

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

Department of Sociology

REQUIRED

- Faculty and administrators of each Unit are required to jointly develop written faculty evaluation guidelines (annual evaluation, promotion and tenure, promotion, post-tenure review) describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit consistent with University criteria and procedures.
--For detailed requirements for these written guidelines, refer to [University Rule 12.01.99.M2.](#)
- Units should include in their guidelines, the initial and periodic review and approval dates by:
 - Faculty Members and Administrators of the Unit
The guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee.
 - Dean of Faculties

Table of Contents

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

1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University Sociology Department is to achieve excellence in the areas of research, teaching and service. The faculty undertake rigorous research addressing important issues in social science and social policy. The faculty in the department embrace the charge, given to them by the Higher Education Coordinating Board of the State of Texas, to produce future generations of scholars and researchers and help students develop critical thinking, leadership and decision-making skills and enhance academic and employment opportunities for students. The faculty and staff of the Department are dedicated to providing excellence in service to the state, the university and the discipline and promoting diversity in graduate and undergraduate education. 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 **Sociology Department** for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. ([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:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf
12.01.99.M2 - 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.

Most of the information in this document draws from the Sociology Department Guidelines for Faculty Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (approved by the faculty May 8, 2019), the Sociology Department Guidelines for the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty, and the Department's Bylaws (last amended by the faculty Sep 21 2018).

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](#). In Sociology, tenure and tenure track faculty use the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The instructional faculty use the titles Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor. The department also uses the title track Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice. Appointment letters specify how the different components of each faculty member's work will be weighted when they are evaluated. Unless the appointment letter specifies otherwise, the standard weighting of categories of performance for tenured faculty is 50% research, 30% teaching, 20% service. For tenured faculty in advising and coordinating positions, the standard weight is 40% research, 30% teaching, 30% service. For untenured faculty on the tenure track, it is 60% research, 30% teaching, 10% service. For instructional faculty and professors of practice, the standard weighting is 80% teaching, 20% service and enhancing instructional effectiveness. For lecturers, it is 95% teaching, 5% service and enhancing instructional effectiveness. Other job titles follow the weighting in their appointment letters.

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

3.1 Teaching

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

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning. A record of high quality in teaching is established by the underlying quality of research that goes into course preparations and the ability to transmit the substance of course materials to students. Excellent teachers effectively present current knowledge of the discipline in the areas of instruction and contribute to the range and depth of the department's curriculum.

3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work:

Research is central to our position as a research department with a world-class PhD training program. All faculty are expected to contribute to the research mission of the department and the university, continuously strive to improve the status of the department and the university in the discipline, and promote research innovation on campus. Evaluation of research requires multiple sources of information and valuing many different methods of communicating research findings. The criteria for effectiveness in research are an established record and program of research and scholarly productivity consistent with the mission of a major research university and accepted within the discipline; the promise of continued growth as a researcher; a national or international reputation as an influential scholar in the field; a contributor to the body of knowledge of the discipline; someone capable of taking a leading role initiating and completing research projects.

3.3 Service. Service is essential to the functioning of the department, college, university, and profession. All faculty are expected to contribute to the service work that is essential to those functions. The criteria for effectiveness in service is

the ability and willingness to contribute to the governance or the conduct of the department, college and university; demonstrable contributions to the the profession, as is appropriate to rank, to student life, and to communities outside of the university.

