

ALEC Faculty Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, December 6, 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

129 AGLS

Information and Questions

- Lecturer position
Dr. Tammie Preston-Cunningham was introduced. She will fill the Assistant Lecturer position that was recently advertised. Her office will be 217 AGLS
- Doc at a Distance Seminar
Clarice has emailed the final agenda for the DAAD seminar. Faculty were reminded of receptions, meetings, etc. that they should feel free to attend.

Action Items (discussion, approval, committee reports, etc.)

- Professors and Associate Professors who are not seeking promotion are to notify Dr. Elliot and submit their APR before February 3rd as to whether they want a face to face review. Deadline for entries into AIMS is January 11th. Edits are to be finished by January 16th and report to VC's office is January 18th. **ATTACHMENT A.**
- Handbook is almost updated. Access is faculty@ALEC. Faculty were asked again to visit the site and let us know of additions/corrections, etc.
- Update on Position Requests. Dr. Elliot reported that four positions have been approved. The STEM position can be filled immediately. The Organizational Leadership and Sustainable Agriculture Systems have been approved for searches in late Spring. The fourth position was not in the original document but will be approved for a future search. Media Law is still undergoing review by Dr. Sams.

We need to start work on job descriptions and need to have search committees in place and ready to go.

Dr. Briers asked at what rank the positions would be posted – Dr. Elliot responded that they would go in as posted, either Associate or Assistant. He also said we need to improve our diversity ratio within college. We need to recruit broadly. Dr. Wingenbach said we need to recruit outside of the box.

Dr. Rutherford reminded faculty that with four searches coming up – faculty need to make sure they have search committee training. For the chair, this training is required.

- Temporary Faculty Fee/Compliance/DE Incentive – Dr. Rutherford
Dr. Rutherford explained the three forms. We are currently spending \$150,000/yr for adjunct faculty. See attachment for new numbers. Line at the bottom is not part of compliance – it is all overload. \$80 per student per credit hour is the current SAEF formula. Ad hoc committee formed to review changes – Rutherford, Wingenbach, Odom and McKim.

- Post-Tenure Review – Dr. Briers
Dr. Briers covered the proposed changes. **ATTACHMENT B**
Only tenured faculty. Current process is over ten years old. The new plan uses, at a minimum, three designations, Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Satisfactory. We currently use Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Most Meritorious. Dr. Briers asked faculty to review attachment B. A vote will be taken in the future. A rating of “unsatisfactory” overall occurs if any area is assessed to be unsatisfactory or if two or more categories of performance are assessed to be “needs improvement.” Attachment B will be shared with Dr. Reed and his comments will be shared before the document goes to DOF on January 15.
- Merit and APR Review – Drs. Boyd, Elbert, Harlin and Elliot **ATTACHMENT C**
Committee explained where their review was at this time. They asked for feedback from the attachment. New plan must be defensible.
- ESCOP SSSc – New Agricultural Leadership Discipline **ATTACHMENT D**
Subcommittee has received approval from S&T and ESCOP to add Ag Leadership as a sixth discipline to the five that have been a part of this subcommittee (i.e., ag communications, ag economics, ag education, human sciences, and rural sociology) representing four regions, 1890 ARD and one at-large member. Ag Leadership. Departmental resources will support. Our recommendations are due by December 9th. Jen Strong and Tracy Rutherford were nominated.
- Future Faculty Meetings – Debbie King
Debbie will set our next meeting for the first part of January. Additional meetings will be set as needed.

2016 APR Process

1. Before the end of fall semester, I am asking all faculty to schedule a 5 minute appointment with Tanya to verify your grant and funding balances.
2. In addition, please log into the Merit Self Report site during this fall to ensure that you have access to your data. On our ALEC web page, select ALEC Intranet under the ABOUT tab then log into AIMS.
3. Due to our administration moving their review of our department to January (they started this in 2013), your input into our data base must be completed by January 11 and any edits must be made by January 16.
4. Elke, Clarice, and Tanya are getting up-to-date with their input (although there will be additional information that they enter between now and January 11).
5. Tyler added a feature where you will enter the exact research citation and the system will input the quantitative values. This will allow the department head to acquire the latest entries for inclusion in the ALEC Update. Faculty will be able to enter citations (and other entries) throughout the year as AIMS will be the repository for all scholarship data.
6. As has been our operational procedures the past three years, merit decisions (if there is merit this year) will be made once the edits are done on January 16.
7. Therefore, please ensure that your entries are reflective of your 2016 efforts.
8. Faculty APR meetings will be scheduled starting February 6, 2017:

By University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (see below), the Department Head must provide all faculty the opportunity for an annual performance review (APR). This year, all faculty will meet with the Department Head. However, Professors and Associate Professors who aren't seeking promotion may opt out of the face-to-face meeting, if their APR documents are submitted to the Department Head by February 3, 2017.

UNIVERSITY RULE: 12.01.99.M2

University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
Approved June 20, 1997 Revised July 27, 2001 Supplements System Policy 12.01

2.5.5 The exact form of the annual review may differ from college to college, or even from department to department within a college, but must include the following components.

- 2.5.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities. The report should be focused on the immediately previous academic or calendar year, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report must incorporate teaching, research, and service. Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals.
- 2.5.5.2 A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations. The department head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual report document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member indicates receipt by signing a copy of the document. This memorandum, and/or the annual report and any related documents, will be entered into the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual report shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and service.
- 2.5.5.3 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member. There will be an annual opportunity for a personal meeting to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year if either party believes it is needed. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.
- 2.5.5.4 Performance Assessment. In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the weights given to teaching, research, and service shall be consistent with the expectations as determined in 2.5.5.2 and 2.5.5.3 above and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department and University. For example, persons with solely teaching responsibilities who attain excellence in all aspects of teaching should receive comparable merit to persons with multiple responsibilities who attain excellence.

**Policy on Promotion, Tenure, Annual Review, Post Tenure Review, and Appointment
Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications
Texas A&M University**

**Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties on May 6, 2013
Draft Revisions December 20, 2016**

Approved policy December 12, 2013 by Faculty Vote

Revisions December 13, 2012, January 15, 2013, February 15, 2013, December 10, 2013

Approved policy October 29, 2012 by the P&T committee as defined below

(Major revisions August 14, 2012, August 16, 2012, October 29, 2012)

Approved newly written policy May 19, 2008

(Minor revisions September 1, 1998, August 31, 2000, and October 10, 2002)

Original policy adopted August 11, 1986

Introduction

The Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications (ALEC) proactively seeks promotion and/or tenure (P&T) of faculty members who contribute significant productivity to the missions of the Department, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, and Texas A&M University through meritorious teaching, research, service, and extension. To that end, ALEC follows the rules and standard operating procedures of The Texas A&M University System components listed above.

ALEC faculty members seeking advancement should follow the guidelines associated with their appointment and affiliated with their career track. ALEC faculty members are categorized in three areas identified within this document as:

1. Tenure-track faculty (pp 2-7);
2. Non-tenure-track, non-AgriLife Extension, faculty (pp 8-9); and
3. Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty (pp 10-16).

ALEC faculty members administratively located in the department with the rank of distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, distinguished lecturer, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant lecturer shall participate in discussion, evaluation, and voting during specific P&T considerations as described in the following sections, for their respective appointment categories. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall not participate in discussion, evaluation, or voting.

P&T Leadership:

ALEC faculty members as described above elect a Chair and Vice-chair to lead the P&T Committee. The Chair and Vice-chair must be ALEC professors and at least one [Chair or Vice-chair] must be tenured. The P&T Committee Chair and Vice-chair serve three-year terms. Terms begin on September 1 following their election. In the event that the Chair or Vice-chair leaves the position for any reason, the faculty will elect a new person to complete the term. The department head cannot be a member of any ALEC P&T review committees and should not (unless invited by the committee) participate during P&T deliberations.

The following sections describe the policies and guidelines to be used to review, rate, and make recommendations for the three faculty categories listed above.

**ALEC Tenure-Track Faculty in Texas A&M University
and Texas A&M AgriLife Research**

I. Faculty Membership

ALEC tenured or tenure-track faculty members (as described in the Dean of Faculties "Guideline to Faculty Titles" http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Guideline_Faculty_Titles.pdf) administratively located in the department with the rank of distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, and assistant professor shall participate in discussion, evaluation, and voting during specific tenure or promotion considerations described below. Visiting or adjunct faculty shall not participate in P&T discussion, evaluation, or voting.

II. Review Committee

Departmental faculty members with tenure who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate seeking promotion and tenure are eligible to participate, for discussion purposes, evaluation processes, and voting decisions, on the Review Committee for tenured or tenure-track candidates. For example, tenured professors and tenured associate professors would participate on the Review Committee for tenure-track assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure; non-tenured professors or non-tenured associate professors would not participate.

III. Evaluation

- A. Discussions related to P&T will be conducted in strictest confidence. Faculty members eligible to vote can participate in the committee discussion and evaluation of a candidate's packet. In addition, the process must uphold and observe scrupulous standards of fairness. The committee discussions and recommendations regarding a candidate's materials will be independent of the ALEC department head.
- B. The review committee will consider and/or discuss confidentially a candidate's materials and external letters of evaluation. The committee will prepare summary reports on the candidate's teaching, research, service/outreach, and other activities. Summary reports will follow the guidelines established by the Dean of Faculties office.
- C. Based on faculty comments and documentation provided to the Chair and committee, the P&T Chair may elect to write reports or assign faculty members to do so. These written reports must reflect the views and opinions of the committee and must reflect the candidate's areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- D. Tenure-track faculty members will have a midterm (3rd year) review conducted by tenured faculty members who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate. The review will use all evaluation components, excluding external letters of evaluation.
- E. The P&T packet shall be in a form consistent with the requirements and guidelines of Texas A&M University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

IV. Voting Procedures

Following confidential discussions, a confidential and verifiable vote will be conducted. Eligible faculty may vote AYE, NAY, ABSTAIN, or RECUSE on P&T decisions. Eligible members not participating in the evaluation discussions should not vote. The committee tally and report will be sent by the P&T Chair in a memorandum to the department head. This document will become a part of the candidate's packet.

