Promotion Committee members for both undergraduate and graduate teaching. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes:

- developing a breadth of teaching experience at lower division, upper division, and graduate levels
- creation of new courses (or major revisions of existing ones)
- usage of innovative and effective new teaching methods
- clarity in the organization, preparation and presentation of course content that reflect a command of the area/s of instruction.
- motivation of students and creation and maintenance of positive and engaging classroom environment.
- productive rapport with students
- professional development that enhances instructional effectiveness

3.2 Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities is central to the College, and effectiveness in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work is required of all tenure-track faculty. All tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to scholarship or research and its publication. Effectiveness and excellence in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work is based on both quantitative and qualitative measures. Measures/sources of information may include: 1) publications in peer-reviewed journals; 2) books published by respected university or trade presses; 3) chapters in edited volumes; 3) chapters in conference proceedings; 4) research funding (e.g. grants, contracts); 5) presentations of research (invited lectures, conference presentations, etc.); 6) technical reports; 7) impact factors and journal rankings; and 8) contextual evidence of impact of research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work. Criteria for demonstrating effectiveness and excellence in research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work include:

- Coherent, continuous scholarly agenda
- Demonstrable scholarly productivity (underscored by the volume of publications or creative work, and grant and other related scholarly activities)
- Influential research or creative work that is highly regarded in sub/specialized fields and disciplines

3.3 Service

Service to the institution, to students, colleagues, the Department, the College, the University, and the Discipline are integral to the operation of the College, and effectiveness in service is required of all tenure-track faculty and all instructional faculty. All tenure-track and instructional faculty members are expected to contribute to service. Effectiveness and excellence in service affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

Evaluation of service is based on: 1) faculty service and leadership within the department; 2) faculty service to the college and university; 3) service and leadership within national and international disciplinary organizations; 4) other service contributions to the discipline, including reviews of grants, manuscripts, and external promotion cases; and 5) contributions to the university's efforts to engage students, faculty, and staff in support of a diverse, welcoming, and inclusive community. Criteria for demonstrating effectiveness and excellence in service include:

- active participation in the operation of the department
- productive contributions to College and University initiatives and activities
- contributions to student development outside assigned teaching responsibilities
- demonstrable contributions to the mission and activities of professional organizations and scholarly communities, as is appropriate for track and rank
- demonstrable contributions to non-scholarly local and regional communities

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Department of Anthropology 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 includes, but is not limited to:

- publication of textbooks or other instructional materials
- successful substantial curriculum development grants
- receipt of major awards for outstanding teaching
- placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions
- outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes

4.2 Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching includes, but is not limited to:

- development of new modes of instruction
- developing a new course, or significantly revising an existing course, that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the university by the candidate
- participation in any workshop or program designed to improve teaching (if possible, identify outcomes or impact on candidate's instructional effectiveness)
- transformational teaching promoting inclusion of a diverse student body, including efforts to decolonize teaching

4.3 Indicators of Excellence in Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

- national or/and international reputation/prominence
- publications in leading peer-reviewed, general science and discipline specific journals
- publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s)
- citations that especially appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions
- highly positive reviews of candidate's books or creative works
- demonstrable transformative impact on sub/special field or/and discipline
- funded research grant proposals
- competitive external fellowships received
- awards for scholarship or scholarly achievements
- keynote addresses or other invited presentations in prestigious venues
- publication and grant records diversifying the field in some way

4.4 Indicators of Effectiveness in Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work includes, but is not limited to:

- journal impact factors
- H-indices in those disciplines where appropriate
- citation counts
- appearance of the candidate's work on graduate syllabi for courses in highly regarded programs
- contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published, especially if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (e.g., other authors who have published in the same venue, composition of the press' editorial board, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue)
- information on the quality of venues for exhibitions or performance of creative works