3.3 Patient care, if applicable: *N/A*.

3.4 Librarianship, if applicable: *N/A*.

3.5 Administration, if applicable: *N/A, except for alternate work assignments as described above.*

3.6 Other, if applicable: *N/A*.

4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The Unit recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. However, it is possible to describe accomplishments that are most likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. In the sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each performance area, based on discussions with your faculty (examples provided in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

- 4.1 Indicators of ***Excellence in Teaching*** include, but are not limited to: receiving major teaching awards at the university or national level ; exceptionally high student and peer evaluations of teaching while teaching a range of courses; exceptional graduate mentoring such as chairing or serving on multiple committees that result in strong placement outcomes; investing an unusually large amount of time mentoring a large number of students above and beyond the performance of regular course duties; documentation of impactful pedagogical presentations or innovations; investment of an unusually large amount of time in teaching development with master teacher training opportunities and implementing innovations from that training.
- 4.2 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Teaching*** includes, but are not limited to: positive student and/or peer evaluations and well documented syllabi while teaching the expected range of courses; graduate mentoring such as chairing one or more committees or serving on several committees; investing an average amount of time mentoring students above and beyond regular course duties; and minor teaching awards at the department or student organization level.
- 4.3 Indicators of ***Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity*** include, but are not limited to: publishing a book with an academic press and/or with excellent reviews; having a well-received peer-reviewed article appear in one of the very top journals along with other peer-reviewed work; receiving a major regional, national or international research award; having a major federal or prestigious private institution grant funded.
- 4.4 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work*** include, but are not limited to: publishing peer-reviewed articles outside the top journals; having a book published with a nonacademic press without strong evidence of positive reviews or significant impact on the field; having chapters appear in edited volumes; submitting a high quality grant proposal to a competitive outlet with an indication of positive reviews.
- 4.5 Indicators of ***Excellence in Service*** include, but are not limited to: receiving a major regional, national or international service award; consistently going above and beyond expectations while serving in one of the major service roles in the department, college or university; performing exceptionally time-consuming community, regional, national or international service for a professional organization; organizing a major research conference.
- 4.6 Indicators of ***Effectiveness in Service*** include, but are not limited to: serving competently on department committees as well as performing some impactful community, college, university or professional service.

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, 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:** Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor must have met the following four requirements:
- a. First, they must have earned their PhD in sociology or a related field by the first effective day of their initial appointment to the faculty. If this condition is not met, their appointment becomes a one-year terminal appointment. In such cases, the department head will notify the faculty member of this fact in writing, within two weeks after the first effective day of the initial appointment.
 - b. Second, they must possess substantial promise for scholarly achievement in one or more areas within the discipline, as evidenced by prior research or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference, which address this point.
 - c. Third, they must demonstrate substantial promise for high quality in teaching, as evidenced by prior teaching experiences or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference, which address this point.
 - d. And, fourth, they must display a willingness to serve the university and the profession.
- 5.1.2 **Associate Professor:** Faculty members being considered for the award of tenure and promotion to associate professor are judged on the quality and impact of their accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service to the university and the profession. Accomplishments of high quality are required. The criteria outlined below indicate commonly accepted indicators of quality in each area.
- 5.1.2.1 **Scholarship.** Candidates for tenure and promotion must have established a program of research consistent with the mission of a major research university and accepted within the discipline as evidenced by publication. Because styles of research vary widely within the discipline, assessments of the quality of scholarship must rest on multiple indicators. These indicators must offer clear evidence that:
- a. The candidate's research program contributes to the body of knowledge of the discipline. This may be shown for instance by publication of a substantial number of one's research articles in journals clearly established as the leading general journals in the field (these include the *American Journal of Sociology*, the *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces* and other highly ranked journals) or in other leading journals in the candidate's sub-field. Publications in other journals will be judged by the quality of the outlets as measured by their visibility within the substantive area, their acceptance rates, or other relevant indices. In the case of books and book chapters, similar evidence of the quality of the publication outlet will be considered, along with book reviews (if available). Candidates are strongly encouraged to consult with the department head and the tenure advisory committee appointed by the department head to develop a list of suitable publication outlets.
 - b. The candidate's research program makes various contributions to the body of knowledge of the discipline as shown, typically, by the number of publications to which it leads. If the candidate's publication program is focused on articles, the number of publications during the probationary period should average between one or two a year, suggesting a minimum of six to twelve publications (or articles accepted for publication) before the award of tenure. With fewer publications, expectations rise that they are sole-authored works published in highly visible outlets. If the candidate's publication program is focused on books, the number of publications expected is less, but candidates should not count on gaining tenure based on the publication of one book only.
 - c. The candidate is capable of taking a leading role initiating and completing research projects as shown by publications that (1) go beyond research conducted for the dissertation and (2) are sole- or lead-authored

