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**This document encompasses two sections. First, the Annual Faculty Review Guidelines developed and followed by the Department Head. Second, the Criteria for Annual Evaluations and 6-years Reviews developed and followed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.**

**SECTION ONE**

**Department Head Annual Faculty Review Guidelines**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences (WFSC) proactively supports promotion and/or tenure (P&T) of faculty who contribute significantly to the teaching, research, extension and service missions of the Department, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension and Texas A&M University. As such, WFSC follows all applicable rules and operating procedures of Texas A&M University and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the other agencies as applicable. Faculty members are expected to use the following guidelines in development and submission of materials for the Annual Faculty Review process.

**ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW**

**Annual Review** (tenured and non‐tenured faculty)

An annual review is conducted for all faculty members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor and Distinguished Professor. The annual review provides information on the accomplishments of the faculty member to the Department Head and guidance from the Department Head to the faculty member regarding assessment of progress.

**Guidelines for Annual Review**

According to University Rule 12.01.99.M2, each faculty member must be reviewed annually, given a written report of his or her evaluation, and must be given the opportunity to discuss the outcome of the evaluation in person. Each academic year, faculty members are requested to submit information related to the following categories in advance of their annual faculty review with the Department Head.

**Faculty Achievement Report** (for the past calendar year)

**Teaching**

* Annual Performance:
* Undergraduate and graduate courses taught
* Chaired and Member of graduate student advisory committees
* Theses and dissertations completed/students graduated
* Graduate and undergraduate mentoring
* Metrics of Excellence:
* Above average student evaluations
* Receiving for a university, college or professional society award for teaching
* Development of innovative teaching methods and materials
* Teaching Honors, Writing Intensive, Communication or Study Abroad courses
* Contributions to student professional training

**Scholarship**

* Annual Performance:
* Published or In Press Manuscripts (peer‐reviewed scientific and non‐refereed technical articles)
* Grant proposals (approved and rejected)
* Presentations at conferences (scientific/industry/commodity), presenter (faculty member/graduate student supervised by faculty), and invited, contributed and published abstract
* Evidence of sustained accomplishments of research program
* Metrics of Excellence:
* Manuscripts published in leading refereed journals
* Books and chapters published
* Significant grantsmanship
* Significant research accomplishments
* Research awards

**Extension** (only faculty with a majority Extension appointment >50%)

* Annual Performance
* Publication of Extension bulletins or reports
* Effective delivery of Extension programs to clientele
* Extramural support of Extension programs (received and rejected)
* Presentations at professional and industry meetings (invited, contributed and published abstract)
* Metrics of Excellence:
* Publication of peer-reviewed articles
* Acquisition of significant extramural funding
* Evidence of national/international program recognition
* Invited presentations at professional meetings
* Evidence of significant impact of Extension program
* Development of distinctive programs
* Extension awards

**Service**

* Annual Performance:
* Committees (University, College, Department)
* Professional organizations (membership and activities)
* Collegiality
* Indicators of Excellence:
* Editorial contributions (editorial board, advisory board, guest review activities)
* Professional leadership (offices held, committees, task forces)
* Professional honors and awards
* Multidisciplinary engagement in international and diversity activities

**Plan of Work** (for subsequent academic year)

**Procedure for Annual Faculty Review Evaluation**

* The Department Head reviews the Faculty Achievement Report and the Plan of Work.
* A consultation is scheduled between the Department Head and faculty member to discuss

all aspects of faculty performance. Areas of excellence and any areas for improvement

are identified. The Department Head offers constructive comments to facilitate the

continued achievement of the faculty member and progress toward advancement.

* The Department Head assigns a ranking (superior, excellent, satisfactory,

needs improvement, or unsatisfactory) for each category (relating to either teaching,

research, extension and/or service) along with an overall ranking and provides a

written summary of the review to the faculty member. The faculty member has an

opportunity to develop written comments to the summary document.

* The Department Head modifies the summary document, if appropriate, based upon the

input from the faculty member.

* Once the summary document is completed, the Department Head and the faculty

member sign the evaluation.

* A copy is provided to the faculty member and a copy is placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.
* A report to the Dean of unsatisfactory performance will be accompanied by a written

plan for improvement. If a faculty member receives three consecutive

unsatisfactory annual reviews from the Department Head and/or P&T Committee, then a professional review is initiated.