4.5 Indicators of Excellence in Service includes, but is not limited to:

- chairing a university, college, or department committee or task force
- serving in key administrative roles within the department
- serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate
- sustained service as an effective advisor to student organizations
- professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers
- serving as program chair or other major program planning role or in a similar leadership position at a national or international research or teaching professional meeting
- key leadership positions in state, regional, national or international organizations
- service that incorporates efforts to improve diversity and inclusion

4.6 Indicators of Effectiveness in Service includes, but is not limited to:

- serving actively on university, college, or department committees and task forces
- serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate

- contributions to student organizations or initiatives
- review of manuscripts for refereed journals and scholarly publishers
- book reviews and encyclopedia entries
- service to state, regional, or national professional organizations (not in leadership positions)
- significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The criteria for the unit are as follows.

5.1.1 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching

The evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance will be based on course syllabi, student evaluations (both numerical scores and written statements), and in-class peer reviews by Promotion and Tenure Committee members. Additional evidence of merit in teaching includes developing a breadth of teaching experience at lower division, upper division, and graduate levels, creation of new courses (or major revisions of existing ones), usage of innovative and effective new teaching methods, receipt of teaching awards, and other relevant evidence. The record of graduate advising at the master's and doctoral levels will also be taken into account when assessing the candidate's teaching performance.

Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate. By the tenure review, successful candidates have historically produced a substantial corpus of publications, including articles in highly regarded, peer-reviewed journals and/or a book in a university press (or the equivalent) to obtain tenure. If a candidate's publications include a monograph with a reputable university or commercial press, then fewer research articles are expected. However, candidates should not expect that they will gain tenure by publishing a book only. Similarly, if the candidate generated significant amount of funding from peer-reviewed grants and fellowships, the number of expected research articles will be less. Refereed book chapters will also be taken into consideration in assessing a candidate's research record. Peer reviewed publications resulting from invited specialized conferences in which the invitation itself to participate indicates the writer's prominence in that research topic are also of value in this regard, as well as long-term fieldwork, conservation analysis, and success in generating substantial contracts.

The number of publications is not the only measure of a candidate's scholarly record. The preponderance of a candidate's publications should be in appropriate and highly ranked journals and presses in their particular field. The review process will factor in the quality and ranking of publication venues according to the ISI Impact Factor and other measures. In some programs, appropriate journals do not have impact factors. In that case, other measures of quality would be useful. This might include evidence that articles published in this journal have impacted the field or evidence

that other highly regarded scholars have published in the journal. For presses of published books of the candidate, contextual information may be of use, such as whether the book is part of a notable series in the field or whether other important scholars have published significant books in the press. At this stage in the candidate's career, the potential to become an influential scholar in the field is a significant factor in tenure consideration. This is evidenced by external reviewers assessing the candidate's research record as well as by citations by others of the candidate's publications. Additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly reputation includes honors and awards of published work, and invitations to present research at other universities.

Given the diversity of programs within the department and of the disciplinary backgrounds of its faculty, including joint appointments, it is recognized that some candidates publish in interdisciplinary journals and journals specific to the field/discipline of their research interest, rather than in "mainline" anthropology journals (whether biological, archaeological, or cultural). In these cases, the ranking of the publication venues will be used that is standard in the field/discipline of the candidate's research interests as agreed by the tenured professors of the individual programs, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and in consultation with interdisciplinary program directors in the case of joint appointments.

It is also recognized that co-authored publications, edited works, and site monographs (all peer reviewed) play a greater role as evidence of progress toward tenure in some programs than in others. A peer-reviewed book that qualifies as a final excavation report may be considered equivalent to a single authored book, once the role of the candidate as principal investigator is established. In cases of co-authored publications, it is the candidates' responsibility to document their contribution toward conceptualizing, funding, implementing, analyzing, and writing up the work. Candidates' contributions, along with significance of position in order of authorship, may be documented through 'statements of contribution' provided by the candidates, preferably with the explicit consent of the senior author of the publication. Candidates may opt to have co-authors provide support letters documenting the candidate's contribution to co-authored publications.

