

## **Appendix B. Departmental protocols for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure considerations**

### **Article I. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

#### **A. Purpose**

This document is intended to articulate the policies of the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics for tenure and promotion. The criteria are intended to supplement, but not supersede, those provided by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences ([link](#)) and of the Texas A&M University System ([link](#)) regarding tenure and promotion.

#### **B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

1. The decision to recommend the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor derives from whether, in the judgment of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department as a whole, and the Head, the candidate has established a record that allows for the confident prediction that academic success and positive contributions to the broad and complex mission of the Department will continue and grow. This determination is made by referencing measures of success in research, teaching, and service. Given that initiative, creativity and independence are essential characteristics for success as a faculty member, no fixed rubric for this determination is possible. Instead, the considered judgment of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department as a whole, and the Department Head, will be applied using the guidelines provided below.
2. Research accomplishments will receive the greatest consideration; however teaching accomplishments are also important and necessary in accordance with the individual's division of effort. A willingness to conscientiously perform service to the department and the university community should be demonstrated; however it is not expected that the candidate's service contributions will be extensive.
3. Except in unusual circumstances, the decisions to recommend the awarding of tenure and the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are made concurrently and are based on the same criteria.
  - a. Generally research accomplishments are measured by peer-reviewed primary publications. Ideally all research publications are evaluated individually based on the significance and impact of the research results reported. However, it is unavoidable that many individuals asked to evaluate research accomplishment will not have a high level of specific expertise in the candidate's field and will use

- measures, such as number of publications and quality of journals, to help inform their assessment.
- b. A successful candidate must demonstrate the development of a research program that is nationally competitive. Research grants obtained after rigorous peer-review at the national level are important indicators of such competitiveness. Highly meritorious peer-review scores of applications that miss funding cutoffs by narrow margins may also provide information that will positively inform this criterion.
  - c. A research program must attract sufficient external funding to be sustainable. Consequently research funding, and prospects for continued and/or future funding, is an important assessment criterion.
  - d. National recognition should be demonstrated, as evidenced by participation in national meetings, invitations to present scientific talks and seminars both regionally and nationally, and participation in peer review at the national level.
  - e. The candidate must establish a research program consistent with the educational mission of the department, which includes the training of graduate students, undergraduate students and postdoctoral research associates in the laboratory.
  - f. Opinions of experts outside the Texas A&M System will be asked to evaluate the scientific impact of the candidate's research program. This evaluation usually centers on the significance of research publications and the candidate's success in obtaining research grant funds, particularly those that result from peer-review at the national level, and the reputation the candidate is establishing within a particular field of research.
  - g. It is very important that the candidate show evidence of effective classroom teaching. A measure of effectiveness can be derived from the results of student evaluations, so it is imperative that student evaluations be conducted for every course taught. Additional measures of effectiveness will be derived from a peer examination of coursework materials and the evaluations made by peer visitations to the classroom. Given the limited classroom-teaching experience some new faculty have when first hired, relatively low effectiveness after initial classroom teaching assignments does not by itself raise serious alarm. However, especially in those instances, it is imperative that the candidate can document a serious effort to improve and that improvement is demonstrated.

### **C. Promotion to Professor**

1. In consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor, all the expectations cited above are enhanced and broadened, as indicated below. Research accomplishments continue to be central, with particular attention paid to accomplishments following promotion to Associate Professor. Importantly, these accomplishments should lead to international as well as national recognition.
  - a. Expanding research achievements and impact, as measured by peer-reviewed primary publications, are expected.
  - b. A successful record of achieving external research grants obtained after rigorous peer-review should be demonstrated.

- c. The candidate's research program must have a record of attracting external funding sufficient for its sustainability.
- d. National and international recognition should be demonstrated, as evidenced by participation in meetings, invitations to present scientific talks and seminars and participation in peer review at national and international levels.
- e. The candidate must have established a research program consistent with the educational mission of the department, which includes the training of graduate students, undergraduate students and postdoctoral research associates in the laboratory. It is expected that graduate students will have been mentored to completion of their Ph.D. degrees.
- f. Opinions of experts outside the Texas A&M System will be asked to evaluate the scientific impact of the candidate's research program. This evaluation usually centers on the significance of research publications; the candidate's success in obtaining research grant funds, particularly those that result from peer-review at the national level; and the reputation the candidate has earned within a particular field of research.
- g. The candidate must have a record of effective classroom teaching. Evidence of creativity, innovation and diversity in pedagogy will strengthen the case.
- h. The candidate is expected to not only have served effectively on departmental and university committees, but also to have demonstrated a commitment to leadership in these activities. Service to professional societies and organizations at the regional and national levels is also anticipated.

## **Article II. Post Tenure Review** *(Approved by BCBP Faculty January 30, 2017)*

### **A. Summary**

1. A periodic post tenure peer review will be conducted in the 6<sup>th</sup> academic year following the last comprehensive peer review conducted since the awarding of tenure.
2. Peer review will be conducted by a committee consisting of 2 elected full professors and 1 full professor appointed by the department head, each serving staggered 3-year terms.
3. In those instances when an associate professor with tenure is to be reviewed, the department head will appoint a tenured associate professor to serve as an ad hoc member in place of the regular appointed member of the peer review committee to participate in the review.
4. Those faculty who receive a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" rating in any of 3 major categories of performance (scholarship, teaching, service) will develop a plan in concert with the department head that will lead to improved performance.