**SECTION TWO**

**CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUTIONS and**

**POST-TENURE REVIEW**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

*Faculty Governance: the initial draft of this document was distributed to all WFSC faculty for comment, followed by a formal meeting (14 November 2016) of faculty and the Department Head to discuss, and a subsequent period for additional comments. The resulting document (21 November 2016) reflected the majority consensus of the faculty. The final document incorporates required modifications from the College and Dean of Faculties.*

**INTRODUCTION**

Per Texas A&M University Standard Administrative Procedure document 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review (updated 6 October 2016), criteria are to be set forth for the following rating categories: “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, and “Satisfactory”. These rating categories will be applied to the following performance categories: Research, Teaching and Service, or Extension. Consistent ratings of “Satisfactory” do not necessarily equate to being worthy of tenure or promotion. In remarkably productive years a faculty member may receive a rating of “Exceptional”. Regardless of ratings received in each category, or the overall rating, the primary outcome of the peer review process is that clear written guidance be given to each faculty member, to facilitate improvement of performance.

Under current procedures adhered to by The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences (WFSC) Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T), these criteria will apply on an annual basis to reviews of Associate Professors, and on a 6 year basis for reviews of Professors.

Per the Post-Tenure Review document, these criteria and ratings are also to be considered by the Department Head during his/her annual evaluations of all Associate Professors and Professors.

Further, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences has extended these criteria to include evaluation of Assistant Professors, which will provide for standardization and uniformity across professorial ranks.

During annual and Post-Tenure Reviews, the faculty member and Department Head will develop a current load expectation in research, teaching and service, that will be considered in the next evaluation. In most cases, load expectations will follow a faculty members’ formal position description.

The Post-Tenure Review document sets forth specific rating criteria that would lead to the initiation of Professional Development Review (section 4.1), with respect to tenured faculty. The WFSC P&T Committee will assess performance of Professors across a 6 year period. The WFSC P&T Committee will recommend to the Department Head initiation of Professional Development Review for any Full Professor receiving an overall “Unsatisfactory” on their 6 year review. Because the WFSC P&T Committee evaluates Associate Professors on an annual basis (rather than 6 year basis), criteria are required to establish the initiation of Professional Development Review for that rank (as suggested by section 3.2.5). The WFSC P&T Committee will recommend to the Department Head initiation of Professional Development Review for any Associate Professor receiving three consecutive “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews.

Texas A&M University is a Tier 1 research institution and as such, research productivity will be given added consideration over productivity in Teaching or Service, although strong performance in each of these categories is also expected. In other words, “Satisfactory” performance in Teaching and Service does not compensate for less than satisfactory performance in Research. An exception to this would be above average assigned Teaching or Service, for Professors only; junior faculty should not, in most cases, receive or accept such assignments.

While this document sets forth criteria to be considered, the document should overall be viewed as being fluid, where criteria may be changed or modified in accordance with majority views of the WFSC P&T Committee or higher academic authorities at Texas A&M University.

**PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH.**

The following activities will be considered by the P&T Committee during deliberations:

 1. Publications (number, quality of journal (by discipline), role of author)

 2. Clear evidence of an independent research program.

 3. Collaborative research (highly encouraged, but does not substitute for #2)

 4. Grants and Contracts (both funding received and attempts at funding will be considered)

 5. Graduate Students and their productivity

 6. Undergraduate Research (this may be considered under Teaching if desired, but not in both)

 7. Presentations at meetings (regional, national or international), Invited talks

 8. Clear evidence from the above criteria that the faculty member is developing National recognition (Assistant Professors), International recognition (Associate Professors) or maintaining recognition in both (Professors)

 9. Other activities as warranted

The WFSC P&T Committee will reach a majority rating consensus for this category based on thorough deliberations of the material presented to them. Publications will be an important factor in these deliberations. As such, faculty members are encouraged to maintain a strong publication rate, although the committee is free to assess publication quality and author line position. The Departmental average for publications for the time period 2013-15 are: 5.1 (2013), 4.68 (2014) and 5.5 (2015). Faculty should meet, or be very close to this level of publications, to be considered for a ranking of Satisfactory; publication performance, along with performance in other activities will guide the P&T committee in assigning an overall Research ranking.