In all instances, the overall research and publication record of the candidate needs to show a coherent trajectory that goes well beyond the dissertation. The quality of the record will be assessed by tenured members of the candidate's program and department, as well as by external reviewers associated with the respective disciplinary fields of the candidate's program and the candidate's research interests. For faculty with joint appointments, external reviewers will be drawn from the respective fields of the department and the relevant program.

Service

A candidate for promotion to associate professor will usually have a record of service primarily to the department. This is in the form of membership in departmental standing or *ad hoc* committees. Service on committees includes attendance and active participation. The candidate is also likely to have advised student organizations and participated in mentoring programs that serve students. For faculty with joint appointments, the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee will take into account the time and effort that goes into service for both units, though the review will focus on service conducted in the Anthropology Department.

5.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Teaching

In the case of candidates for promotion to Full Professor, the high standards of teaching expected for the promotion to Associate Professor continue to be relevant. At this stage the candidate is expected to have mentored a significant number of graduate students (MA, MS, PhD). In this regard, the committee will consider the extent to which the candidate's graduate students have successfully generated external funding for their research, participated in scholarly conferences, published their work, completed their degrees, and secured professional positions. Additional evidence of

merit in teaching includes publication of textbooks and other instructional material, peer reviewed grants for teaching, and other relevant evidence.

Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Creative Work

Similar to promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to demonstrate significant accomplishments in their research, primarily through their publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and through refereed monographs authored and/or co-authored by the candidate. *All of the statements for the first promotion apply to the second promotion.* There is no standard period of time between the two promotions. Candidates considered for promotion to Full Professor will have achieved an outstanding body of publications based on an active research agenda that extends beyond the first promotion. By the time the candidate comes up for the second promotion, their overall research record should represent a coherent and significant research contribution to the candidate's discipline, and they should have gained a national/international reputation as an expert in their area of specialty. Indications of this reputation, such as citations by others of the candidate's works, will be taken into account as will the evaluations of external reviewers who have expertise in the candidate's research field. Also important are major external grant and fellowship funding received for research. The quality of the record will be assessed by full professors of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as by external reviewers with expertise in the respective disciplinary field of the candidate's program.

Service

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to have contributed to the governance of the Department, College, and University. Candidates are also expected to have a record of service to professional organizations within the candidates' discipline (elected or appointed office, committee membership). As relevant, candidates may also have a record of service to the broader public (community organizations, public lectures, popular articles) that relates to their professional expertise. The candidate's presence on editorial boards of highly ranked scholarly journals and presses, participation in grant review panels, scholarly awards of achievement by professional groups, and other similar indices will also be taken into consideration.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty

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.

Candidates for promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or Instructional Professor are expected to have made significant contributions in teaching and any particular scholarship or service roles as defined in their position descriptions. Review for promotion to instructional associate professor normally occurs after a minimum of five years in the department, while review for promotion to instructional full professor typically happens after a minimum of five years of service at the rank of instructional associate professor.

Because candidates for promotion in the academic professional track are not judged according to success in research, any such scholarly activities should be carefully linked to the candidate's teaching and service records. Specifically, in Anthropology it is understood that some high-impact experiences for undergraduates (e.g. laboratory classes, internships, field schools) cannot be de-coupled from research activities, in that they often lead to the accumulation of new materials and knowledge that ethically need to be reported to the professional community. Additionally, in some cases extraordinary service roles of some APT faculty could lead to special opportunities in grant-proposal writing, presenting at conferences, or publishing that are not commonly considered part of an APT dossier.

5.2.1 Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor / Senior Lecturer

Teaching

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor or to Senior Lecturer is based largely on meritorious teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following criteria: strong teaching performance, as demonstrated by peer evaluation, student evaluation and student outcomes; development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as shown by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; evidence of very high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments; successful development of new courses or major revising of existing courses; effective coordination of a multi-section course; demonstrated success in service as departmental undergraduate program director (which could also be included as a service activity if appropriate); significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness; earning competitive grant funding for teaching; participation in University Honors or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students; offering high-impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, field school, critical-thinking seminars, Freshman seminars, senior honors theses); selection for a college or university outstanding teacher award.