V. External Letters of Evaluation

The packet must contain at least three letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. External reviewers should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. All letters received must be included in the packet. All requests for letters must be noted in the packet. (See Dean of Faculties "Promotion and Tenure" () for specifics about this process.)

VI. Evaluation Components

Committee members will evaluate a candidate's materials using teaching, research, service, and extension components as appropriate. Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure are encouraged to make supporting documents readily available for committee members' review. Candidates are expected to develop teaching, research, and/or extension programs consistent with their position

descriptions and expectations. Evaluation of candidate materials will be based on such descriptions and expectations.

- A. *For promotion to associate professor*, evidence of excellence in teaching, development of a focused line of inquiry supported by funding and peer reviewed publications, and service to the university and professional societies are expected.
- B. *For promotion to professor*, evidence must be convincing, cumulative, and consistent. Criteria are: sustained excellence in teaching; national and international reputation in a focused line of inquiry that is supported by grant funding and publications in leading journals; excellence in graduate student mentoring; and superior service as evidenced by national and international reputation, leadership in departmental, college, and university committees, and leadership in professional societies.
- C. Research faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on evaluation criteria established in the Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures 12.99.99.A1.03 "Faculty Promotion."
 1. **Teaching Evaluation:** This criterion includes classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students. The teaching evaluation will focus on both evidence of teaching effectiveness and course support/development.
 - a. For faculty seeking *promotion to associate professor*, excellence in teaching, as measured by student ratings of faculty and peer evaluation of teaching, is a minimum expectation.
 - b. For faculty seeking *promotion to professor*, continued excellence in teaching is a minimum expectation.
 - c. Indicators of meritorious teaching performance may include, as appropriate, the following examples.
 - Advising undergraduate students.
 - Chairing master's and doctoral committees.
 - Receiving positive peer evaluations of teaching.
 - Developing a new course or making major revisions to an existing course that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
 - Developing and/or leading a study abroad or other high-impact educational experience.
 - Developing effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student evaluation of teaching, and student outcomes.
 - Developing new courses or significantly revising existing courses.
 - Directing graduate student thesis or dissertation research.
 - Directing graduate student research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
 - Showing evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
 - Developing and implementing pedagogical approaches to promote student motivation and engagement.
 - Being invited to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence.
 - Publishing widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
 - Receiving competitive grant support for teaching/learning projects.
 - Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
 - Being selected for an outstanding teacher award.
 - Indicating teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student rating of teaching, and documented student outcomes.
 2. **Research Evaluation:** This criterion includes both an analytical summary of the candidate's research record and a qualitative judgment. The research evaluation should examine all examples of creative works including publication and granting history. The evaluation of research will focus on quality, quantity, accomplishment, and direction.
 - a. For faculty seeking *promotion to associate professor*, the development of a focused line of inquiry supported by funding and publications is warranted.
 - b. For faculty seeking *promotion to professor*, persistent funding support and leadership in scholarly publications are warranted.
 - c. Indicators of meritorious research performance may include, as appropriate, the following examples:
 - Citation of candidate's publications by others.
 - Leadership on publications and grants.
 - Mentoring students on publications and grants.

- Presentation of papers at international, national, and regional meetings.
 - Publication of research in refereed journals.
 - Publication of scholarly books or chapters.
 - Publication of non-research based, refereed publications.
 - Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals.
 - Receiving fellowships or research awards.
 - Receiving external peer-reviewed funding for research.
 - Receiving funding for scholarly activities.
 - Refereed research publications in leading journals.
 - Serving as editor or member of editorial board of journals.
 - Writing proposals for external grants.
3. Service Evaluation: This criterion includes service to students, colleagues, the department, the college, and the university—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. The service evaluation will focus on leadership and participation in university, state, national, and international activities that strengthen those institutions or serve as a professional development opportunity for faculty.
- a. For those seeking *promotion to associate professor*, participation in departmental, college, and university committees (as requested), leadership in professional societies, and evidence of an emerging national reputation are warranted.
 - b. For those seeking *promotion to professor*, providing leadership to departmental, college, and university committees (as needed) and a strong national and international reputation are warranted.
 - c. Indicators of meritorious service performance may include as appropriate the following examples:
 - Committee chair of national or international professional organization.
 - Committee involvement in national or international professional organization.
 - Officer in national or international professional organization.
 - Officer in regional or state professional organization.
 - Program chair or similar position at national or international meeting.
 - Placement of students in academia and industry.
 - Serving as a member of the faculty senate.
 - Serving as a student club advisor.
 - Serving on university, college, and department committees and task forces.
 - Please refer to the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension section in the document for appropriate indicators of meritorious service performance.

VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components

- A. Spring Semester (specific date to be communicated in writing from the department head and P&T Chair): Candidates wishing to be considered for tenure and/or promotion must notify, in writing, the department head and the P&T Chair of his/her intentions to submit his/her P&T packet.
- B. Spring Semester (specific date to be communicated in writing from department head): Those candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion will present their packets to DH and the P&T Chair for consideration.
- C. Summer Semester: External letters, if required, will be sought.
- D. August: P&T review committees receive candidates completed packets for additional review and voting.
- E. September: Department head receives review committee reports.
- F. Mid-September: Candidate's packet is due in the college dean's or agency director's offices respective of the candidate's position.
- G. Deadlines (department head/P&T Chair notice to faculty members of promotion and/or tenure annual process; candidate notice to department head/P&T Chair of intent to seek promotion and/or tenure; candidate draft packet submission to the P&T Chair for formative review and feedback; department head's notice to candidates of list of outside reviewers; and other similar procedural deadlines) will be communicated in writing to all ALEC faculty members.

VIII. Department Head's Summary Report

The Summary Report gives the department head an opportunity, after reviewing reports and recommendations from the committee, to convey the rationale that ultimately leads to the department head's recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. This report includes a discussion of the review committee's evaluations and recommendations, outside letters, and any further evaluation by the department head. The report shall:

1. Explain the department head's decision; it should not merely summarize the candidate's achievements but

- rather substantiate the department head's decision.
- 2. Explain why the candidate does or does not deserve endorsement by the dean or director.
- 3. Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case.
- 4. Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
- 5. Explain special consideration cases (e.g., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances).
- 6. Explain differing opinions, mixed votes, or other inconsistencies.

IX. Peer Evaluation Committee, Annual Review, and Post Tenure Review

A. Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee:

- 1. ALEC departmental faculty will establish a peer evaluation committee of three professors to advise the department head regarding the annual reviews of each of the following categories of faculty: tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure-track faculty.
- 2. This peer evaluation committee comprises the ALEC P&T committee chair(s) and other professor(s) elected by departmental professor(s).
- 3. The peer evaluation committee will conduct a post tenure review (for tenured faculty) independent of the department head once every six years. The results of this review will be communicated in writing to the department head.
- 4. Each year before the annual review process, the committee will meet with the department head to review, confirm, revise, and communicate to faculty the criteria used in annual evaluation of faculty performance including teaching, research, service, and extension components when appropriate with respect to their position description and expectations.

B. Annual Review:

- 1. An annual review of faculty members in the department of ALEC will be conducted by the department head. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the department head and faculty. The review will typically take place during spring semester and will include, at a minimum, accomplishments from the previous calendar year. The timeline and procedures for this annual review will be communicated in writing to the faculty at least 60 days in advance of the review. Three days prior to the annual review, each faculty member must submit an annual activity report as described in the following sections.
- 2. An annual review provides valuable information to the department head about faculty members' accomplishments and to the faculty members with regard to the department head's assessment of their progress in the discipline and in the context of department goals. Annual reviews are to be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the individual faculty member and the institution.
- 3. The focus of the annual review process will vary by rank and should be conducted in recognition of the different stages of a faculty member's career. For *tenured or tenure-track faculty*, the period of evaluation examined during the annual review will consist of the previous year, and may take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three- to five-year horizon may be necessary to evaluate scholarly progress. For *tenure-track assistant professors*, the annual review process must also provide an indication of their progress toward promotion and tenure. For *tenured associate professors*, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For *professors*, annual review should 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.
- 4. In preparation for the annual review, each faculty member will prepare and submit an annual activity report that shall at a minimum consist of a faculty member's merit report that verifies the AIMS data and granting activities.
- 5. Other examples of activities a faculty member may wish to report include: Statement of goals and objectives; supporting documentation, i.e., copies of published materials, grants, attestations, and artifacts; and a curriculum vitae.
- 6. The primary basis of evaluation for the annual review shall include an analysis of the merit report and granting activities.
- 7. Any additional information used by the department head in the evaluation must be specified in writing by the department head.

