

ALEC Faculty Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 19, 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

129 AGLS

Information/Updates

Drs. Elliot and Harlin attended a college climate meeting last week. He passed around a binder with 13 departmental reports. The binder will be available in Debbie's office if anyone wants to check it out. Dr. Elliot also attended a university climate meeting. One of the guest speakers was Stephanie Payne. Drs. Elliot and Rutherford will work on scheduling a lunch with her to discuss improving the university climate survey process.

Dr. Elliot announced that he has been in conversation with Dr. Jimmy Cheek, Chancellor at the University of Tennessee. Dr. Cheek is planning a sabbatical visit to TAMU on April 26-28, 2017. His focus will be leadership and youth development. Dr. Elliot will work on an agenda for his visit.

APRs – Elliot – Attachment A

Attachment A summarizes the process for preparing for your APR. If you are at the Associate Professor level or higher and not seeking promotion and do not want a face to face meeting, make sure the 7 items listed on Attachment A are to Debbie by February 3. Associate Professors who are seeking promotion must schedule a face-to-face meeting. Make sure you update your job description.

AGSC Program Leader/Location – Murphy

Dr. Murphy reminded faculty that he has assumed the position of AGSC Program Leader and that his office is now 245.

Riverside Campus Update – Elliot/Murphy/Edney

Conversation concerning available office space at IMS. There are multiple office spaces available. See Dr. Elliot or either of the Associate Department Heads if you are interested.

Drs. Elliot, Murphy, and Edney discussed the possible use of the IMS building at RELLIS to support the TEEX/Blinn College work force training classroom needs. Multiple walk through visits have been made by TEEX and the Vice Chancellors Office. John Barton, Associate Vice Chancellor and Director of the RELLIS Campus has been the primary contact.

Faculty Account – Elliot

Faculty allocation sheets were distributed. There has been a 50% increase in accounts this year.

Development Account - Elliot

Updated account balances were distributed.

Next Board meeting is scheduled for April 6-7. The Board dinner will be on the evening of April 6th. All are invited to this function.

Reminder that the ALEC Academic Program Review is April 2-5. Please keep those dates as open as possible as the agenda is being developed. Attached is the listing of the review team.

Attachment B.

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

Temporary Faculty Fee/Compliance/DE Incentive – Drs. Rutherford, Wingenbach, Odom, McKim

Vote to approve and remove draft designation from document. Seconded. Voice vote. All in favor, none opposed. PASSED. **Attachment C.**

Faculty Teaching Workload Reporting Form/DE Incentive Policy. Note conditions at bottom of page. Must be submitted a minimum of 120 days prior to first day of class. Workgroup leader signature is also required. **Attachment D.**

See **Attachment E** for the form to be completed for proposed teaching assignments for the Fall '17, Spring '18, and Summer '18. Plan should be more strategic/systematic/transparent. Don't complete independently, work with your workgroup. Form not completed, course not happening. Correct ICD to be International Cultural Diversity. Friendly amendment – make for electronic. Approved with edits.

Post-Tenure - Dr. Briers

Received significant feedback from Dave Reed. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting. Attached is the document submitted to DOF on Monday, January 16th.

Attachment F.

Merit and APR – Drs. Boyd, Elbert, Harlin and Elliot

Committee met and reviewed the two documents. More feedback needed.

Next Faculty Meeting – Debbie King

The next meeting will be planned for the end of February.

Other

Dr. Elliot announced that he will not seek a third term as Department Head. This decision came after multiple discussions over many months with Dr. Hussey. He will remain as Head until a new person has been identified. There will be an international search conducted immediately.

The STEM Education search and the Department Head search will commence immediately. The remaining two position searches will begin when the new department head is on board.

Dr. Hussey also asked that Dr. Elliot remain in charge of the AgriLife Advanced Leaders program. Dr. Elliot's goals for the interim period will be to generate as much money as possible.

When the new department head has been identified, Dr. Elliot will immediately start a year long faculty development leave. He has identified the University of Vermont and the University of Notre Dame as possible FDL sites.

Dr. Elliot asked that no rumors, assumptions, etc. be started. This is a giant opportunity for the department to move forward in a positive direction.