publications. Collaboration in research is often desirable and necessarily results in co-authored publications. Yet candidates for tenure and promotion should know that expectations about the overall number of publications required during the probationary period will increase with the proportion of co-authored to total publications, and they should take care to document their contribution to co-authored publications. Candidates are encouraged to solicit their co-authors' statements about relative contributions to publications.

- d. The candidate's research program promises to build the candidate's reputation and impact as an influential scholar in the field. The primary evidence of the candidate's reputation rests on an explicit evaluation of the quality of candidate's work by external reviewers. Other evidence may include award of external peer-reviewed research grants or major research fellowships, award of prizes or other honors for published work, citation of publications, appointment to the editorial board of major journals, or other similar indices.
- e. The candidate's contributions were made during the probationary period. Works published prior to the onset of the candidate's probationary period are ordinarily not considered in the tenure and promotion process, with one exception. Candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor sometimes transfer several years of probationary service from another institution. In such cases, all work published during the transferable portion of the probationary period will be evaluated as if it had been done at Texas A&M University. In addition to that work, the candidate, nevertheless, must have a record of successful scholarly publication during the probationary period in residence at Texas A&M University.

5.1.2.2 **Teaching.** Tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor requires positive evidence of high quality and effectiveness in teaching. The indicators of quality and effectiveness in teaching are various and not every indicator is appropriate to use in the evaluation of every case. Among the indicators considered the following are commonly used to provide clear evidence that:

- a. The candidate's teaching effectively presents current knowledge of the discipline in the areas of instruction. This is judged by (1) evaluation of course syllabi, required and supplemental reading lists, the rigor of examinations, term papers and other course projects, and other course materials; (2) peer-reviewed evaluations of classroom performance); and (3) student evaluations of courses.
- b. The candidate's teaching contributes to the range and depth of the department's curriculum as shown by the development of new courses or major revisions of existing courses, documented use of innovative teaching methods, the variety of course offerings at the graduate and undergraduate level, and other major contributions to the development of new instructional programs.
- c. The candidate's contribution to graduate training through the supervision of graduate student research at the master's and PhD levels as the chair or as a member of graduate student committees in this and other departments.
- d. The candidate's special contributions to the quality of teaching in the department and the discipline as shown by publication of text books or other widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials, publication of articles on teaching in professional journals, award of external, peer-reviewed grants for teaching, award of prizes or other honors recognizing teaching performance, or other relevant evidence.

5.1.2.3 **Service.** Departmental policy is to minimize the service requirements for untenured assistant professors. Nevertheless, effective service is a necessary but not sufficient component in the promotion of

candidates from assistant to associate professor with tenure. While opportunities for service vary widely, effective service makes a major contribution to the department's reputation and the quality of life for faculty, staff and students alike. It is expected that, when called on, faculty members will serve in a timely and collegial manner, within the university and the profession. Clear evidence of acceptable service is provided when:

- a. The candidate has contributed to the governance of the department, college and university by service as member or chair on standing or ad hoc committees, by holding elective offices on faculty committees and representative assemblies, by assuming responsibility for directing or developing new departmental programs, or by helping to direct or develop interdisciplinary programs.
- b. The candidate has contributed to the governance or conduct of the profession as shown by service as an elected officer of a professional association, as the chair or member of committees or task forces organized by a professional association, or as a chair or organizer of a professional conference.
- c. The candidate has contributed to the quality of student life as shown by acting as an advisor to student organizations, documented service as a student mentor, or other appropriate participation to promote student activities.
- d. The candidate has contributed to the quality of public life as shown by rendering professional service to government agencies, being invited to address public groups or giving interviews to the media on matters related to one's professional expertise, or receiving public awards in honor of one's professional service.