As a purely hypothetical example, a faculty member might have four publications in a year. If the faculty member was one of many authors on all four papers (and not first or senior (typically last author)) where their contribution is less clear, the P&T committee could find overall research productivity less than satisfactory, despite strong performance in other activities. Therefore, faculty members are strongly encouraged to insure that they are first or senior author on publications every year; this would be indicative of an independent research program.

**PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR TEACHING.**

The following will be considered by the P&T Committee during deliberations:

 1. Student evaluations of courses. In order to increase response rates thereby providing more information for the P&T Committee and Department Head to evaluate, faculty of all ranks are expected to distribute paper copies of evaluations to students, rather than online evaluations. From these evaluations, the following will be considered:

 A. Overall mean

 B. Scores in each evaluation category

 C. Written comments

2. Grade distributions. Courses with highly skewed grade distributions may be indicative of issues that would require further assessment by the P&T Committee or Department Head.

3. Peer reviews of lectures (undergraduate courses). Faculty will receive 2 independent, written assessments of lectures annually. Timing of these assessments will be at the discretion of the reviewer, and at least one review must be performed by a faculty member familiar with the subject material. We do encourage faculty to interact with the Center for Teaching Excellence in this regard, as they will have insights beyond basic content. Assistant Professors are not expected to evaluate lectures of Associate Professors or Professors, but are not precluded from doing so. Further, peer evaluations will look for promotion of student motivation and engagement, and effectiveness of pedagogical approach.

4. Undergraduate Research (this may be considered under Research if desired, but not in both)

5. Other factors as warranted

The WFSC P&T Committee will reach a majority rating consensus for this category based on thorough deliberations of the material presented to them. WFSC faculty typically score very well on evaluations, and overall means > 4 are often considered Satisfactory; however the departmental average across classes is typically ca. 4.5 and faculty are expected to show year over year improvement of scores that are below that average. Low scores in any individual student evaluation category will be discussed in depth. While student evaluations often weigh most heavily in a Satisfactory ranking (e.g., ca. 4.5 score), mostly positive Peer Review comments are also important for a Satisfactory ranking to be assigned as is evidence of a rigorous course.

**PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR SERVICE.**

Service in the following areas is expected of all faculty members:

1. Service to Students, e.g., advising student groups and clubs; providing letters of recommendation; advising students on career options and opportunities.

2. Service to the department, college, or university, e.g., participation or leadership on committees or in special assignments; participation or leadership in faculty governance.

3. Service to the discipline or profession, e.g., demonstrable time and effort dedicated to the advancement of one’s discipline through participation in academic societies; serving as a journal editor or reviewer of scholarly works; reviewing funding proposals, participating in federal grant review panels; engagement with local, state, and federal agencies or institutions related to the discipline; other demonstrated activities that can be shown to advance the discipline or profession.

Service from these areas will be considered collectively by the P&T Committee during deliberations. However, Assistant Professors are expected to have reduced requirements for committee participation at Department, College, and University levels. The following criteria may be considered by the P&T Committee during deliberations:

 1. Main Advisor of graduate students and on the committee of other graduate students.

 2. Member of Department, College, or University committees.

 3. Advisor to student chapters.

 4. Reviews manuscripts for journals.

 5. Is a member of an editorial Board or an Associate Editor of a scientific journal.

 6. Participates in committees for scientific societies.

 7. Chairs sessions and organizes scientific meetings.

 8. Participates on review panels for NSF, NIH, EPA or other funding agencies.

 9. Serves as ad hoc reviewer for NSF, NIH, EPA or other funding agencies.

 10. Provides support to state and federal agencies when requested.

 11. Serves on Boards and governance committees of governmental bodies and scientific societies.

 12. Curatorial duties (if part of appointment).

 13. Other factors as warranted.

A Satisfactory ranking in Service will be related to an assessment of a faculty member’s participation in the above categories according to academic rank. Assistant Professors should focus primarily on categories that support their Research (e.g., peer and ad hoc reviews, review panels, service to societies); Associate Professors should maintain productivity in those categories, while showing increased productivity on committees; Professors should maintain productivity in those categories, with possible expansion (e.g., Chairing key committees).