Service

For promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, the candidate should demonstrate meritorious service to the department. Normal activities could include serving on departmental, college, or university committees; advising a student organization; filling administrative roles within the department; serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate; completing significant self-development activities leading to enhanced effectiveness in service roles; providing service to a national or international organization focusing on teaching or the faculty member's individualized service role.

5.2.2 Promotion to Instructional Professor

Teaching

Promotion to Instructional Professor is based on demonstrated excellence in teaching, as measured by some combination of the following criteria: outstanding teaching performance, as demonstrated by peer evaluation, student evaluation, and student outcomes; evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence; publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials; receipt of external grant support for teaching/learning projects; recognition through awards for success in teaching; significant contribution to the professional development of students; outstanding performance as departmental undergraduate program director (which could also be included as a service activity if appropriate); frequent offering of high-impact experiences for students.

Service

For promotion to Instructional Professor, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in service to the department, college, university, and/or profession. Examples of suitable service activities include chairing a departmental, college, or university committee, advising a student organization for a sustained period; serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate; completing sustained, significant self-development activities leading to enhanced effectiveness in service roles; and serving in a leadership position in a national or international organization focusing on teaching or the faculty member's individualized service role.

5.3 Process

The Department of Anthropology's Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for assessing candidates for tenure and promotion to associate and full professor. It takes into account the candidates' academic record, with a respective weight of 50%, 30%, and 20% given to research, teaching, and service. For promotion to Associate Professor, the committee is composed of all tenured faculty of the department. For promotion to Professor, the committee is restricted to Full Professors. The committee is called into active service at four occasions: 1) to conduct an annual review of assistant professors; 2) to undertake a detailed mid-term evaluation of the progress toward promotion and tenure by assistant professors (normally in the 3rd year of their appointment); 3) to carry out a review of untenured assistant professors being considered for promotion and tenure (normally in the 6th year of their appointment); and 4) to conduct a formal review of Associate Professors who are being considered for promotion to Professor. There is no standard period of time between the two promotions. Prior to such a review, candidates may submit their CV and Personal Statement to the Professors of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for an informal evaluation of their readiness to begin proceedings for promotion to Professor.

The department recommends that all candidates for promotion and tenure also refer to university and college guidelines on Promotion and Tenure, available on the Dean of Faculties website and the College of Liberal Arts website:

- [12.01.99.M1 University Rules on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#), including Appendix I. Examples of Criteria That May be Employed in Evaluation of Faculty
- [Office of the Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)
- [College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Review: Mid-term, Tenure & Promotion, and Promotion](#)

Generally, candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to have strong records in all three categories: teaching, research, and service. According to University Rules on Promotion and Tenure, however, exceptions to these normal requirements may sometimes be warranted (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1, Section 4.4.1.4). In such cases, candidates should clarify that they are seeking promotion on the basis of this exception clause.

The promotion and tenure process proceeds as follows. In the Spring semester before the Promotion and Tenure dossier must be submitted for review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair begins selecting potential external reviewers for the dossier in accordance with Dean of Faculties guidelines (Texas A&M University Guidelines, section 4). The Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair creates a list of 5-10 names of arms-length individuals, and requests a similar, non-overlapping list of names from the candidate. The Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair then solicits reviews from 8-10 of the identified individuals, with an even mix from the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair's list and the candidate's list. External letters are solicited, with a requested due date of on or around August 15.

The candidate compiles a dossier that includes a) candidate's statement; b) candidate's CV; c) grants summary chart; d) verification of contents statement; e) faculty biography; f) faculty summary data table; and g) other materials and documentation. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that their component of the dossier is complete and correct. The external reviewer's letters are added to the dossier by the department. The Department also adds the following documents to the candidate's dossier: a) faculty tenure table; b) teaching report; c) research and/or other scholarly activities report; d) service report; e) other activities report (if needed); f) department P&T Committee discussion report and recommendation; and g) Department Head recommendation.