5.1.3 Professor: Promotion to the rank of full professor recognizes a career of distinguished achievement in the discipline. It is the highest honor that a department can bestow upon its faculty. Therefore, promotion to full professor must be recommended only when there is great certainty that it is warranted. Candidates for appointment to the rank of full professor must have met all the requirements for appointment at the lower ranks. In addition, they must meet the following three requirements for initial appointment to the rank of full professor:

- a. First, they must have achieved a national or international reputation, readily evidenced, for example, by publications, citations, professional honors or awards, and evaluations by other nationally visible scholars.
- b. Second, they must have demonstrated high quality in teaching since their appointment to the rank of associate professor.
- c. And, third, they must have displayed the ability and willingness to serve in the governance of the department, college, and university, in the governance and conduct of the profession, or in other ways to use one's professional expertise to benefit student and public life.

5.1.3.1 Scholarship. Candidates for promotion to full professor must have achieved a distinguished record of high quality publication. The hallmarks of such a record are (a) the influence of one's work on others within the discipline and (b) the receipt of professional honors and awards.

- a. There are two standard measures of the influence of scholarly work on others. One is the citation by others of the candidate's publications. The degree to which citations are adequately measured by standard indices will vary by the style and format of publication appropriate to one's research specialty. Care must be taken to allow for this variation. The other is an explicit evaluation of the influence of the candidate's work by external referees.

b. Professional honors and awards are diverse in their form and nature. There are, nevertheless, some standard honors and awards that generally reflect one's standing in the discipline. Among these are (1) appointments as editor of scholarly journals, (2) positions on the editorial boards of scholarly journals and presses, (3) membership in grant review panels or professional advisory groups, (4) invitational lectures to professional groups, and (d) prizes or awards for scholarly achievement from professional groups.

5.1.3.2 **Teaching.** Candidates must have maintained an established pattern of high quality in teaching as evidenced by meeting the criteria for initial appointment to the rank of full professor.

5.1.3.3 **Service.** Candidates must have been active in promoting the intellectual development, growth, and visibility of the department as evidenced by meeting the criteria for initial appointment to the rank of full professor.

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. Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice are evaluated by the same criteria as Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor.

5.2.1 Instructional Assistant Professor: Candidates for the rank of Instructional Assistant professor must:

- a. First, they must have earned their PhD in sociology or a related field by the first effective day of their initial appointment to the faculty. If this condition is not met, their appointment becomes a one-year terminal appointment. In such cases, the department head will notify the faculty member of this fact in writing, within two weeks after the first effective day of the initial appointment.
- b. Second, they must demonstrate substantial promise for high quality in teaching, as evidenced by prior teaching experiences or by strongly supportive and detailed letters of reference, which address this point.
- c. And third, they must display a willingness to serve the university and the profession.

5.2.2 Instructional Associate Professor: Candidates for promotion to the rank of Instructional Associate professor must meet the criteria for the lower rank, and in addition, must:

- a. Normally, serve five years in rank.
- b. Second, demonstrate meritorious teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following: Strong teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced 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 revision of existing courses; Effectively coordinating a multi-section course; Demonstrated success in departmental undergraduate advising activities (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate); Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness; Receiving competitive 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, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.); Selection for outstanding teacher awards; or Teaching related publications.
- c. Third, demonstrate meritorious service to the department as indicated by some combination of the following: Serving actively on university, college, or department

committees and task forces; Serving as an advisor to student organizations; Serving in administrative roles within the department; Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate; Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

5.2.2 Instructional Professor: Candidates for promotion to the rank of Instructional professor must meet the criteria for the lower rank, and in addition, must:

- a. Normally, serve five years in rank.
- b. Second, demonstrate excellence in teaching as indicated by a combination of some of the following: Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes; Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence; Publication of instructional materials; Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum; Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects; Receipt of awards for success in academic performance by the faculty member's students; Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the University Honors program); Outstanding performance in departmental undergraduate advising activities (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate); Frequent offerings of high impact experiences for students (e.g., study abroad, critical thinking seminars, directing senior honors theses, etc.); Selection for teaching awards.
- c. Third, demonstrate excellence in service to the department, university or profession as indicated by some combination of the following: Chairing a university, college, or department committee or task force; Sustained service as an advisor to student organizations; Serving in key administrative roles within the department; Serving as an officer in the Faculty Senate; Sustained and significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness; Serving as chair or other major leadership position on teaching related sessions or panels at regional, national or international meetings or conferences.

Section 5.3 Process for Promotion and Tenure:

5.3.1. Departmental process for Promotion and Tenure:

5.3.1.1. Tenure and Promotion Committee. Responsibility for evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion to associate and full professor and for promotion on the Academic Professional Track rests with the tenure and promotion committee. The committee is composed of all tenured faculty in the department, except that associate professors are eligible to deliberate and vote only on the candidacies of assistant professors. If academic professional track faculty are being considered for promotion, the tenure and promotion committee consists of all tenured faculty and all academic professional faculty whose rank is higher than that of the faculty member under consideration for promotion. The committee is called into active service on four occasions: (1) to conduct a third-year review of progress toward tenure and promotion by untenured assistant professors, (2) to conduct a sixth-year review of untenured assistant professors going up for tenure and promotion (or a similar review for those who may be going up for an early tenure decision), (3) to conduct a formal review of those being considered for promotion to full professor, and (4) to conduct a formal review of those being considered for promotion within the academic professional track. When the committee is active: (a) The department head appoints the chair of the committee from among the ranks of the full professors. (b) The department head also solicits external reviewers of the candidate's scholarship in accordance with the *College Guidelines*. Nominations for external reviewers are made and approved by the tenure and promotion committee. The candidate submits a list of qualified persons to be considered as reviewers and may also submit a second list of "do not contact" persons. From the two lists, a group of at least seven are selected and

contacted by the department head. At least three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the department/college suggested list. The department requires at least five (5) letters from external reviewers.

- 5.3.1.2. Subcommittee Responsibilities. The department head and committee chair appoint three subcommittees of at least three members, with one designated to serve as the subcommittee chair. Each subcommittee is assigned to review either the scholarship, teaching, or service of the faculty members being considered for retention, tenure, and promotion in accordance with the criteria specified in the *Department Guidelines*. In the case of those in ranks with “Instructional” or “Practice” in the titles, there are only two subcommittees: teaching and service. (a) All members are expected to evaluate each candidate’s dossier. Once the individual evaluations are complete, the subcommittee will meet to discuss each candidate’s dossier. (b) On the basis of their discussions, each subcommittee prepares a report for each candidate of the candidates’ strengths and weaknesses in the area it examined. The subcommittee report is forwarded to the chair of the tenure and promotion committee. (c) The promotion committee chair uploads the reports into interfolio so that they are available to all members of the tenure and promotion committee eligible to vote on each candidate.
- 5.3.1.3. Full Committee Review. No less than ten working days after the distribution of the collated report, the tenure and promotion committee chair convenes a meeting of the eligible members of the tenure and promotion committee to consider each candidate in turn. Before the meeting, it is expected that each eligible member of the tenure and promotion committee will have read the functional sub-committee reports and personally reviewed each candidate’s entire dossier in interfolio. (a) At that meeting, the eligible members of the tenure and promotion committee shall discuss and vote, by secret ballot, on recommending each candidate for retention, tenure or promotion. (b) The committee chair takes notes of the discussion, duly recording the sense of the meeting. From those notes, the chair writes an overall report on each candidate. (c) The chair uploads the overall report to the dossier in interfolio for informational purposes to all tenure and promotion committee members eligible to vote on the candidates. The chair also uploads into the dossier in interfolio the complete report, consisting of the overall report and the three functional sub-committee reports.
- 5.3.1.4. Initiation of the Committee Review Process. Reviews by the tenure and promotion committee will occur automatically for untenured assistant professors at the beginning of their third and sixth years of service. Any assistant, associate Professor, or instructional assistant or associate professor, or Assistant or Associate Professor of Practice may request prior to May 1st that the tenure and promotion committee consider, in the next academic year, his or her case for promotion or tenure. That request must be made in writing to the department head.
- 5.3.2. The expected contents for the promotion and tenure dossiers do not differ from College guidelines.