8. Items included in the primary basis of evaluation include publication in journals and other outlets, granting activities, weighted student credit hours generated, compliance load, teaching evaluations, awards and recognition, graduate student committee work, club advisorship, and leadership and service to the department, college, university, professional societies and groups, and the public. *Note:* Standard, end-of-semester, student evaluations of teaching must not be the only instrument used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.
 1. Operationally, these items are referred to as the merit matrix.
 2. The merit matrix is used to calculate a faculty merit score that is used primarily for awarding merit raises.
 3. The merit matrix is weighted 70% research, 20% teaching, and 10% service.
 4. As described subsequently, a faculty member's merit score cannot be used as the sole criterion to determine the category of review assigned to a faculty member.
9. In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the department head shall give weights to teaching, research, service, and extension consistent with a faculty member's position description and expectations. For each area of performance (i.e., teaching, research, service, and extension—as appropriate for the faculty member's assignment), the department head shall assess the faculty member as “most meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” or “unsatisfactory.”
10. The department head will prepare a written report stating his/her evaluation of the faculty member. This report will be transmitted to the faculty member who indicates receipt by signing a copy of the report.
 1. In this report, the department head shall categorize each faculty member overall as “most meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory.” A rating of “unsatisfactory” overall occurs if any area is assessed to be unsatisfactory or if two or more categories of performance are assessed to be “needs improvement.”
 2. If the department head reviews a faculty member as “meritorious” or “satisfactory,” the faculty member may request that the appropriate faculty review committee review performance of the faculty and provide written advice to the department head regarding the rating.
11. There will be an annual opportunity for faculty to meet and discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.
12. The department head will prepare a written report stating his/her evaluation of each faculty member during the annual review. This report will be transmitted to the faculty member who indicates receipt by signing a copy of the report. In this report, the department head shall categorize each faculty member as “most meritorious,” “meritorious,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory.”
13. A faculty member would be deemed to be “unsatisfactory” overall if the faculty member receives an “unsatisfactory” rating in teaching, research, or service, or receives at least two “needs improvement” ratings in teaching, research, and service.
14. If the department head reviews a faculty member as "unsatisfactory" overall, the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will review the performance of the faculty member and provide written advice to the department head; this advice will conclude with substantiation of the review as "unsatisfactory" or suggest that the review category be changed to "satisfactory," "meritorious," or "most meritorious."
15. The department head shall then either change the review or append the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee findings to the administrative review.
16. Faculty with complaints about the annual review process should attempt to resolve such issues informally with the department head or the department ombudsperson. If an informal resolution is not possible, then the faculty member may bring their concern to the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee for review and recommendations. If the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee cannot resolve the issue, then the faculty member should follow TAMU System guidelines.
17. To ensure consistency over time, the department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means.

C. Post Tenure Review

1. Prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure and at least once every six years thereafter, the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will review the performance of each tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service (i.e., “Post Tenure Review”).
 - i. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in research if the faculty member maintains status/membership on the graduate faculty through the conduct and communication of research, teaching of graduate courses, and mentoring of graduate students.

- ii. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in teaching if the faculty member is compliant with Faculty Teaching Workload Policy (University Rule 12.03.99.M1) and maintains student evaluations of teaching within two standard deviations of the college mean.
 - iii. A faculty member will be deemed to be at least satisfactory in service if the faculty member is appointed, elected, or carries out service that directly contributes to the mission of the department or college. Such service may include administrative appointments; undergraduate, graduate, or student club advising; appointment/election and service to a department, college, or university.
2. For a faculty member who receives a substantiated review of “needs improvement” in a single category (teaching, research, or service), or who receives a substantiated review of “unsatisfactory” overall, or who receives three consecutive substantiated reviews of “unsatisfactory” overall, University Rule 12.06.99M0.01 will be followed.
 3. The Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will report its Post Tenure Review to the faculty member and the department head.

X. Appointment

- A. Guided by the “Guideline to Faculty Titles,” faculty is defined for the purpose of this policy as any appointment in the department that includes in the position title the word “professor,” “instructor,” or “lecturer” regardless of other rank of appointment qualifiers associated with the title.
- B. When any faculty vacancy occurs or is imminent, or a faculty position becomes available, a search committee should be formed by the department head.
 1. The search committee will develop a position description and advertise the position.
 2. The search committee, with input from departmental faculty, will recommend candidates to interview.
 3. Members of the faculty will have an opportunity to meet with the candidates and, after all candidates have been interviewed, vote on the acceptability of each candidate. Such a vote may also include a ranking of candidates.
 - i. Tenure-track and tenured faculty votes will be kept separate from the non-tenure/non-tenure-track faculty votes.
 - ii. Faculty will be given at least one week to vote.
 - iii. Voting will be by secret ballot.
 - iv. No faculty member may vote more than once. Members of the search committee who are faculty may not vote during this acceptability vote balloting, unless they recuse themselves from voting as a member of the search committee.
 - v. The ballots shall be collected and tabulated by a person chosen by the search committee.
 - vi. The person chosen may not be a member of the search committee.
 - vii. After votes are tabulated, faculty will be informed of the ballot results.
 - viii. Those candidates receiving a positive acceptability vote by the faculty who participated in the balloting are the only candidates who will be considered by the search committee.
 4. The search committee will then rate the remaining candidates as either acceptable or unacceptable to the search committee, and provide a written recommendation to the department head.
 5. This written recommendation may include a ranking of candidates.
 6. The search committee shall take into account the rights of the applicants and the Texas Public Information Act, Chapter 552, Texas Government Code.
- C. The curriculum vitae and all other non-confidential materials the search committee has pertaining to each candidate shall be made available for examination by the faculty. This includes all written reports of the search committee. A departmental request for waiver of a faculty search should be processed only with approval of a majority of the faculty at the rank of the candidate being considered.
- D. A tenure-upon-hire request must be voted on by faculty with tenure at or above the rank of the candidate. This is a separate procedure from that described above and is coordinated by the P&T Chair. For example, a faculty member being hired as an associate professor with tenure would be voted on by all tenured professors and tenured associate professors.
- E. Any faculty appointment, including adjunct and visiting, in the department not covered by the guidelines provided above will be vetted and voted on by faculty at or above the rank being sought. This would include, for example, changes in appointment, open positions, new positions, changes in administrative location, and changes in title.

**ALEC Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Texas A&M University
and Texas A&M AgriLife Research**

I. Faculty Membership

All ALEC faculty members (as described in the Dean of Faculties "Guideline to Faculty Titles" http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/hiring/Guideline_Faculty_Titles.pdf) administratively located in the department with the rank of distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, distinguished lecturer, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant lecturer shall participate in discussion, evaluation, and voting during specific promotion considerations described below. Visiting or Adjunct faculty shall not participate in promotion discussion, evaluation, or voting.

II. Review Committee

Departmental faculty members who hold rank at or higher than the rank sought by the candidate are eligible to participate, for discussion purposes, evaluation processes, and voting decisions, on non-tenured candidates. For example, a non-tenured senior lecturer would serve on the Review Committee for a candidate seeking lecturer or assistant lecturer; a professor whether tenured or not, would serve on the non-tenure track Review Committee for non-tenured candidates seeking promotion to professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior lecturer, lecturer, or assistant lecturer.

III. Evaluation

- A. Discussions related to promotion will be conducted in strictest confidence. Faculty members eligible to vote can participate in the committee discussion and evaluation of a candidate's packet. In addition, the process must uphold and observe scrupulous standards of fairness. The committee discussions and recommendations regarding a candidate's materials will be independent of the ALEC department head.
- B. The Review Committee will consider and/or discuss confidentially a candidate's materials and external letters of evaluation (for assistant and associate professors), when provided. The committee will prepare summary reports on the candidate's teaching, research, service/outreach, and other activities as they relate to their position descriptions and expectations. Summary reports will follow the guidelines established by the Dean of Faculties office.
- C. Based on faculty comments and documentation provided to the Chair and committee, the P&T Chair may elect to write reports or assign faculty members to do so. These written reports must reflect the views and opinions of the committee and must reflect the candidate's areas of strengths and weaknesses.
- D. A midterm (3rd year) review is optional, but strongly encouraged. External letters are not required.
- E. The promotion packet shall be in a form consistent with the requirements and guidelines of Texas A&M University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

IV. Voting Procedures

Following confidential discussions, a confidential and verifiable vote will be conducted. Eligible faculty may vote AYE, NAY, ABSTAIN, or RECUSE on promotion decisions. Eligible members not participating in the evaluation discussion should not vote. When applicable, tenure-track and tenured faculty votes will be kept separate from the non-tenured/non-tenure track faculty votes. The committee tally and report will be sent by the P&T Chair in a memorandum to the department head. This document will become a part of the candidate's packet.

V. External Letters of Evaluation

The packet for assistant and associate professors must contain at least three letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. External reviewers should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. All letters received must be included in the packet. All requests for letters must be noted in the packet. (See Dean of Faculties "P&T Guidelines" (<http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tp-guidelines>) for specifics about this process.)

VI. Evaluation Components

Committee members will evaluate a candidate's materials using teaching, research, and service components as appropriate. Candidates seeking promotion are encouraged to make supporting documents readily available for committee members' review. Candidates are expected to develop

teaching, research, and/or service programs consistent with their position descriptions and expectations. Evaluation of candidate materials will be based subsequently on such descriptions and expectations. Please see the teaching, research, and service indicator examples list in the “tenure track” portion of this document (pp 2-7).

Please refer to the “tenure track” portion of this document for the following sections:

VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components

VIII. Department Head’s Summary Report

IX. Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee, and Annual Review

X. Appointment

**ALEC Non-Tenure Track Faculty in Texas A&M
AgriLife Extension Service**

I. Introduction

- A. Faculty in the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service perform a vital role in the triad of functions—teaching, research, and extension/outreach—which form the basis of the land-grant university system. Extension faculty are responsible for extending the university system to the people of Texas through a variety of research based educational programs.
- B. Faculty are encouraged to work collaboratively in developing linkages with all parts of The Texas A&M University System. Extension faculty develop opportunities for increased collaboration with faculty and scientists in the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and the Texas A&M College of Veterinary Medicine. Increased opportunities for collaboration exist with faculty in the various colleges of Texas A&M University and other institutions both within and outside of the A&M System. Extension faculty also are encouraged to pursue linkages with other key educational and health institutions in the state and nation, as well as develop associations at the international level and with private-sector research and development.
- C. In furthering the mission of Texas A&M AgriLife Extension, Extension faculty perform in the total arena of teaching, research, and extension education and are expected to be innovative and progressive in their programmatic efforts. Applied and adaptive research must often be conducted to obtain specific information that can be used by clientele in technology and knowledge transfer. The unique role of program development through local needs assessment and program implementation through a network of county Extension agents often distinguishes the Extension faculty from the resident instructor and the research scientist. In educating adults and providing youth with leadership development programs, Extension faculty have a direct and often immediate impact on individuals and their quality of life.