Once the dossier is complete, the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair convenes a three-member sub-committee to write the teaching report, the research and/or other scholarly activities report, and the service report, respectively. The Promotion and Tenure Committee then reviews all the relevant materials and meets to discuss and vote on whether the candidate should be approved for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair writes a report on the committee's discussion and recommendation, and the Department Head writes a report with their recommendation. The entire, expanded dossier is then forwarded to the College for further action.

Mid-tenure review follows the same procedures as the tenure review process, except that external letters of support are not solicited. Promotion to Professor follows that same procedures as the tenure review process, except that the vote is only for promotion and the Promotion and Tenure Committee includes only full Professors. Promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Senior Lecturer positions follow the same procedures except that there is no research component included in the dossier, and external letters are not solicited.

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 Process

On or about the 20th of January of each year the Department Head distributes a blank “Department of Anthropology Faculty Summary Report” form for faculty to fill in. Each faculty member is required to submit a completed form, along with an up-to-date CV, by approximately February 14 of the same year. Faculty use the Faculty Summary Report to detail their research activities for the previous three calendar years, and their teaching and service activities for the previous one year. The Faculty Summary Report and the CV serve as the primary basis for the Annual Review conducted by the Department Head. The Department Head ranks all faculty according to a four-point scale: Meritorious, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory. Faculty receive such a ranking for each category of performance (teaching, research, service) as well as an overall rating of performance. The Department Head utilizes a 10-point scoring rubric to determine faculty rankings on the Meritorious/Satisfactory/Needs Improvement/Unsatisfactory scale for each category of performance (teaching, research, service; see Section 6.5). This 10-point scale is used by the Department Head to generate an overall numerical score for each faculty member, which is then used to determine merit allocations.

Academic Professional Track faculty are reviewed by the Department Head alone. Untenured, tenure-track faculty are reviewed by the Department Head and by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, who provide feedback for the faculty that the Department Head can use in the Annual Review. Tenured faculty are reviewed by the Department Head and by the Executive Committee as part of the Post Tenure Review process (see Section 8). In the case of tenured faculty, the Executive Committee reviews all tenured faculty members’ Faculty Summary Reports and CVs, and uses the same 10-point scoring rubric that the Department Head uses to determine faculty rankings on the Meritorious/Satisfactory/Needs Improvement/Unsatisfactory scale. The report from the Executive Committee to the Department Head does not include a numerical score, though the nominal rankings on the Meritorious/Satisfactory/Needs Improvement/Unsatisfactory scale are included and utilized by the Department Head as part of the annual performance review.

6.3 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).

Faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts (whether successful or not) are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences are given lower priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given higher priority; graduate student mentoring and advising are given lower priority. Assistant Professors are expected to have a service record primarily to the department; other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications are also considered favorably, though not required.

Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts (whether successful or not) are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences are also given high priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course

syllabi are given high priority, as are graduate student mentoring and advising. Associate Professors are expected to have a service record at the level of the department and the University, other service contributions to national or international academic organizations, and to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications.

Faculty at the rank of Professor are reviewed based on their contributions in scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service. For research, the publication record and grant-raising efforts are given the highest priority, including publication in appropriate and highly ranked journals and competitive external and internal funding sources; other indicators such as citation metrics and participation in national and international conferences, including invited lectures and keynote addresses, are also given high priority. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, as are graduate student mentoring and advising; inclusion of graduate students in academic products (e.g. co-authorship) is considered especially favorably. Professors are expected to have a service record at the level of the department and the University, service contributions including leadership roles in national or international academic organizations, and service contributions to the discipline including review of manuscripts and grant applications, editorial roles in peer-reviewed journals or academic presses, and review of external promotion cases.

Faculty at the rank of Instructional Assistant Professor are reviewed based on their contributions in teaching and service. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation. Instructional Assistant Professors are expected to have a service record primarily to the department; other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline are considered favorably, though not required.