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. The faculty of the Department of Sociology are working to achieve the highest standards of the discipline. We wish to encourage appropriate faculty investment in long-range scholarship. Furthermore, we are aware of the year-to-year fluctuations in the size of the available salary pool. Thus the annual evaluation will give consideration to the quality of the overall record while placing primary focus on the efforts of the preceding year.

6.1 Departmental Process

- 6.1.1 The Faculty Evaluation will be initiated by the Department Head on an annual basis, at the end of the fall semester.
- 6.1.2 Each faculty member must complete the annual faculty evaluation form at the end of the Fall semester each year. Any faculty member who does not submit an evaluation form after two requests cannot be evaluated and subsequently cannot be considered for a raise and is in violation of university rule. The evaluation procedure will be done at the middle of the Spring semester so that individual faculty receive their evaluations by the end of the Spring semester.
- 6.1.3 Each faculty member will complete the faculty evaluation form and supply copies of any book or article manuscripts which are in press, but not yet published. Student evaluations and number of courses taught are kept by the department as they become available. In addition, other evidence of teaching may be submitted: syllabi, texts, chair and membership on Masters and Ph.D. committees, the teaching of 485s and 685s, and work with master teachers who have observed a faculty member's classes to review teaching.
- 6.1.4 Each faculty member will be evaluated by the Annual Review Committee. The annual review committee should consist of 4 elected members selected from the tenure-track faculty who are not currently serving on the executive council and have a 50% or greater appointment in Sociology. All of the department's tenure-track, and Academic Professional Track faculty are eligible to vote. Voting for committee members shall be conducted by secret ballot within the first month of the spring semester. a) In the nomination stage, each voting member of the faculty can nominate one person for each open position. Candidates receiving 3 or more nominations will be included in the ballot for the second stage election, provided they are willing to serve if elected. There are no limits on the number of candidates on the second stage ballot. b) In the second stage, the two people receiving the largest number of votes are considered elected to the annual review committee. c) In cases of ties in the second stage, a runoff election shall be held. Results are made available to the department's faculty. Terms are two year, staggered terms so that two positions are decided each year. Elected members cannot serve two consecutive terms. The department head is a fifth, ex officio, voting member.
- 6.1.5 Recommendations for Salary increases will be determined by weighting the faculty member's scale score in each of these areas by the percentage the area contributes to the entire workload of the faculty member. These percentages are not to be considered absolute. They are approximate guidelines. (
- 6.1.6 Medical/family Leave: If a person is on medical/family leave, merit scores for teaching and service should be calculated based upon the preceding 2 years the faculty member was in

residence. Merit scores for research should be based upon the person's choice of either the present year's accomplishments or the mean of the preceding 2 years.

- 6.1.7 Research or other Leave: If a person is on research or other leave, merit scores for teaching and service should be calculated based upon the preceding 2 years the faculty member was in residence. Merit scores for research should be based upon the person's research accomplishments for the present year.

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.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.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

6.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective and/or excellent performance, and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.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 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. In the Sociology department, the evaluation period is for one calendar year (January through December) and is not a cumulative record of a faculty member's performance. One exception is the rolling credit given for original book manuscripts. In order to ensure the historical compensation that such works merit, credit will be given in the year the book is in press *and* in the following year. Individuals will receive credit for externally funded research held in the year of the evaluation. Special recognition will be given in the first year of an externally funded project. Awards for distinguished scholarship will be given credit in the year they are received.