As I previously mentioned in our faculty meetings and noted in our minutes, **associate professors who are seeking promotion, must schedule a face-to-face meeting.** Sorry for not reiterating it in the message below. Dr. Elliot

From: Jack Elliot

Sent: Friday, January 20, 2017 9:24 AM

To: ALEC - Faculty <alec-faculty@exchange.tamu.edu>

Cc: King, Debra J <dj-king@tamu.edu>; Gunnels, Tanya K <t-gunnels1@tamu.edu>; Stroud, Kenneth B <k-stroud@tamu.edu>; Aguilar, Elke R <elke-r-aguilar@tamu.edu>; Fulton, Clarice <cfulton@tamu.edu>

Subject: APR process and due dates

The first APR sessions begin February 7 and end February 17. Your documents (1-7 below) are due to Debbie 3 work days prior to your meeting. Please schedule your APR with Debbie. Staff will be reviewed later this spring. Advisors will meet with Drs. Rutherford and Elliot later this spring. Extension faculty will meet with Drs. Cummings and Elliot. **NEW THIS YEAR: If you are at the associate professor level or higher (and not seeking promotion) and do not want a face to face meeting, your 7 items (as applicable) are due to Debbie by February 3.**

- 1) Your vitae (with the pertinent 2016 parts highlighted) or the ALEC Faculty Achievement Report (on the handbook website)
- 2) Research agenda/conceptual or theoretical framework, research topical areas, and research skill set are updated and on your faculty page.
- 3) Update last year's or send at a minimum one new impact statement that is related to at least one of our posted public value statements (on our website).
- 4) Position description (the one in great jobs - obtain from Kenny)
- 5) Your plan of work or goals for 2016 and beyond. This is essentially how you plan to implement your job description.
- 6) For early career personnel please provide me with the names of your internal and external mentors and bring your updated professional growth time line/goals (for those who did that last year, simply update your document).
- 7) NEW THIS YEAR – a completed FY '18 teaching form (attached). This should be done in conjunction with your program area.

APR – 2016:

Remember, the Appropriate Items and Merit Input documents are on our handbook website.

This year I won't be providing you with your status (meritorious, very meritorious, etc.) until the last person is reviewed. You will receive a draft of your letter and I will ask you for your contributions to the letter just as I have the last 6 years, but it won't be finalized until we are all done with our reviews. Summer and Fall WSCH have not been provided to Elke. Fall student evaluations were just provided to Elke. Therefore, I won't be able to calculate final merit numbers until I have all of the data.

If your grant(s) and other resources are not managed by ALEC, please provide Tanya with documentation that clearly identifies the percentage (and dollar amount/year) of your responsibility to that project.

During your APR We will look at:

- 1) Your research agenda/framework (be ready to share how you use this in your work with graduate students, research, teaching, and engagement)
- 2) impact statement(s)
- 3) CV - Please bring refereed documents and/or web locations of your key scholarship documents.
- 4) research skill set, and research topical areas on your faculty page on our web site (a reminder was sent to those faculty who needed to complete this task).
- 5) FY'18 teaching form
- 6) We will review your position description and plans for the future.
- 7) We will create a draft of your APR letter after the review.

Academic Program Review

Agricultural Leadership, Education, & Communications

College of Agriculture & Life Sciences

Texas A&M University

College Station, Texas

April 2-5, 2017

	<p>M. Susie Whittington – CHAIR Professor Department of Agricultural Communication, Education, and Leadership The Ohio State University 208C Agricultural Administration Bldg. 2120 Fyffe Road Columbus, OH 43210</p> <p>Phone: 614-292-6321 Email: whittington.1@osu.edu</p>
	<p>Michael Newman Professor School of Human Sciences College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Mississippi State University Mississippi State, MS 39762</p> <p>Phone: 662-325-2950 Email: mnewman@humansci.msstate.edu</p>
	<p>Traci Irani Director UF/IFAS Center for Public Issues Education 121E Bryant Hall P.O. Box 112060 Gainesville, FL 32611</p> <p>Phone: 352-273-2588 Email: irani@ufl.edu</p>
	<p>Robert Birkenholz Professor Agricultural Communication, Education, and Leadership Ohio State University Columbus, OH 43210</p> <p>Phone: 614-292-8921 Email: birkenholz.1@osu.edu</p>

FY'17 ALEC adjunct/temporary/summer teaching funding

Adjunct/temporary position requests must be made in writing to the Department Head and Associate Heads for the academic year by March 1. Faculty members may be eligible for additional funding to increase the educational opportunities available for students in the summer, if funding is available.

Class Size	Grad Class w/Doctorate	
13-20	\$5,000	
21-30	\$6,500	
Class size	UG Class w/Masters	UG Class w/Doctorate
25-40	\$4,000	\$5,000
41-75	\$5,000	\$6,000
76+	\$ 6,000	\$7,000

- Enrollment is determined by the official TAMU Census Day enrollment numbers (12th Day of long semesters, 4th Day for summer).
- Courses must "make" 2.5x State Minimum enrollment on the Census date, to be funded.
- Funding is based on 3 credit courses, 2 credit courses will receive 2/3 payment, 1 credit, 1/3.

In some cases it is more appropriate to hire temporary program assistants to increase teaching capacity (e.g. student teaching supervision). These individuals may be paid an hourly rate rather than a flat contract rate per course based on their qualifications.

Program assistant hourly rates, and example budget totals, for 19hrs/week x 15 weeks.