II. Titles and Evaluation Criteria

A. Titles

1. Incremental non-tenured ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor will be assigned to each qualified Extension faculty member. The professorial title will include the rank (e.g., Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor) and "Extension Specialist" and may be followed by a subject matter subtitle. Examples include the following:
 - i. Professor and Extension Poultry Specialist
 - ii. Associate Professor and Extension Nutrition Specialist
 - iii. Assistant Professor and Extension Forage Specialist

B. Evaluation Criteria

1. Extension faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on evaluation criteria as established in this policy. Evaluation of an individual's effectiveness will be based on various diverse activities that represent overall contributions in educational programming and translating technology for effective delivery to targeted audiences. A combination of critical professional endeavors forms the basis for an accurate evaluation of Extension faculty members:
 - a. Program Development Activities and Planning
 - i. A variety of peer and clientele inputs should be used to determine the content, quality, priority, and emphasis of the Extension faculty member's programmatic leadership.
 - ii. This should reflect the assimilation and synthesis of information from county and regional program development committees, clientele organizations, and key industry leaders relative to the strategic plans of the department, college, and agency.
 - b. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
 - i. Teaching quality involves command of the subject discipline, progressive assimilation and delivery of new knowledge, and ability to present information through logic and effective communication.
 - ii. Quality and effectiveness should be represented through clientele and peer evaluation. Faculty should utilize state-of-the-art communications technology when appropriate.
 - c. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
 - i. Faculty are expected to participate in disciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary programming efforts as appropriate to adequately address the priority issues of the clientele.

- ii. Financial and material support should be sought through grants and contracts or innovative linkages with other agencies, industry, or organizational groups. The evaluation should assess both grant and contract proposals or solicitations submitted and awarded.
- d. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
 - i. Each Extension faculty member is expected to establish and enhance mutual support among colleagues within and across disciplines at the agency, college and university level.
 - ii. Timely and effective coordination, cooperation, and scheduling of activities with District Extension Administrators, Regional Program Directors, county staff, and other agencies/organizations are required for programs and responsibilities with mutual audiences.
- e. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
 - i. The faculty member should demonstrate evidence of contributions to professional and total Extension programs.
 - ii. The development of creative educational programs and/or materials which are widely accepted and used are examples of professional contributions.
 - iii. Applied or translational research and comprehensive and intensive program evaluations are important components for Extension faculty.
 - iv. Publication of creative and scholarly work is expected.
- f. For purposes of promotion, all of these indicators of performance should be reviewed by departmental or Extension program unit evaluation committees. Specific materials to be included are program objective statements, program evaluations, plans of work, and the faculty achievement reports. Additional supporting materials provided in the faculty achievement report such as public and institutional service, research, teaching, and other non-extension activities shall be included in the overall assessment. A qualitative assessment performed by a peer committee evaluation at the department or program unit level will be conducted.
- g. Educational materials that have been developed for Extension bulletins, fact sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, and computer software programs will also be included in the evaluation. Similarly, written and visual support materials (including PowerPoint presentations, video tapes, and film) used in educational settings such as field days, seminars, workshops, and interactive video productions also should be evaluated. The overall evaluation should not be limited to traditional materials, but should consider the quality and originality of thought and the integration of educational concepts that will lead to increased awareness and appropriate change and/or adoption. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (e.g., interactive video, e-learning systems) and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches in the base program areas of the discipline.
- h. The development and publication of comprehensive handbooks, training manuals, and textbooks may also be considered in evaluating the faculty members' contributions to the entire educational program. In such cases, the committee should assess the quality of the work in addition to determining the value and acceptance of the work in other states and by other universities. Educational grants for the development of new and creative Extension programs may also be considered as instances in which prepared materials extend beyond the limits of the university or state.
- i. Appendix 1 provides categories of criteria which may be considered in promoting Extension faculty in the Professorial rank system. Other evidence of recognition by colleagues, Extension clientele, and other professionals includes the following examples:
 - j. Receipt of awards for outstanding programs or service.
 - k. Peer recognition by other faculty within the discipline, particularly those who have direct evaluative experience, and have attended Extension programs or presentations before professional groups or societies.
 - l. Comprehensive program evaluations that attest to program effectiveness (awareness, adoption, etc.) through pre- and post-survey evaluations and/or other evidence of productive change or mastery by clientele.
- m. Evidence that the faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new programming approaches within and/or across disciplines to include developing interactions with new faculty, scientists, and clientele.
- n. Contributions to professional societies.
- o. Leadership in networking with other faculties, research scientists, societies, and professional groups leading to integrated interdisciplinary programming.

- p. Solicited evaluations by outside faculty within the discipline of national reputation as to assessment of creative professional accomplishments.
- C. Standards of Achievement of Professorial Ranks (as follows on pages 14 - 20)
1. Assistant Professor and Extension Specialist
 - a. Degree Requirements
 - i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
 - b. Duties and Responsibilities
 - i. Program Development Activities and Planning
 - (i) Perceived ability and evidence of competence necessary to:
 1. Determine and understand the type of programmatic approaches needed to meet the variable educational capabilities of different audiences for effective program planning and execution.
 2. Assist County Extension Agents and Program Area Committee members to effectively use the Extension's program development process.
 - ii. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
 - (i) Satisfactory indication of personal and professional traits necessary to:
 1. Train Extension personnel to use appropriate educational methods and techniques for communicating with specific audiences.
 2. Determine and understand the variable needs and interests of audiences for effective program delivery.
 3. Develop effective learning environments for adult and/or youth audiences.
 4. Select suitable methods and techniques for solving problems and achieving objectives within subject matter discipline.
 5. Identify, train, and support volunteer leaders to enhance effective adult and/or youth education programs.
 - iii. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
 - (i) Evidence of a high standard of scholarship and promise of growth and development sufficient to:
 1. Function effectively on program planning committees and in various service capacities at the university, agency, and clientele level.
 2. Utilize appropriate media to effectively disseminate subject matter information.
 3. Prepare effective newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
 4. Maintain effective working relationships with sponsors and donors in securing and maintaining support and resources for Extension educational programs.
 5. Develop proposals for grants or contracts.
 - iv. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
 - (i) Professional and personal attributes necessary to:
 1. Interact positively with diverse populations including teaching, research, and extension faculty and the general public, especially those participating in the faculty member's discipline.
 2. Function effectively with clientele, academic faculty, research scientists, and associates.
 - v. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
 - (i) Evidence indicating a commitment to:
 1. Maintain continued competency in discipline.
 2. Desire to improve knowledge and subject matter competence.
 3. Gain recognition in professional organization as a contributor in the field.
2. Associate Professor and Extension Specialist
 - a. Degree Requirements
 - i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline and at least six years of professional experience (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
 - b. Duties and Responsibilities (in addition to those of the lower rank)
 - i. Program Development Activities and Planning
 - (i) Effectively plan and implement quality educational programs needed to meet the informational expectations of the clientele.

- (ii) Work through Extension's program development process in planning, carrying out, and evaluating Extension educational programs in assigned program area.
 - (iii) Be recognized by peers and county personnel for expertise and ability to develop and plan highly effective programs.
 - ii. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
 - (i) Lead Extension faculty in determining and understanding the clientele's needs and interests including the development of effective educational programs to address relevant issues.
 - (ii) Develop and conduct appropriate learning experiences for adult and/or youth audiences.
 - (iii) Present effective educational information through formal and informal programs including in-depth education for adult and/or youth audiences.
 - iii. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
 - (i) Effectively utilize appropriate communication tools to disseminate subject matter information.
 - (ii) Provide evidence of effective ability to write newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
 - (iii) Demonstrate effective working relationships with sponsors and donors in securing and maintaining support and resources for Extension educational programs.
 - (iv) Demonstrate success in obtaining grants and contracts to support the faculty member's educational program.
 - iv. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
 - (i) Assist in directing and coordinating efforts of teaching, research, and Extension faculty to create an effective and synergistic working relationship.
 - (ii) Cooperate effectively with external organizations important to the Agency and educational programs.
 - v. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
 - (i) Maintain expanded competency in discipline.
 - (ii) Demonstrate knowledge of the current advances and developments within the profession and provide evidence of the ability to apply such knowledge.
 - (iii) Be recognized for service and leadership in professional organizations.
 - (iv) Be recognized by peers for scholarly contributions and professionalism.
- 3. Professor and Extension Specialist
 - a. Degree Requirements
 - i. Terminal degree in appropriate subject matter discipline and at least ten years of professional experience (exceptions may be granted for outstanding service and distinguished achievements)
 - b. Duties and Responsibilities (in addition to those of lower ranks)
 - i. Program Development Activities and Planning
 - (i) Plan comprehensive and effective educational programs and develop procedures and methods that meet program outcome objectives.
 - (ii) Plan, implement, and evaluate programs developed through Extension's program development process; adjust program based on evaluation input.
 - (iii) Develop broad objectives, programs, and plans for strengthening Extension efforts in an assigned program or subject matter area related to the Agency Strategic Plan
 - (iv) Demonstrate ability to be creative in seeking solutions to complex educational problems and issues.
 - c. Teaching Effectiveness and Quality
 - i. Provide comprehensive technical assistance and expert guidance to administrators, Extension faculty members, and county Extension agents.
 - ii. Develop and implement relevant, in-depth programs in subject matter responsibility.
 - iii. Develop educational programs and techniques that are innovative, comprehensive, and appropriate for the audience.
 - d. Quality of Program and Organizational Support
 - i. Exemplary competence in developing and writing newsletters, news articles, technical fact sheets, and educational materials.
 - ii. Demonstrate leadership roles on faculty, agency, and college committees.
 - iii. Identify, secure, and maintain support and resources for educational programs. Successful in attracting grants and contracts.

