

Plant Pathology and Microbiology

Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Review

Tenure

Tenure refers to the entitlement of a faculty member to serve in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is irrevocable except as specified in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Generally, guidelines for tenure and promotion are established by individual departments within the context set by the guidelines established by their college, which in turn must abide by the university guidelines and University Rule 12.01.99.M2: University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. College and departmental guidelines can be found on the department guidelines for tenure and promotion page.

Forms

Templates are available for documentation with respect to several aspects of the tenure and promotion process: dossier cover sheets, grants, external reviewers, and college-wide tracking of faculty candidates for tenure and promotion. These are available at (<http://dof.tamu.edu>).

Relevant University Rules

University Rule 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion

The Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology at Texas A&M University is judged by the quality of its academic, extension and research programs and the total contributions of its faculty. Because of this, the department seeks to hire and retain faculty members who develop distinguished teaching, research and extension programs. Excellence in teaching and research supervision at the graduate and undergraduate levels is also considered critical to departmental success as is contributing to the profession, colleagues and society through sharing of time and professional expertise both within and outside the University community.

This document describes the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology policy and procedures for promotion and/or tenure of its faculty members. The general procedures for evaluation at the College, University and Systems levels following Departmental evaluation are also described.

The policies and procedures for promotion described in this document apply to both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, except that the stated teaching criteria do not apply to non-tenure track faculty whose positions do not require them to teach organized college courses. The annual program review and recommendation for promotion to higher rank for faculty located at Research and Extension Centers will be the responsibility of the Department Head and the appropriate Resident Director.

Tenure and Promotion

Individual Duties

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to be aware of the criteria for promotion within the Department, College, University, and System and to meet or exceed these criteria to be promoted and/or be granted tenure. Faculty members should insure that their required documentation is current and complete. The faculty documentation file will include:

1. A current position description prepared and signed by the faculty member and the Department Head and Resident Director, as appropriate. Duties and responsibilities of the position with regard to extension, instruction, and/or research programs should be clearly stated. The position description will be reviewed annually with the faculty member by the Department Head and Resident Director, as appropriate.
2. An Annual Plan of Work consistent with the position description which reflects in detail the objectives and tasks to be accomplished during the coming fiscal year. This document is prepared by the faculty member for consultation with the Department Head and Resident Director, as appropriate. The Annual Plan of Work for the previous year is to be utilized as a point of reference in the evaluation process.
3. A cumulative, comprehensive Achievement Report of extension, instruction, research and public service for the faculty member's professional lifetime, including copies of no more than five publications selected by the candidate. This report will be used in support of recommendations for promotion and tenure.
4. A list of three (3) to six (6) referees who are external to the System and whom the candidate believes are capable of critical evaluation of the candidate's merit for promotion and/or tenure. Additional reference(s) will be obtained from those not provided by the candidate. More details on references are provided on the final page of this document.

The official P&T calendar and Recommendations for improving the P&T dossier can be found at (<http://agriflife.org/hrfaculty/>).

When called upon for written evaluations, each referee will be provided with the departmental criteria used for promotion and tenure, a current Curriculum Vitae of the candidate, and the candidate's statement of teaching, research, extension, and service as appropriate.

Departmental Duties

Individual Promotion and Mentoring Committees:

- An Individualized Promotion and Mentoring Committee (IPMC) is assigned during the first two years of the individual's residence in the department.
- The Department Head cannot be a member of the IPMC.
- The committee will consist of five faculty, with one faculty member serving as chair. The committee members are selected by the Department Head after consultation with the candidate. The candidate has the right to reject proposed members of the committee.
- This committee will evaluate and advise the candidate for the entire period leading up to the tenure evaluation (or promotion evaluation for Research or Extension faculty).
- The function of the IPMC is to mentor and evaluate the candidate and to represent the needs of the candidate to the Department Head.
- At the appropriate times, based on the candidate's tenure/promotion clock, the committee evaluates the candidate's bid for promotion. The IPMC assists the candidate in the preparation of the midterm dossier (see below for details on the mid-term review process) and the dossier and other materials required for tenure and promotion (or promotion as appropriate for Research and Extension faculty).
- As the committee knows the candidate well, the committee assists the Department Head in the selection of appropriate outside reviewers.
- The committee jointly writes three summary statements, one evaluating the candidate's contributions to teaching, one for research (or extension as appropriate) and a third for service. The committee votes and provides the three summaries, an overall summation, and the vote tally to the Departmental T&P Committee (DTPC) with a copy to the Department Head.

Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC):

In August of the final year of evaluation of a candidate for tenure and promotion, promotion to full professor, or promotion for Research/Extension faculty, the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC) receives the IPMC summary reports, its overall summation and final vote. The DTPC reviews the candidate's packet and the materials submitted by the IPMC. The committee discusses and writes three summary statements evaluating the candidate's contributions to teaching, research and service (or extension as appropriate). The committee can use or modify the summations provided by the IPMC or write independent summaries. The

DTPC votes and provides the vote tally, the individual summary statements, and an overall summation of the candidate to the Department Head.

Specifics of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion (DTPC) Committee:

- This committee is the group whose vote is forwarded to the college as the official *faculty* vote on the candidate.
- This is a faculty committee composed of all tenured faculty in the department.
- Only tenured faculty are eligible to vote on tenure cases.
- Voting faculty must hold a rank equal or higher than the candidate. Therefore, some members might be ineligible to vote on some candidates (ex. Associate rank cannot evaluate and vote on full rank).
- A member of the IPMC can be a member of the DTPC.
- The Department Head cannot be a member of the DTPC nor can the Department Head participate during the DTPC evaluations of the candidate.
- The actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates must be systematic and uniform across candidates.
- All DTPC members must be active participants in the evaluation process and must read all of the pertinent materials. If a member has not read the dossier they should abstain from voting.
- Minority reports are strongly discouraged. If submitted, the names of the authors must be indicated.

Definitions

Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure or tenure-track status typically is restricted to faculty having a minimum of a 25 percent appointment on a 12-month basis or a 33.3 percent appointment on a 9-month basis with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Texas A&M University.

The probationary period for a faculty member will not exceed seven years of full-time service, beginning with appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor or higher rank. Persons with prior experience may be accorded lesser probationary terms. Persons whose initial appointments to the faculty are at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor are eligible for tenure upon appointment.

The tenure decision for faculty hired without tenure is made no later than the second year prior to the end of the probationary period. Only in exceptional cases will the decision on promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure take place prior to the last probationary year. Such action recognizes the accomplishments of the faculty member in making exceptional progress in the development of research, teaching, and/or extension programs.

Assistant Professors who have served a maximum probationary term will not be recommended for tenure without also being recommended for promotion to Associate Professor. The probationary period should in no way restrict the awarding of merit salary increases.

Decisions to dismiss a non-tenured faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, to deny the renewal of the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member, or to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and will be consistent with University and System policy [<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>]

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will be based on the documentation of superior achievement in extension, teaching, research, and professional activities. Consideration may be given to promotion of an individual whenever criteria as set forth in the following section are met. There is no definite maximum period designated for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

Non-tenure Track Faculty

Extension and research faculty who do not have a formal teaching appointment that puts them in the tenure track will be considered for promotion but not tenure. The eligibility requirements and requirements for promotion of non-tenured faculty are the same as those for tenured faculty except that the formal teaching function is not required. For these faculty, the recommendation of the Department Head and Resident Director, as appropriate, will also become a part of the promotion package.

Mid-Term Review

(3-Year Review for 7-Year Probationary Period)

(<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/faculty/annual-midtermguidelines.pdf>)

The Mid-Term Review often takes place in the third year since the hire date. Tenure-track faculty with a probationary period of 7 years are required (by University Rule 12.01099.M2) to have a Mid-Term Review.

Purpose

The purpose of the Mid-Term Review is mentoring. The decisions and opinions of the Head, Resident Director, Associate Head, and P&T Committee are not final. The Mid-Term Review informs faculty members as to their progression towards promotion and/or tenure with sufficient time to allow deficiencies in the dossier materials to be corrected. The Annual Review by the Head, Resident Director or Associate Head for TCE allows annual mentoring. The Mid-Term Review gives candidates an indication as to how the Tenure and Promotion Committee views

their progress towards promotion. Candidates are expected to confer with their mentoring committee in preparation for the mid-term review.

Mandatory for all Faculty – TAMU, AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension

Mid-Term Reviews are mandatory for TAMU faculty with seven year probationary periods. Since the main purpose of the Mid-Term Review is mentoring, departmental policy also requires Mid-Term Reviews for Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension faculty, both on-campus and off-campus.

Process

The Mid-Term Review should be similar to the tenure/promotion review process, including the submission of a dossier. However, no outside letters are sought; but internal letters of recommendation can be included. The Mid-Term Review packet is put together according to the Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Packages for that year (http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/tenure_guide.doc).

At the discretion of the Head, Resident Director or Associate Head for Texas AgriLife Extension, the Mid-Term Review can take the place of the Annual Review during the year of the Mid-Term Review.