\$17.00/hour	\$4,845.00
\$18.00/hour	\$5,130.00
\$19.00/hour	\$5,415.00
\$20.00/hour	\$5,700.00

Individuals interested in being considered for temporary positions must apply at greatjobs.tamu.edu. All positions are contingent on funding availability. All positions are less than half-time employees, and do not receive any TAMU employment benefits. Minimum qualifications include demonstrated ability and experience in agriculture science, agricultural leadership, agricultural development, instructional design, or agricultural communications and a Master's degree in closely-related discipline.



Faculty Teaching Workload Reporting

Request for Distance Education Differential Tuition Allocation or Incentive

I, _____, am requesting the approval of DE allocation/incentive funds for

_____ Semester

Option	Example	Course/section
Program Area allocation:		
1. Graduate assistant funding	DE funds from three courses offered during FY17 will be pooled to hire new GA for FY 18	
2. Adjunct/temporary faculty funding	DE funds from Fall 2016 will be pooled to hire temporary faculty member for Spring 2017.	
3. Hire hourly student grader	DE funds from Fall 2016 will be pooled to hire grader for Spring 2017.	
Individual incentive:		
4. Faculty incentive	DE course with a minimum enrollment (2.5x state minimum), which is not included in required compliance teaching, may be approved as overload teaching.	

Allocation Options:

Option 1. A program area may consolidate funding from several courses to support a graduate assistant. This requires a minimum 12 month commitment (~\$13,000/yr. M.S., does not include tuition).

Option 2 A program area may consolidate funding from several courses to hire adjunct/temporary faculty on a semester basis (wage based on department approved temporary teaching position policy – see below). Approval must be a minimum of 120 days prior to first class day (university paperwork processing time).

ALEC Adjunct/Temporary Teaching Position Pay Scale

	UG Class w/Masters	UG Class w/Doctorate	Grad Class w/Doctorate
Class size			
15-25			\$5,000
25-40	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,500
41-75	\$5,000	\$6,000	
76+	\$ 6,000	\$7,000	

Option 3 A program area may request funds to hire a grader (~\$10-\$15/hour, max 20 hours per week).

Incentive Option: Individual faculty members may request an amount equal to adjunct teaching rate to be transferred to individual faculty member’s account or a course reduction in a future semester.

I certify that all conditions set forth in the department policy are met.

1. The faculty member meets ALEC faculty teaching load compliance (minimum 9 credits/semester)
2. The DEDT course is not a variable credit course or a 1 credit seminar.
3. The DEDT course has a minimum of 25 undergraduate or 15 graduate students enrolled on census day.
4. The DEDT course, and the allocation/incentive option, are approved by the appropriate Associate Head (Undergraduate or Graduate) in writing.

Date

Faculty member signature (submission)

Date

Associate Department Head signature (approval)

Date

Department Head signature

Name:

FALL '17

Check all applicable columns for each course.

Course/section	Credits	ALEC Core	# Students	F2F	Online	Study Abroad	Study Away	Field Trip Fee \$	W/C	ICD	UCC
Total credits	0										

SPRING '18

Course/section	Credits	ALEC Core	# Students	F2F	Online	Study Abroad	Study Away	Field Trip Fee \$	W/C	ICD	UCC
Total credits	0										

SUMMER '18

Course/section	Credits	ALEC Core	# Students	F2F	Online	Study Abroad	Study Away	Field Trip Fee \$	W/C	ICD	UCC
Total credits	0										

FY '18 TOTAL 0

List all courses you plan to teach for each semester (Identify if you are teaching multiple sections of the same course by listing each section).

Core indicates ALEC Core courses required for our majors.

F2F - face-to-face

W/C - writing or communication intensive

ICD - international ~~core curriculum~~ *cultural diversity*

UCC - university core curriculum

Online - indicate a "W" if webbased or a "DE" if distance education

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

**Draft Revisions Discussed by Faculty on December 20, 2016
Revisions Suggested by Faculty, Addl Suggestions from Admin Incorporated as of January 15, 2017**

Revisions on December 10, 2013, **Approved as policy, December 12, 2013 by Faculty Vote**

Approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties on May 6, 2013

Revisions December 13, 2012, January 15, 2013, February 15, 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 2–8);
2. Non-tenure-track, non-AgriLife Extension, faculty (pp 9–10); and
3. Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty (pp 11–17).

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.
 - d. Indicators of satisfactory teaching performance is defined as
 - Presenting accurate, up-to-date, well-organized information and content.
 - Demonstrating interest in the course subject and the process of teaching.
 - Receiving acceptable or better teaching evaluations.
 - Satisfactorily resolving student complaints.
 - e. Reasons for judging teaching performance as unsatisfactory include
 - Significantly negative student or peer evaluations.
 - Regular and unresolved student complaints.
 - Presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information.
 - Disorganized presentation of course materials
 - Poor communication of course requirements.
 - Inability or unwillingness to address items above.