- iv. Utilize electronic technology to effectively reach clientele.
- e. Cooperative and Coordinative Efforts
 - i. Motivate and contribute significantly to program unit, task forces, faculty committees, etc., and create effective working relationships across departments, agencies, and colleges.
 - ii. Demonstrate cooperation with leadership of key organizations that are relevant to program delivery strategies.
- f. Scholarly Contributions and Professionalism
 - i. Maintain and possess a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the discipline.
 - ii. Have an established regional or national reputation as having contributed significantly to one's field of expertise.
 - iii. Serve in leadership positions in professional organizations.
 - iv. Recognized by colleagues within the discipline for scholarship and professional understanding of subject area.

III. Extension Professorial Career Ladder

A. Professorial Progression

1. Annual reviews of each Extension faculty member by the unit head are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her department head and associate department head or program unit leader. (Appendix 2)
2. Following appointment to the initial professorial rank, an Extension faculty member will annually be eligible for consideration at the next higher rank based on recommendations of the designated unit head. Comments will be solicited from a peer review committee based on the criteria as stated in this policy. The Extension faculty member will be informed of the decisions of the peer review committee and the unit head pertaining to promotion recommendations.

IV. Peer Review Committee

- A. Departments/units are responsible for reviewing all Extension Specialists who hold a disciplinary appointment through an academic department/unit. Department heads will consult the departmental P&T committee (peer review committee) on promotion recommendations for on- and off- campus extension specialist faculty before transmitting the promotion recommendation to the Director of the Agency. This advisory mechanism should be well-structured and effectively communicated within the unit. This committee should be composed of appropriate senior teaching, research, and extension faculty members who can evaluate the quality and breadth of the overall performance of the junior faculty relative to the role of Extension faculty in a land- grant university system. Department/Unit heads will work with their departmental/unit peer review committees to ensure that the following guidelines are followed:
1. Only faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor will be named to serve on a peer review committee, and only faculty members with rank higher than the candidate being considered should serve on peer review committees for promotion. Departmental/unit peer review committees should include on- and off-campus faculty where possible. (Note: The promotion candidate's dossier cover sheet must include the total number of faculty eligible to vote.)
 2. Committee recommendations should be based on a written and widely circulated promotion document which specifies criteria and procedural guidelines, promulgated by the department and agency.
 3. Committee deliberations must be conducted in confidence.
 4. Committee recommendations are advisory in nature.
 5. A preponderance of outside letters should be from peer institutions. Departments and units will be responsible for determining their respective peers. All letters requested and received are to be included in the candidate's promotion dossier.
- B. In consideration of requests for promotion from non-departmentalized faculty who do not have a clear disciplinary department, the Director of the Texas A & M AgriLife Extension Service, in consultation with the Vice Chancellor and Dean of Agriculture, will be responsible for defining the committee membership for non-departmentalized faculty. These committees should be composed of faculty who possess the appropriate disciplinary expertise necessary to evaluate the quality and breadth of the performance of the non-departmentalized Extension faculty member(s). Where possible and appropriate, members from various departmental review committees will be included in the non-departmental review committees to assure consistency of the review process.
- C. During the review process, if both the department head and the peer review committee do not recommend promotion, then the candidate's promotion file will not be forwarded to the Director for further consideration unless the candidate so requests. If a person is under final review for promotion

from assistant to associate professor, the candidate's promotion file must be forwarded to the Director for review and action regardless of whether the recommendation is positive or negative.

- D. If the department head or the review committee does not agree on a recommendation, then the matter will be forwarded to the Director for evaluation and further consultation with the Vice Chancellor.
- E. At any point in the process, a candidate for promotion may elect to withdraw his/her name from further consideration by written request.

V. Agency Review by the Texas AgriLife Peer Review Committee

- A. The Director will use the AgriLife Peer Review Committee to review all requests for promotion in rank of all Extension specialists. The committee will review all promotion recommendations and ensure equitable review and evaluation of teaching, research and extension promotion candidates, relative to the position description for each candidate.
- B. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be composed of 16 senior faculty members appointed by the Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Dean of the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Director, Texas AgriLife Research; and Director, Texas AgriLife Extension. The makeup of the committee will reflect the composition of the faculty within the College, Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension, and will be reviewed every three years to ensure it continues to represent the demographics of the faculty. Committee members shall serve two-year terms, with approximately one-half of the committee rotating each year. As with the departmental peer review committees, all members of the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may vote on promotion and tenure decisions; however, the vote of the tenured faculty must be kept separate. The results of the committee's anonymous vote and the overall perspective of the committee relative to each faculty member under consideration shall be explained by the Chair of the Committee in a statement to the Vice Chancellor on each candidate.
- C. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee shall review all promotion and tenure recommendations in accordance with the following:
 - 1. Review completeness of promotion candidate's file submitted by the department/unit, requesting additional information, if necessary, particularly if the candidate's department is not represented on the committee.
 - 2. Review recommendations of the departmental/unit peer review committee, department/unit head, and AgriLife Extension non-departmental program leader, as appropriate. The AgriLife Peer Review Committee should focus on nominations of a marginal nature. Specifically:
 - a. If the departmental peer review committee and the unit administration strongly recommend a decision and the AgriLife Peer Review Committee does not concur, then the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may request further input prior to a final recommendation. Detailed comments should accompany all AgriLife Peer Review Committee recommendations, which are in opposition to the recommendations of the departmental/unit peer review committee or unit administration.
 - b. If the departmental peer review committee and the unit administration are in direct conflict, the AgriLife Peer Review Committee should carefully review the entire file, including external letters, to determine the merits of the file. If necessary, the AgriLife Peer Review Committee may invite the appropriate department/unit head and chair of the departmental peer review committee to the meeting to gain further information.
 - 3. The Chair of the AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be responsible for transmitting written results of the committee's deliberations and make recommendations regarding desired changes to the process.
- D. When the Director does not concur with the recommendation of the department/unit head and/or department peer review recommendation, the Director will inform the appropriate unit leader of the reasons for that decision. The departmental peer review committee shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have in fact been properly enclosed with the promotion dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. In the event that germane new evidence is introduced or new, quite different arguments are applied, the departmental peer review committee may submit a newly organized document for reconsideration.
- E. If the Director recommends against promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the department head/program leader, then the Director shall inform the appropriate unit leader and the candidate of the reasons for the decision. The faculty member shall then have the opportunity to offer any new evidence in support of the request for promotion, and that evidence shall be reviewed by the Director and the AgriLife Peer Review Committee before a final recommendation concerning promotion is made.

- F. In the event of a negative promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If requested by the faculty member, a statement of reasons will be provided by the department head or AgriLife Extension non-departmental program leader, as appropriate.

VI. Appeals Procedure for Professorial Progression

- A. Extension specialist faculty have the right to present grievances concerning progression through the Professorial Career Ladder (<http://agrilife.org/hrfaculty/files/2011/04/faculty-promotion-extension-professorial-career-ladder.pdf>). Basis for an appeal regarding progression in rank exists when, in the opinion of the Extension faculty member, one or more of the following has occurred:
 - 1. There was a failure to follow the prescribed procedures
 - 2. There was a failure to adhere to the established criteria for determining progression in rank.
 - 3. There was a discovery of significant new evidence in support of the Extension faculty member related to academic credentials, length of professional service, performance appraisal information and overall achievement, productivity, and/or effectiveness.
- B. Extension faculty having concerns or grievances regarding other aspects of the Professorial Career Ladder are encouraged to seek resolution of those concerns through established supervisory channels prior to filing a written appeal. If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by an appeals committee
- C. The written appeal shall include the basis for the appeal committee and must contain any supporting evidence and/or documentation to be considered. Written appeals concerning denial of progression in rank must be filed within 20 working days of notification of denial.
- D. A seven-member Appeals Committee shall be appointed by the Director to review and/or hear individual appeals regarding progression in rank
- E. The appellant may request to meet with the Appeals Committee to present his/her case. Such a request shall be included in the written appeal. If the appellant elects to be represented by an attorney, the appellant will notify the Director's Office at least five working days before the date the appeal is to be heard. The appellant will be solely responsible for any legal expenses incurred in such representation
- F. The Appeals Committee shall judge the merits of the case and forward its written recommendation with supporting documentation to the Director for final action within 20 working days from the end of the appeal hearing.
- G. The Director shall notify the appellant in writing of acceptance or rejection of the Appeals Committee recommendation. Such notification shall be made within 60 working days of receipt of the written appeal.

VII. Estimated/Anticipated Tenure and/or Promotion Timeline and Packet Components (see Section VII pp 4-5)

Appendix 1

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROMOTION IN THE EXTENSION PROFESSORIAL RANK SYSTEM

Categories

- A. Contributions to assigned Extension duties*
 - 1. Presentations
 - 2. Program initiation, development, evaluation, and interpretation
 - 3. Workshops, seminars, field days, etc.
 - 4. Extension publications
 - 5. Demonstrations (result/method, field trials/applied research)
 - 6. Agent training sessions
 - 7. Mass media work
 - 8. Grants and contracts
 - 9. Interagency activities
 - 10. Clientele commodity support groups
 - 11. Extension planning activities
 - 12. Leadership and volunteer training
 - 13. Consultation/technical assistance
 - 14. Other Extension contributions

- B. State/regional/national/international contributions
 - 1. Publications (including peer reviewed journal publications)
 - 2. Presentations (professional organizations and peer audiences included)
 - 3. Committee assignments
 - 4. Membership in professional organizations (including offices held)
 - 5. Other Extension contributions

- C. Contributions to major Agency missions
 - 1. Teaching
 - 2. Research (basic and applied)
 - 3. Service

- D. Service to university/Extension/community (committee assignments, leadership positions, etc.)

- E. Awards and honors, including membership in honorary societies

*Because of the wide variation in position descriptions, not every Extension faculty member is expected to contribute in all categories listed. Specific position descriptions and plan of work dictate which categories are most appropriate.