### **B. Process**

1. A periodic peer evaluation will be conducted no more than 6-years since the awarding of tenure; promotion following the awarding of tenure; receipt of an honor based on peer evaluation of accomplishments, such as University Distinguished

Professor or Regent's Professor; or a previous Post Tenure Peer Evaluation; whichever has occurred most recently. The peer evaluation will be conducted by a 3-person committee consisting of 2 elected [full] professors and one [full] professor appointed by the Department Head. All members will serve 3-year terms, staggered so that one new member is either elected or appointed each year. The appointed member will be a [full] professor except for the following circumstance: when a tenured Associate Professor is due to be evaluated by the committee, the Department Head shall appoint an ad hoc tenured Associate Professor to serve on the evaluation committee in lieu of the regular appointed member when reviewing that case. All other cases before the committee that year will be reviewed by the regular committee.

2. At the beginning of each academic year the Department Head will notify the members of the faculty who will be subject to the Post Tenure Peer Review, as well as the members of the Post Tenure Peer Review Committee. The faculty to be reviewed will be asked to submit a full CV and any other documents that may be useful for the Committee to address whether the following expectations have been met. After the Committee has performed their evaluation, they will communicate to the Department Head the rating (Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory) they have determined for each of the 3 categories; Scholarship, Teaching, and Service; along with a brief statement regarding the reasons for their determination. The results will be communicated to the Dean and to the respective faculty member by the Department Head.
3. For faculty receiving a rating of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory", the faculty member will meet with the Department Head to develop a plan for improving the performance. This plan should be developed as much as possible by the faculty member. Should resources be required to meet the plan, the Department Head will make every effort to secure those resources. The plan should articulate specific goals and a timeline for achieving those goals. The faculty member and the Department Head should meet subsequently to evaluate progress being made toward meeting the proposed goals, and the plan revised as necessary if appropriate. These subsequent meetings should take place no less frequently than once every 6-months until the goals have been achieved.

### **C. Performance Expectations**

#### **1. Scholarship:**

- a. A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence of active engagement in scholarship such as:
  - 1). Peer-reviewed publications or publication of invited review articles or presentation of research results at a regional or national or international meetings.
  - 2). Efforts to achieve external research funding as evidenced by persistent submission of proposals.
  - 3). Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- b. A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved if engagement with

scholarship is judged to be inadequate such as:

- 1). Active conduct of research or scholarship that have rarely resulted in publication or other means of dissemination.
  - 2). Research proposals being developed that have rarely been submitted or re-submitted.
  - 3). Occasional attendance at research conferences or national meetings, but without presentation of research results.
- c. A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:
- 1). Very little if any research or scholarship actively being conducted.
  - 2). No research grant proposals under development.
  - 3). No attendance at research conferences or national meetings.

## **2. Teaching:**

- a. A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence of conscientious engagement with the educational missions of the Department such as:
- 1). Consistently effective teaching performance as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and/or student outcomes. Occasional difficulties are expeditiously and effectively addressed.
  - 2). Effective direction of research laboratory training of graduate, undergraduate, and/or postdoctoral students as evidenced by student satisfaction and/or student outcomes.
  - 3). Selection for an award based on teaching performance.
  - 4). Development and utilization of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and/or student outcomes.
  - 5). Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
  - 6). Receiving competitive grant support for teaching/learning projects.
  - 7). Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching as evidenced by self- evaluation.
  - 8). Participation on graduate student advisory committees.
  - 9). Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments.
  - 10). Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
  - 11). Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
  - 12). Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- b. A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved if engagement with teaching is judged to be inadequate such as:
- 1). Little evidence of improvement of low classroom performance despite efforts to do so.
  - 2). Students in laboratory not making normal progress.
  - 3). Little innovation or other efforts to improve teaching effectiveness.
- c. A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:

- 1). Poor classroom performance with no effort to improve.
- 2). No students being trained in the laboratory.
- 3). No service on graduate student advisory committees.

**3. Service:**

- a. A rating of 'Satisfactory' can be achieved with evidence of conscientious involvement with professional activities at local and/or national levels such as:
  - 1). Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals.
  - 2). Service as a reviewer for national research organizations.
  - 3). Being a committee chair in a professional organization.
  - 4). Being an officer of a professional organization.
  - 5). Serving as program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organizational meeting.
  - 6). Serving as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
  - 7). Serving on University, college, or departmental committees or task forces.
  - 8). Serving as a consultant.
  - 9). Being an advisor to student organizations.
  - 10). Serving in administrative roles within the Department, College, or University.
  - 11). Evidence of professional service to the local community and/or public at large.
  - 12). Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- b. A rating of 'Needs Improvement' can be achieved by evidence such as:
  - 1). Minimal service on Departmental or University committees.
  - 2). Limited involvement with reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals.
  - 3). Limited professional involvement off campus.
- c. A rating of 'Unsatisfactory' can be achieved with evidence such as:
  - 1). No service on departmental committees.
  - 2). No professional service reviewing manuscripts or grants.
  - 3). No service in professional organizations.