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.
 - d. Indicators of satisfactory research performance include
 - Regular publication in peer reviewed journals.
 - Involvement in graduate student training.
 - Pursuit of extramural research support.
 - Performance of other scholarly activities such as attendance at scientific meetings, authorship of review articles, electronic publications, or publication in popular/non-refereed journals.
 - e. Unsatisfactory research performance may include
 - Lack of publication in peer-reviewed journals.
 - Failure to participate in training of graduate students.
 - Unwillingness to seek extramural research support.
 - Absence of other scholarly activities.
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 tasks forces.
 - Please refer to the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension section in the document for additional, appropriate indicators of meritorious service performance.
- d. Criteria for judging service performance as satisfactory include
- Regular attendance at faculty meetings.
 - Participation in faculty activities such as recruiting or orientation of students.
 - Service on departmental, college, or university committees when asked.
 - Performance of requested service to the larger scientific/professional community in the form of grant or journal article reviewing.
 - Active participation in scientific/professional societies.
- e. Unsatisfactory service performance would include
- Failure to attend faculty meetings regularly.
 - Refusal to serve on departmental, college, or university committees.
 - Lack of participation in the broader scientific/professional community or societies.
4. A faculty member's performance may be evaluated to be in the category of "needs improvement" in any of the areas teaching, research, or service if the performance is assessed to be meritorious or satisfactory by some criteria but unsatisfactory by another criterion/other criteria.
5. Performance expectations in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service should be specified as a percentage, totaling 100% in the three areas. These percentages should be determined by the department head and the faculty member in the initial appointment and addressed annually in the faculty member's review. Adjustments/changes in the percentages should be noted in the annual review document. As the percentage in performance expectation decreases, the expectation for performance quantity decreases but does not decrease to zero/no expectation.

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:

- A. Explain the department head's decision; it should not merely summarize the candidate's achievements but rather substantiate the department head's decision.
- B. Explain why the candidate does or does not deserve endorsement by the dean or director.
- C. Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case.
- D. Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
- E. Explain special consideration cases (e.g., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances).
- F. 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 or vice-chair (if the committee chair is not tenured) and two other tenured professors elected annually by departmental professors.
3. The peer evaluation committee will conduct reviews of faculty members as requested and periodic peer reviews (post tenure reviews for tenured faculty) independent of the department head once every six years as described below. The results of each 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/criterion used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.
- a. Operationally, these items are referred to as the merit matrix.
 - b. The merit matrix is used to calculate a faculty merit score that is used primarily for awarding merit raises.
 - c. The merit matrix is weighted 70% research, 20% teaching, and 10% service. These weights do NOT, however, indicate the percent load/assignment/expectation in each of these three areas. Rather, those percentages are established upon hire and are discussed and adjusted as agreed upon annually by the faculty member and the department head.
 - d. 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.
 - a. 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."
 - b. If the department head reviews a faculty member as "meritorious" or "satisfactory," the faculty member may request that the Faculty Peer Evaluation 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 and the faculty member requests it, 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. An annual review resulting in an overall "unsatisfactory" performance will state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean.
 18. The report to the dean of each unsatisfactory performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and the department head, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, the department head may request a periodic peer review of the faculty member.
 19. If a faculty member received a "needs improvement" rating in a single category, he or she must work with his or her department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In research or service, this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of "needs improvement" can stay as "needs

- improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met; otherwise, the rating will be changes to “unsatisfactory.”
20. To ensure consistency over time, the department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means.
- C. Periodic Peer Review/Post Tenure Review
1. Prior to the sixth anniversary of the date of the awarding of tenure or receiving an academic promotion 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. The purposes of this Periodic Peer Review is to assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member, provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; assist the faculty member to enhance professional skills and goals, and refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.
 2. The Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee shall use in its reviews the criteria established for the annual review of faculty members as its performance criteria and standards of performance (Section VI. C. of this document).
 3. The materials reviewed by the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will be the annual review materials. However, rather than a single year’s materials, the committee may examine materials from three annual reviews at its request or at the request of the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member may also summarize his or her performance in a document, including statements concerning professional development, professional skills and goals, and anticipated or desired refocusing of academic and professional efforts.
 4. If a faculty member is reviewed by the Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee as described in section IX. B. as part of an annual review, then this review fulfills the requirements for a Periodic Peer Review.
 5. Additional responsibilities of the committee and additional procedures related to periodic peer review are detailed in Sections 3.3 through 7. of Standard Administrative Procedure, 12.06.99.M0.01 Post Tenure Review.
 6. The Faculty Peer Evaluation Committee will report its Post Tenure Review to the faculty member and to 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 or 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 for the position/vacancy 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 or above 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 2–8).

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, Annual Review, and Post Tenure 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 Communications
 - 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