Appendix 2

GROUPS ELIGIBLE FOR PROFESSORIAL CAREER LADDER IN THE EXTENSION PROFESSORIAL RANK SYSTEM

- A. Departmentalized Groups
 - 1. Agricultural Economics
 - 2. Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication
 - 3. Biological and Agricultural Engineering
 - 4. Animal Science
 - 5. Biochemistry and Biophysics
 - 6. Ecosystem Science and Management
 - 7. Entomology
 - 8. Horticultural Science
 - 9. Nutrition and Food Science
 - 10. Plant Pathology and Microbiology
 - 11. Poultry Science
 - 12. Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
 - 13. Soil and Crop Sciences
 - 14. Veterinary Medicine
 - 15. Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences

- B. Non-departmentalized Groups
 - 1. Agricultural Communications
 - 2. Agricultural Chemicals
 - 3. Computer Technology
 - 4. 4-H and Youth Development
 - 5. Family and Consumer Sciences
 - 6. V.G. Young Institute of County Government

ALEC Faculty Merit System

Review Committee: Barry Boyd, Chanda Elbert, Julie Harlin
December 6, 2016

The ALEC Climate Committee suggested the review of our faculty merit system. Our current system has been in place since 2011 and, while it is very quantitative and equitably applied to all, some faculty shared that the system unnecessarily creates a competitive environment, negatively impacting our departmental climate. The committee on ALEC Faculty Merit System was charged with reviewing the current system and proposing options for the faculty to consider.

The current system rewards faculty primarily for research productivity. As a result, we have seen significant increases in grant dollars as well as numbers of publications. Some have suggested that these increases have come at the expense of climate and collegiality as we “competed” against each other for individual rankings in this system.

Questions for consideration as we move forward:

- Are we rewarding what we value?
- Is ALEC contributing to the University’s goals, vision, and mission? (ALEC Scorecard)
- Within the categories of teaching, research, and service, what do we value most?
- How can we reward the activities that provide value to the individual faculty member, the Department, and the College/University?
- If we value collaboration, efforts to improve teaching, and other endeavors that are more difficult to measure, can we develop a way to assess these for merit?
- Should each faculty member be evaluated the same way, regardless of position description/appointment?
- If rankings are creating perceived competition for a small pot of money (consistently around 3% annually), are there other ways to view this process, such as using a committee to conduct a holistic assessment of teaching, research, and service?
- Could a committee be utilized to conduct a holistic assessment of teaching, research, and service?

Option A—Current Merit System

Continue with the current system: 70% Research, 20% Teaching, 10% Service with weights for each category within the areas. Rankings of each faculty member used to determine merit increases, with discretion of the Department Head.

Pros: Very linear and equally applied to all. ALEC salary increases have been deemed fair and equitable by the Dean.

Cons: Weights do not necessarily reward what some faculty value. Some believe this systems creates perceived competition that does not contribute to a positive climate.

Option B—Holistic Committee System

An elected and/or appointed committee would evaluate each faculty member based on teaching, research, and service, with a score of 0-10 in each category. Scores would be averaged to create an overall score. These scores would then be used to determine merit increases, with the highest scoring members receiving the biggest increases.

Pros: Allows more discretion in distributing merit.

Cons: Do we trust each other to adequately assess our merit? What will be the basis for the scores and will they be equitably applied? Will salary increases (or lack thereof) be defensible?

Option C—Z Scores for Research and Holistic Review for Teaching and Service

We could potentially develop a system where we submit the data for research which calculates a score based on productivity in grants, publications, etc., similar to the system we currently use. A committee could then evaluate teaching and service through a holistic approach that considers numbers of classes, graduate committees, etc., as well as quality indicators such as peer reviews of teaching, awards, etc.

Pros: The combined approach would ensure that we are still collecting the data that must be submitted for our departmental scorecard, yet provide more qualitative assessments that enrich the process.

Cons: Do we trust each other to adequately value our teaching and service? Will it be equitably applied? Will salary increases (or lack thereof) be defensible?

Option D—Statement of Mutual Expectations

Each faculty meets with the Department Head to set an individual set of performance expectations and/or create an individualized job description (an enhance revision of our current process during the annual performance review). Faculty then report based on their annual performance plan. Merit is determined if performance exceeded, met or failed to meet mutually agreed expectations. This can still be quantitatively measured, but with some room for qualitative components.

Pros: Provides for individualized performance and allows faculty to work to their strengths. It is not a one size fits all approach.

Cons: Will it be equitably applied? The burden is placed the faculty member to perform with the Department Head determining if the expectations for merit are met. Will salary increases (or lack thereof) be defensible?

Other Options?

We are seeking input on these options as well as others.

Key Vision 2020 Metrics

Research

- (1) Research Expenditures
- (2) Federal Expenditures
- (3) Academy members
- (4) Faculty awards
- (5) Citations

Student success

- (6) Freshman retention
- (7) 4 year graduation
- (8) 6 year graduation
- (9) Students with Pell
- (10) % URM students

Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications

Merit Criteria, Factors, and Weights

March 1, 2010

edited February 24, 2014

Research (70%)

1. Refereed Technical/Scientific Journal Publications (Z-score x 5)
2. Non-refereed Journal Publications (e.g., editorials, teaching tips, book reviews, commentaries, etc.) . . (Z-score x .75)
3. Books/Book Chapters (Z-score x 2)
4. Refereed Abstracts/Refereed non-technical/scientific publications (Z-score x 2)
5. Refereed Posters (Z-score x 1)
6. Grant & Contract Reports (including CRIS) (Z-score x 1)
7. Research Conference Presentations (Z-score x 1)
8. Other Scholarly Publications (e.g., technical reports/bulletins, popular press articles, software, etc.) . (Z-score x .75)
9. Scholarly Award/Recognition/Impact (e.g., invited publications/expertise, tech. transfer, products, etc.) (Z-score x 1)
10. # Local/State Grant Proposals Submitted (Z-score x .25)
11. # National Competitive Grant Proposals Submitted (Z-score x .75)
12. # Grants Received (Z-score x 1.5)
13. Grant \$ Received [portion attributed to you - under your control - contributes to department] (Z-score x 5)

note: 10-13 will be provided by Tanya - meaning she is our lead grant staff person and what she has on record will become our financial report

Teaching (20%)

1. Weighted Student Credit Hours (Z-score x 6)
2. Compliance Load (Z-score x 3.5)
3. Undergraduate Research Scholars (Z-score x 1)
4. Teaching Evaluations (Z-score x 2)
5. Teaching Awards/ Recognition (Z-score x 1)
6. MS-Chair (Z-score x 2)
7. MS-Member (Z-score x .5)
8. MAG/MED-Chair (Z-score x .75)
9. MAG/MED-Member (Z-score x .25)
10. Doctoral Chair (Z-score x 3)
11. Doctoral Member (Z-score x 1)
12. Club Advisor (Z-score x 1)

Service (10%)

1. Department Leadership/Service (Z-score x 3)
2. College Leadership/Service (Z-score x 4)
3. University Leadership/Service (Z-score x 5)
4. Professional Association Leadership/Service (Z-score x 5)
5. Editor or Editorial Board (Z-score x 5)

Step 1: Calculate Z-scores from the raw data

Step 2: Multiply by the factor in parenthesis (note: total factor values must be equal among the 3 areas [e.g., in this case the total is 22 {i.e., Service factor values 3+4+5+5+5=22; Teaching factor value totals = 22; Research factor value totals = 22}])

Step 3: Sum items in each of the three areas (i.e., research, teaching, and service)

Step 4: Multiply by the respective weights assigned to each area (i.e., research - 70%, teaching 20%, and service 10%)

Step 5: Sum a total for each faculty

Step 6: Rank faculty according to their total score

Step 7: Department Head will use this information as the main influence for merit. The Department Head will use collegiality and other more qualitative attributes to make minor adjustments to merit.

Faculty Member	Refereed Technical/Scientific Journal Publications (Factor x 5)	Journal Publications (e.g., editorials, teaching tips, book reviews, commentaries, etc.) (Factor x .75)	Books/Book Chapters (Factor x 2)	Refereed Abstracts/Refereed non-technical/scientific publications (Factor x 2)	Refereed Posters (Factor x 1)	Grant & Contract Reports (including CRIS) (Factor x 1)	Research Conference Proceedings (Factor x 1)	Publications (e.g., technical reports/bulletins, popular press articles, software, etc.) (Factor x .75)	Award/Recognition/Invited reports/expertise, tech. transfer, products, etc.) (Factor x 1)	Local/State Grant Proposals Submitted (Factor x .25)	National Competitive Grant Proposals Submitted (Factor x .75)	Grants Received (Factor x 1.5)	Grant \$ Received (portion attributed to you - under your control - contributes to department) (Factor x 5)	Weighted Student Credit Hours (Factor x 6)	Compliance Load (Factor x 3.5)	Undergraduate Research Scholars (Factor x 1)	Teaching Evaluations (Factor x 2)	Teaching Awards/Recognition (Factor x 1)	MS-Chair (Factor x 5)	MS-Member (Factor x .75)	MAG/MED-Chair (Factor x 25)	MAG/MED-Member (Factor x 25)	Doctoral Chair (Factor x 3)	Doctoral Member (Factor x 1)	Club Advisor (Factor x 3)	Department Leadership/Service (Factor x 3)	College Leadership/Service (Factor x 4)	University Leadership/Service (Factor x 5)	Professional Association Leadership/Service (Factor x 5)	Editor or Editorial Board (Factor x 5)
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3011.25	35.5	0	4,82375	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	81650	1780.2	49.6	0	4,755	1	2	1	4	3	0	19	1	3	0	1	0	
7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	0	0	0	0	80000	1396.35	33.3	0	3,32	0	0	1	2	0	4	1	1	1	2	0	1	
0	0	0	0	4	5	0	9	0	0	4	3	5	46267	1138.47	29.4	0	4,30333	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	4	0	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	308137	2228.41	29	0	5	0	2	1	2	2	6	13	2	2	1	1	2	
4	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	1	3	0	0	0	52993	1372.53	37.3	3	4,439	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	1	4	
2	0	0	0	8	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	32000	2821.8	38.6	0	4,49778	0	1	2	1	3	2	3	0	4	2	3	4	
1	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	2	7	0	0	1124	2626.94	42.5	0	4,84722	0	0	4	1	2	6	8	0	2	1	0	3	
5	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1153592	1445.29	50.9	1	4.68	1	1	1	3	3	5	3	1	5	3	2	5	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15000	1916.01	32.9	0	4,565	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3	2	1	4	
1	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	1	1	2	0	1	74982	924.92	23.1	0	4,685	0	1	3	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103256	1909.39	33.6	0	4,81333	0	3	0	6	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	4	
1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	43835	460.12	15.2	0	4,876	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	3	3	
2	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	2	1	0	232774	1753.16	53.08	0	4,78857	0	2	4	1	1	0	3	4	2	5	3	1	
1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	6	3	0	0	95002	2676.46	34.53	0	4,905	1	2	4	1	1	2	5	2	1	1	2	1	
2	0	0	0	1	6	0	6	0	4	0	10	6	154145	2200.45	35.23	0	4,82	4	2	3	1	3	1	2	5	1	3	2	4	
2	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	211610	1698.88	30.13	0	4.08	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	4	1	3	4	4	
average	1.83333333	0.16666667	0.33333333	1.44444444	2.05555556	0.94444444	3	1.61111111	1.33333333	1.38888889	1.44444444	1.61111111	149298.1687	1869.97222	35.9427778	0.22222222	4.8048512	0.55555556	1.66666667	1.38888889	1.61111111	1.16666667	2.27777778	4.66666667	0.66666667	2.61111111	1.38888889	1.61111111	2.72222222	1.11111111
total	33	3	6	26	37	17	54	29	24	25	26	29	2687367	33478.68	646.97	4	82.887321	10	30	25	29	41	84	12	47	25	29	49	20	