Faculty at the rank of Instructional Associate Professor are reviewed based on their contributions in teaching and service. For teaching, student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses, as are the development of opportunities to engage undergraduate students in high-impact experiences, participation (and leadership) of campus activities that focus on pedagogical methods, and efforts to obtain competitive grants for teaching. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation. Instructional Associate Professors are expected to have a service record to the department as well as other service contributions to the University, national or international academic organizations, or to the discipline.

Faculty at the rank of Lecturer are reviewed based on the contributions in teaching. Student evaluations, in-class peer-reviews, and review of course syllabi are given high priority, including development or revision of new courses. Any teaching awards received will factor strongly in the final evaluation.

6.4 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. The review window for the Department of Anthropology is three years.

6.5 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.

6.5.1 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 or teaching.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and participation in high impact learning activities.
- **Meritorious** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.

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.

6.5.1.1 Scoring rubric for *Teaching*

M	10	Meritorious (highest) – strong in ALL areas considered, including very high evaluations, multiple indicators of impact in teaching, mentoring, advising; received prestigious teaching award
M	9	Meritorious (high) – strong in MOST areas considered, including very high evaluations, multiple indicators of impact in teaching, mentoring, advising; received teaching award
M	8	Meritorious (medium) – high evaluations, strong participation in high impact activities, significant grad student outcomes, important new contributions to the curriculum
M	7	Meritorious (low) – high evaluations, participation in high impact activities, positive grad student outcomes, important new contributions to the curriculum
S	6	Satisfactory (high) – good evaluations, offers some high impact activities to undergraduates, some positive grad student outcomes
S	5	Satisfactory (low) – overall teaching record is satisfactory (one or more areas might be lower than others), including good teaching evaluations
S	4	Minimally satisfactory – overall teaching record has areas that could stand to be improved; evaluations are mediocre, and no other significant contributions to graduate or undergraduate education
NI	3	Needs Improvement – individual is attending class, but there are one or more problem areas; e.g. evaluations are consistently and significantly low and there is little evidence that the faculty member is making efforts to improve teaching
U	2	Unsatisfactory (low) – individual is attending class, but there are several problem areas; e.g. evaluations are consistently and significantly low, there is no evidence that the faculty member is making efforts to improve teaching, and the individual is not making any contributions to high-impact learning or graduate education.
U	1	Completely unsatisfactory – would mean that person is not performing their job as an instructor

Note: M=meritorious; S=satisfactory; NI=needs improvement; U=unsatisfactory

6.5.2 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.
- **Meritorious** – 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: high quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations.

6.5.2.1 Scoring rubric for *Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*

M	10	Meritorious (highest) – exceptionally strong in 3-year window, exceptionally strong in 1-year window in ALL areas of research; plus multiple signs of strong research impact (invited lectures, external grants, prestigious awards), including top-tier journal publications
M	9	Meritorious (high) – very strong in 3-year window, very strong in 1-year window in most areas of research; plus multiple signs of strong research impact (invited lectures, external grants, awards), including top-tier journal publications

M	8	Meritorious (medium) – overall research record in 3-year window is significantly higher than average faculty, multiple publications (especially as lead/1st author), PLUS other research areas; plus signs of strong research impact (invited lectures, external grants, awards)
M	7	Meritorious (low) – overall research record in 3-year window is noticeably higher than average faculty, multiple publications plus other signs of research productivity & impact (invited lectures, external grants, awards)
S	6	Satisfactory (high) – at least 1 strong publication; satisfactory quality and quantity of publications relative to other faculty in 3-year window, plus other signs of research productivity (conferences, fieldwork, presentations, etc.)
S	5	Satisfactory (low) – at least one publication in the current year, multiple publications in 3-year window (but lower than department average), and other signs of research productivity (conferences, fieldwork, presentations, etc.)
S	4	Minimally satisfactory – some signs of research productivity in 3-year window, but not a strong year (typically no publications in the current year)
NI	3	Needs Improvement – some signs of research activity in 3-year window (e.g. conferences, grants/contracts, fieldwork)
U	2	Unsatisfactory (low) – minimal signs of research productivity in a three-year window
U	1	Completely unsatisfactory – no research productivity at all over a three-year window

Note: M=meritorious; S=satisfactory; NI=needs improvement; U=unsatisfactory

6.5.3 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.
- **Meritorious** – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.