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 the following categories: "Unsatisfactory/Inactive," "Needs Improvement," "Satisfactory," "Average," and "Above Average (most meritorious)." As advised, Sociology uses more than three categories. Overall performance will also be described using these terms.

- 6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Teaching** are:

- Unsatisfactory/Inactive (scores of 0-0.9)– the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- Needs Improvement (scores of 1.0-1.9)– minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- Satisfactory (scores of 2.0-4.9) – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- Average (scores of 5.0-7.9) – 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.
- Above Average/Most Meritorious (scores of 8.0-10) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

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

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

- Unsatisfactory/Inactive (scores of 0-0.9)– the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- Needs Improvement (scores of 1.0-1.9)– 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 (scores of 2.0-4.9) – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- Average (scores of 5.0-7.9) – 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.**
- Above Average/Most Meritorious (scores of 8.0-10) – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

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

- Unsatisfactory/Inactive (scores of 0-0.9) – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.

- Needs Improvement (scores of 1.0-1.9)– 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 (scores of 2.0-4.9) – 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.
- Average (scores of 5.0-7.9) – 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.
- Above Average/Most Meritorious (scores of 8.0-10) – 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.

Each year, faculty submit a report of previous activities including the following:

- **A report of all scholarly activity for the last year, with attached scholarly work (such as articles or books in press)**
- **A report of all teaching activity for the last year, with attached evidence of teaching effectiveness (such as syllabi)**
- **A report of all service activity for the last year**
- The report is focused on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but allows a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred.
- The report incorporates teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.
- Faculty members can state their short-term and long-term goals and/or objectives.

For examples see Section 2.4.3.3. of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion)

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

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

and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

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

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

6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.

The department head, director, or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

6.5.4 Performance Assessment.

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual’s appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the Department, College, and University.

6.6 Assessment outcomes that require action

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

6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance

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

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

6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance

If a tenured faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with their department head, director, or supervisor immediately to develop a plan for near term

improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”. The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” when pre-determined milestones are met.

6.7 Time-Line

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year.”

6.8 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines:

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the department published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The dean of the college will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the dean of the college may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.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

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

- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review.
- If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

7.2 Process

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

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

7.3 Feedback from midterm review

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

The Department of Sociology will conduct the midterm review following the procedure described in the College of Liberal Arts Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation.

8. Post-Tenure Review¹

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

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

8.1 Purpose

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

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

8.2 Peer Review Committee

The Annual Review Committee, described above, functions as the Sociology Department's Peer Review Committee. If a full professor is a candidate for post-tenure review, all the members who are not qualified will be replaced with full professors chosen in the same manner.

8.3 Process

- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
- Faculty evaluation form [for the period under review; 6 years, or less, if the PPR has been requested before 6 years].
 - Copies of book or article manuscripts, including those which are in press, but not yet published
 - Student evaluations (kept by the department as they become available) [for period under review]
 - Other evidence of teaching excellence may be submitted: syllabi, texts, chair and membership on Masters and Ph.D. committees, the teaching of 485s and 685s, and work with master teachers who have observed a faculty member's classes to review teaching
 - Other examples of work that the faculty member wants reviewed
- 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.² If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head,

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

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 7.) or an "Unsatisfactory" Peer Review (see Section 8.2.) 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 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

8.4.2a If a professional development review is required, the review will be conducted following the procedures outlined by the College and University. An exemption from this review is allowed if the department head and dean agree that there are substantive mitigating circumstances. If there are not, the review is conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean in consultation with the department head and the faculty member.

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.

Faculty separating from the Sociology Department who wish to be considered for emeritus status submit their materials to the department. Faculty whose appointment are the same rank as the separating faculty member or higher are eligible to vote.

Contact Office

Sociology Department Office, e-mail sociology@tamu.edu

Approved by the Department of Sociology, _____

Approved by the College of Liberal Arts _____

Approved by the Dean of Faculties, 8/30/2021