Research	Teaching	Service
70%	20%	10%

Service allocations 0=None evident; 1=minimal; 3=moderate; 5=high

Calculate Z score	0.44174	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.56337	1.69404	-0.04664	-0.30355	0.5545	-0.53336	-0.50185	-0.27387	-0.38752	-0.97183	-0.60588	-0.33294	-0.79349	-1.20722	-0.39742	0.37505	-1.15786	-0.08127
-0.44174	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.56337	1.69404	-0.04664	-0.30355	0.5545	-0.53336	-0.50185	-0.27387	-0.38752	-0.97183	-0.60588	-0.33294	-0.79349	-1.20722	-0.39742	0.37505	-1.15786	-0.08127	
0.81943	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.56337	0.38018	-0.27839	-0.30355	-3.25471	-0.53336	-1.25462	-0.27387	0.2466	-0.97183	0.18662	-0.73247	0.39675	-1.20722	-0.39742	0.37505	-0.48555	-0.08127		
-0.97183	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.26149	-0.68131	-0.60647	-0.30355	0.21147	0.42669	-1.25462	-0.27387	-0.38752	-0.13983	-0.60588	-0.13318	0.39675	-0.45791	0.62452	1.33946	-0.48555	-0.81268		
-2.73878	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.38878	-1.05168	-0.68922	-0.30355	-0.78379	-0.53336	0.25092	1.1346	-0.02183	-0.97183	-1.00005	-0.93224	-0.79349	0.2914	1.84646	0.37505	0.85906	-0.48555	0.05014	
-0.97183	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	0.66707	1.05857	0.59937	-0.73135	-0.30355	1.00097	-0.53336	0.25092	-0.27387	0.2466	0.85416	-1.00005	-0.93224	-0.79349	0.2914	1.84646	0.37505	0.85906	-0.48555	0.05014
-0.44174	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.38878	-1.05168	-0.68922	-0.30355	-0.78379	-0.53336	0.25092	-0.27387	0.2466	0.85416	-1.00005	-0.93224	-0.79349	0.2914	1.84646	0.37505	0.85906	-0.48555	0.05014
1.14852	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.44262	1.41527	0.27991	-0.30355	-0.27123	-0.53336	-0.50185	-0.43037	-0.38752	1.52715	-1.17611	-0.33294	-0.79349	1.04071	0.62452	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
0.08835	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
-0.44174	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
1.67861	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
-0.97183	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
-0.44174	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
-0.97183	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
0.08835	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	
0.08835	-0.43461	-0.28054	-0.60644	-0.86078	-0.55661	-1.0933	-0.31235	-0.59982	-0.21374	-0.19059	-0.73233	-0.55913	1.12855	0.69074	-0.30355	0.61396	-0.53336	-1.25462	1.83884	-0.38752	0.69416	-0.13476	-0.79349	-0.45791	-0.39742	-1.55378	1.33946	0.85906	0.05014	

Step 3 Sum Items by Area	Sum Research	Sum Teaching	Sum Service	Step 4 Weight Items by Area	Weighted Research 70%	Weighted Teaching 20%	Weighted Service 10%	Step 5 Sum Pts Total	Sum	Step 6 Rank Faculty	Step 7 Department Head will use this information as the main influence for merit. Other potential influences will be collegiality and other more qualitative attributes to make minor adjustments to merit.
-11.7651125	5.6547875	-9.53174	-8.23567875	-8.23567875	-5.763975	-0.953174	-8.05778625	-8.05778625			
-7.5763975	7.117525	-20.96428	-5.8347825	-1.4235075	-2.096428		-6.25640125				
-6.057015	-6.6296575	-6.17019	-4.2399105	-1.3259315	-0.617019		-6.182861				
-9.5769	-6.2968475	1.3305	-6.70383	-1.2593695	0.13305		-7.8301495				
18.207445	-16.05264	9.56719	12.74522025	-3.210258	0.956719		10.48141125				
-5.093015	11.12805	-5.08726	-3.5657405	2.22561	-0.508726		-1.8488565				
-3.316405	-0.13103	-3.43038	-2.3214835	-0.028208	-0.343038		-2.6907275				
-0.6440675	5.8730075	19.66351	-0.45147725	1.1746015	1.966351		2.70947525				
4.2765575	13.04025	-13.86196	2.99350025	2.60805	-1.386196		4.21544425				
19.8534825	7.5611625	21.0816	13.89743775	1.5122325	2.10816</						

Colleagues,

The date has been set for the 2017 ESCOP SSSc meeting. It will be held **February 21 & 22** (Tuesday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm & Wednesday, 7:30 am to noon) and will be held at the UPLU building in Washington, D.C. as it has in the past. The meeting agenda is forthcoming after the first of the year. The executive team is working it and has tentatively narrowed the focus of the meeting. The discussion will center around NIFA's current efforts with big data and social science's role in those efforts. It will also be interesting to learn about the changes and discussion occurring with a new administration taking over.

Secondly, following up on our decision from 2016 meeting, I am pleased to announce that the subcommittee has received approval from S&T and ESCOP to add Ag Leadership as a sixth discipline to the five that have been a part of this subcommittee (i.e., Ag communications, ag economics, ag education, human sciences, and rural sociology) representing four regions, 1890 ARD and one at-large member. The 2016 membership list is attached for your reference. Please note that we are working to fill last year's vacancy as well as renew or replace those whose terms are expired. Nominations for those positions are appropriate and can be sent to Travis Park, SSSc Secretary and Chair-elect, at tdpark@ncsu.edu.

We are asking for nominations of individuals to represent Ag Leadership on this very important national committee. I have reached out to program leaders and chairs across the county with an open nomination. The initial terms will be staggered to start the rotation but are three-year renewable terms. If you have individuals you would like to nominate, **please send your nominations to me no later than end of business on December 9**. Final nominations will be presented to the Science and Technology and ESCOP committees for formal approval and notification.

The charge of this committee is to recommend specific actions to help the Land-Grant system address high priority research and education issues leading to outcomes that deal with social issues in a significant, measurable way and that will generate sustained financial support. This committee has been extremely valuable over the years to promote better coordination among the areas of social sciences discipline, increase visibility, and increase funding opportunities for social sciences. Recent impacts include the Science Roadmaps and a gap analysis of NIFA RFPs. Also see - <http://escop.ncsu.edu/ViewCommittees.cfm?comid=23>

Kind regards,

Mike Retallick

SSSc Chair 2017 and 2018

Michael S. Retallick

Professor and Chair

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Agricultural Education and Studies Department

513 Farm House Lane, 0201 Curtiss Hall, Ames, Iowa 50011-1054 msr@iastate.edu

515.294.4810

Web: <http://www.ageds.iastate.edu/people/michael-retallick>

ESCOP Social Sciences Subcommittee
Membership Status as of January 2016 (three-year renewable terms*)

Discipline	Northeast	North Central	South	West	1890 ARD	At Large
Ag Communication	Rama Radhakrishna ('16) Penn State	Emily Buck ('15) Ohio State University	Dwayne Cartmell ('16) Oklahoma State	Erica Irlbeck ('16) Texas Tech	Adell Brown ('16) Southern University	Abigail Borron ('15) U of Georgia
Ag Economics	Stephan Goetz ('15) NERDC, Penn State	Valdivia Corinne University of MissouriColumbia	Chuck Moss ('15) University of Florida	Philip Watson ('14) University of Idaho	Ntam Baharanyi ('15) Tuskegee University	Matt Fannin ('14) Louisiana State
Ag Education	Harry Boone ('14) West Virginia University	Mike Retallick ('15) Iowa State University	Travis Park ('15) North Carolina	James Connors ('16) University of Idaho	Alton Johnson ('15) Prairie View A&M U.	Jack Elliot ('16) Texas A&M
Human Sciences	Daniel Perkins ('15) Penn State	Soyeon Shim ('13) U. of Wisconsin, Madison	Betsy Garrison ('15) U of Arkansas	VACANT	Doze Butler ('16) Southern University and A&M College	Lynn Bordon ('15) U of Minnesota
Rural Sociology	Carolyn Sachs ('15) Penn State	Linda Lobao ('14) Ohio State	Mimmo Parisi ('15) Mississippi State	Don Albrecht ('15) WRDC, Utah State	Dreamal Worthen ('15) Florida A&M	Bo Beaulieu ('13) Purdue