6.5.3.1 Scoring rubric for *Service*

M	10	Meritorious (highest) – strong in ALL areas considered (professional leadership, professional service, department, college & university leadership & service); strong attendance at department, college, and university events; received service award
M	9	Meritorious (high) – strong record of leadership internally and externally; strong record of regular internal and external service; strong attendance at department events
M	8	Meritorious (medium) – very strong internal AND external service; service is meaningful and involves multiple leadership roles
M	7	Meritorious (low) – strong level of either internal or external service, combined with strong level of service at the other level; contributions are meaningful; external service record demonstrates scholarly reputation; service includes some leadership
S	6	Satisfactory (high) – acceptable service at department, college and/or university level relative to rank; service is meaningful; fairly strong external service relative to rank
S	5	Satisfactory (low) – acceptable levels of service at TAMU, but no demonstrated impact of this service; acceptable external service
S	4	Minimally satisfactory – minimal expected service at all university levels; no external service
NI	3	Needs Improvement – some service, but less than expected for rank
U	2	Unsatisfactory (low) – minimal service relative to rank
U	1	Completely unsatisfactory – no service whatsoever

Note: M=meritorious; S=satisfactory; NI=needs improvement; U=unsatisfactory

6.6 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).

6.6.1 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:

- A list of activities, accomplishments, and awards in the area of **teaching**, including but not limited to:
 - courses taught
 - student evaluation scores
 - peer-review of teaching reports
 - graduate student committee membership and roles
 - graduate student accomplishments
 - guidance provided for undergraduate and graduate research
 - high impact learning opportunities offered
 - any professional development related to teaching
- A list of activities, accomplishments, and awards in the area of **research/scholarly activity/creative work**, including but not limited to:
 - books, peer-reviewed journal articles, edited volume chapters, conference proceedings, and popular articles either published or accepted for publication
 - keynote addresses, invited lectures, and conference presentations
 - grants and fellowships that were applied for, distinguishing those that were received and those that were not received
 - research honors and awards received
 - any field work conducted
- A list of activities, accomplishments, and awards in the area of **service**, including but not limited to:
 - department, college, and university committee service roles
 - mentorship provided or received
 - faculty advising for student organizations
 - professional service roles to the discipline
 - external reviewer for promotion and tenure cases, or outside department academic program reviews
 - scholarly editing or reviewing
 - service to the public
 - any training or any teaching, research, and/or service efforts related to climate, diversity, and inclusion

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

6.6.2 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.

6.6.3 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.

6.6.4 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.

6.7 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:

6.7.1 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 6.5). 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 8.4) 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).

6.7.2 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.

6.8 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.”

6.9 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)

See College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation for specific details on the mid-term review process in the College.

7.3 Feedback from Mid-Term 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

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 Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee is comprised of all voting members of the Department’s Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one representative from each of the four Programs in the Department as voting members, as well as the directors of the Center for the Study of the First Americans and the Director of the Center for Maritime Archaeology and Conservation as non-voting members. If a voting member of the Executive

Committee is at the Associate Professor rank, that individual will be replaced by a Full Professor from the same program as appointed by the Department Head.

8.3 Process

8.3.1 Materials to be Reviewed by Peer Review Committee

- Annual Faculty Performance Report, which itself is based on a 3-year window (see Section 6.4)
- Curriculum Vitae

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.¹ If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.

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.

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) 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

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

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 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.

8.4.2 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 8.5.

8.4.5.3 Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, Department Head, and Dean. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see section 8.5) 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

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

Contact Office

Department of Anthropology, Office of the Department Head, e-mail deruiter@tamu.edu

Approved by Anthropology Department Faculty on October 5, 2020