*Number represents the start of membership term

Subcommittee Chair: David Doerfert (through 2016 meeting)

Subcommittee Secretary and Chair-Elect: Mike Retallick (secretary through 2016 meeting, chair through 2018 meeting)

USDA NIFA Liaisons: Aida Balsano, Caroline Crocoll

Liaison to the ESCOP Science & Technology Committee: Travis Park

ESCOP Liaison: Jeff Jacobsen, North Central Regional Association of Experiment Station Directors, Michigan State University

ESCOP Science & Technology Committee Chair: Bill Ravlin, The Ohio State University

ARD Representative: Ntam Baharanyi, Tuskegee University and Alton Thompson, Provost, Delaware State University

Ex-Officio (non-voting) Members:

Regional Rural Development Centers: Scott Loveridge, Bo Beaulieu, Stephan Goetz, and Don Albrecht

Neil Conklin, Farm Foundation

Chuck Fluharty, Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI)

Board on Human Sciences Liaisons: Soyeon Shim, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Wendy Naus, Consortium of Social Science Associations

Caron Gala, The Council on Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics (C-FARE)

R. Thomas (Tom) Van Arsdall, National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research (National C-FAR)

<http://escop.ncsu.edu/Viewcommittees.cfm?comid=23>

Don Albrecht, Director
Western Rural Development Center
Utah State University
4880 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-4880 435-797-
9732 don.albrecht@usu.edu

Ntam Baharanyi, Professor
Agricultural and Resource Economics
Cooperative Extension Program
Morrison-Mayberry Hall
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, AL 36088 334-724-4840
baharany@mytu.tuskegee.edu

Aida Balsano, National Program Leader
Division of Family & Consumer Sciences
National Institute of Food and Agriculture/USDA
4433 Waterfront Centre
800 9th St., SW
Washington, DC 20024 202-720-4436
abalsano@nifa.usda.gov

Bo Beaulieu, Director
Purdue Center for **Regional** Development
Gerald D. and Edna E. Mann Hall, Suite 266
203 Martin Jischke Drive
West Lafayette, IN 47907-2057
765-494-7273 ljb@purdue.edu

Harry Boone, Professor and Chair
Agricultural and Extension Education
Division of Resource Management
2054 Agricultural Sciences Building
PO Box 6108
Morgantown, WV 26506-6108 304-293-
5451 harry.boone@mail.wvu.edu

Lynne M. Borden, Professor and Head
Department of Family Social Science
College of Education and Human Development
290 McNeal Hall
1985 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108 612-624-7707
lborden@umn.edu **Abigail**
Borron, Assistant Professor
Dept. of Agricultural Leadership, Education and
Communication
141 Four Towers
405 College Station Road
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602 706-542-
7102 aborron@uga.edu

Adell Brown Jr., Vice Chancellor for Research
Southern University Ag Center
Ashford O. Williams Hall
P.O. Box 10010
Baton Rouge, LA 70813
225-771-2242
Adell_brown@suagcenter.com

Emily B. Buck, Associate Professor
Department of Ag Communication, Education &
Leadership
203C Ag Administration Building
2120 Fyffe Rd
Columbus, Oh 43210 740-490-
5236 buck.210@osu.edu

Doze Butler, Professor & Associate Dean
College of Sciences and Agriculture
Southern University and A&M College
P.O. Box 9614
Baton Rouge, LA 70813 225-771-
3505 doze_butler@subr.edu

Dwayne Cartmell, Professor
Dept. of Agricultural Education,
Communications,
& Leadership
Oklahoma State University
448 Agricultural Hall
Stillwater, OK 74078 405-744-
0461
dwayne.cartmell@okstate.edu

James Connors, Department Head
Agricultural Education and 4H Youth
Development
University of Idaho
875 Perimeter Drive, MS 2040
Moscow, ID 83844-2040 208-885-
6358 jconnors@uidaho.edu **Neil**
Conklin, President
Farm Foundation
1301 West 22nd St. Suite 615
Oak Brook, IL 60523-2197 630-571-
9393 neil@farmfoundation.org

Valdivia Corinne, Associate Professor
Agricultural and Applied Economics
210 Mumford
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 573-882-
4020 valdiviac@missouri.edu

Caroline E. Crocoll, Director
Division of Family & Consumer Sciences
USDA, National Institute of Food and Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20250-2225 202-
720-4795 ccrocoll@nifa.usda.gov

David Doerfert, Associate Dean
Graduate School
Texas Tech University
MS 41030
Lubbock, TX 79409 806-834-
4477 david.doerfert@ttu.edu

Jack Elliot, Professor & Head
Dept. of Agricultural Leadership, Education, &
Communications
Texas A&M University
250 AGLS, TAMU 2116
College Station, Texas 77843-
2116 979-845-6944
jelliot@tamu.edu

Matt Fannin, Associate Professor
Dept. of Agricultural Economics and
Agribusiness
Louisiana State University
130 Martin D. Woodin Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803 225-578-
0346 mfannin@agcenter.lsu.edu

Chuck Fluharty, President and CEO
Rural Policy Research Institute
214 Middlebush Hall
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, MO 65211 573-882-
0316 cfluharty@rupri.org **Caron
Gala**, Executive Director
The Council on Food, Agricultural and Resource
Economics
900 Second Street, NE
Suite 205
Washington, DC 20002
202-408-8522
CGala@cfare.org

M. E. (Betsy) Garrison, Professor & Director
Human Environmental Sciences
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701 479-575-
4307 megarris@uark.edu

Stephan Goetz, Director
Northeast Regional Center for Rural
Development
The Pennsylvania State University
7 Armsby Bldg.
University Park, PA 16802-
5602 814-863-4656
sgoetz@psu.edu

Erica Irlbeck, Associate Professor
Dept. of Agricultural Education &
Communications
Texas Tech University
MS42131, 2810 15th Street
Lubbock, TX 79409 806-834-
6708
erica.irlbeck@ttu.edu

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA Executive Director
Justin S. Morrill Hall of Agriculture
446 West Circle, Room 408
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824 517-884-
7965 jjacobsn@msu.edu

Alton B. Johnson, Professor & Dean
Director of Land-Grant Programs
College of Agriculture and Human Sciences
Prairie View A&M University
936-261-5125
ABJohnson@PVAMU.EDU

Linda Lobao, Professor
Rural Sociology, Sociology, and Geography
School of Environment and Natural Resources
2021 Coffey Rd.
The Ohio State University
Columbus OH 43210
614-292-6394

lobao.1@osu.edu **Chuck Moss**,
Professor
Food and Resource Economics Department
University of Florida
1155 McCarty Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611-0240 352-392-
1845 x404
cbmoss@ufl.edu

Wendy Naus, Executive Director
Consortium of Social Science Associations
1701 K Street, N.W.; Suite 1150
Washington, DC 20006 202-
842-3525 wnaus@coossa.org

Domenico "Mimmo" Parisi, Professor & Director
National Strategic Planning & Analysis Research Center (nSPARC)
P.O. Box 6027
Mississippi State, MS 39762 662-325-8065 mimmo.parisi@nsparc.msstate.edu

Travis Park, Associate Professor
Box 7607 NCSU
Room 204 Ricks Hall
1 Lampe Drive
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695 - 7607 919-515-9441 tdpark@ncsu.edu

Daniel Perkins, Professor
Professor of Family and Youth Resiliency and Policy / Department of Agricultural and Extension Education/Courtesy Appointment with Human Development and Family Studies
The Pennsylvania State University 107 Ferguson Bldg.
University Park, PA 16802
814-865-6988
dfp102@psu.edu

Rama Radhakrishna, Professor
Agricultural and Extension Education
Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education
Penn State
102 Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-7420
brr100@psu.edu

Bill Ravlin, Associate Director
Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center
209 Research Services Bldg.
Wooster, OH 44691 330-263-3705 ravlin.1@osu.edu

Michael S. Retallick, Associate Professor
Agricultural Education and Studies
Iowa State University
206 Curtiss Hall
Ames, IA 50011-1050 515-294-4810 mrs@iastate.edu

Dan Rossi, Executive Director

Northeastern Association of State AES Directors
Rutgers University 59 Dudley Rd.
New Brunswick, NJ 08901 732-932-9375 X337
rossi@njaes.rutgers.edu

Carolyn Sachs, Professor of Rural Sociology & Head
Women's Studies Department
The Pennsylvania State University 111C Armsby Bldg.
University Park, PA 16802 814-865-3746 csachs@psu.edu;
xyi@psu.edu

Soyeon Shim, Dean
School of Human Ecology
University of Wisconsin-Madison 2135 Nancy Nicholas Hall 1300 Linden Dr.
Madison, WI 53706 608-262-4847
soyeon.shim@sohe.wisc.edu
jaander8@wisc.edu

Alton Thompson, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Delaware State University
1200 N. DuPont Highway
Dover, DE 19901
303-857-6100 Fax
303-857-7410
athompson@desu.edu

Bobby Torres, Professor & Head
Dept. of Agricultural Education
University of Arizona 205 Saguaro Hall 1110 E.
South Campus Dr.
Tucson, AZ 85721 520-621-7173
torres1@email.arizona.edu

R. Thomas (Tom) Van Arsdall, Executive Director
Van Arsdall & Associates Inc.
National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research 703 509-4746
tom@vanarsdall.com

Philip Watson, Assistant Professor

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural
Sociology
Agricultural Science Building Room 28D
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-2334 208
310-7059
pwatson@uidaho.edu

Dreamal Worthen Siva Sureshwaran
College of Engineering Sciences, Technology
and Agriculture Florida A&M University 116
B. Perry-Paige Bldg.
Tallahassee, Florida 32307 850-599-3400
dreamal.worthen@famu.edu
diw116@hotmail.com