The Mid-Term review package goes only to the level of Dean of the College, or Directors of Texas AgriLife Research or Texas AgriLife Extension.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

General Policy

The criteria for promotion or promotion and tenure in Plant Pathology and Microbiology, as described below, are identical for both; that is, promotion and/or tenure are/is recommended only if the candidate meets the criteria for promotion to the next higher rank (distinguished professorships excepted).

Associate Professor:

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires demonstration and evidence of superior performance in extension, instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. Evidence of a substantive research or extension program including peer-reviewed publications relevant to the job description of the candidate, success at grant acquisition, and other evidence of successful extension and/or research activities is required. If appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of instructional competence is also required for advancement to this grade. Other professional and scientific activities, as well as efforts in international, national, regional, state, and university programs are positive factors. The candidate must be establishing a clear national/international reputation as appropriate for their area of expertise.

Professor:

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of superior and sustained performance as a leader in extension, instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. Evidence of superior achievement in one or more of these three functions is required of a Full Professor. The relative importance of the three functions is determined by the position description.

Publications that provide evidence of a distinguished extension or research program and, if appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of superior instructional competence are required. The candidate should have achieved national and international recognition within the scope of research, extension, and instruction functions in the individual's job description. Significant service contributions to the Department, College, and University are expected through committee assignments and leadership roles, and by visible participation in professional and scientific societies at the national/international level.

Measures that may weigh heavily in evaluation for promotion to Professor include quality of instruction, research; including the quality of research performed under the candidates supervision; success at grant acquisition; participation in Departmental, College, and University business; and participation in appropriate activities with commodity organizations and state and federal agencies.

Annual Faculty Reviews

(<http://dof.tamu.edu>)

Annual Review

An annual review will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer, Instructor, Librarian (I, II, III, or IV), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the administration and faculty. Annual review provides valuable information to the department head about the faculty members' accomplishments and to the faculty members with regard to the department head's assessment of their progress in their discipline and in the context of department goals.

Guidelines for Annual Review

Annual review guidelines are established by departments within the context set by the guidelines established by the college. According to University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion, each faculty member, regardless of title, must be reviewed annually, must be given a written report of his or her evaluation, and must be given the opportunity to discuss the outcome of the evaluation in person. UR 12.01.99.M2,

§2.5.3 further states, “to ensure consistency over time, each department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means. Annual review procedures for the department shall be approved by the respective college dean before publication and shall be reviewed by the Dean of Faculties for consistency with this section. The creation and modification of this document should be a product of joint deliberation by faculty members and the department head. If there is no need for department specific guidelines, a college-wide document, developed jointly by faculty and administrators and reviewed by the Dean of Faculties, is sufficient.” Please contact your department head for a copy of your Annual Review Guidelines.

Annual Faculty Review

Each academic year, faculty are requested to submit the following in advance of their annual faculty review with the Department Head:

1. Faculty Achievement Report (for the past Calendar year).

A. Teaching.

- Undergraduate courses taught.
- Graduate courses taught.
- Direction of graduate students (as major advisor, service on committees, post-doctoral supervision).
- Advising activities.
- Teaching improvement activities.
- Other teaching accomplishments.

B. Creation of Knowledge or Creative Activities

- Percentage budgeted time.
- Current research projects.
- Acquisition of research funds.
- Documentation of research and other scholarly activity (peer reviewed publications, non-peer reviewed, abstracts, chapters).
- Laboratory safety.
- Technology transfer.
- Service activities.

C. Service/Engagement

- Departmental.
- College.
- University.
- Profession.

D. Honors and Awards.

E. Summary of Achievement of Objectives from Previous Plan of Work.

2. Current Position Description.
3. Abbreviated 2-page CV.
4. Impact Statement.
5. Teaching evaluations for the current year.
6. Annual Plan of Work for next period.

Procedure:

The Department Head reads and prepares a summary of the faculty member's activities for the immediate past calendar year and the faculty member's plans for the next reporting period.

A meeting is scheduled between the Department Head and the faculty member between February and April. During this 2-3 hour meeting all aspects of faculty performance are discussed, including teaching, research, service, and laboratory safety. Areas of excellence are discussed as well as any areas that could use improvement. The Annual Plan of Work is also discussed. The Department Head makes constructive comments and suggestions to help ensure the continued success of the faculty member both for the immediate future and which will be useful for subsequent promotion if appropriate.

The faculty member is provided the summary document and will add additional information as needed or requested by the Department Head plus any clarifications. The faculty member also has the opportunity to add comments to the summary document.

The Department Head modifies the summary document based on the input of the faculty member and provides a revised version to the faculty member.

When the document is satisfactory, the Department Head and the faculty member sign the evaluation.

Copies are kept by the department Head and placed in the faculty member's personnel files.

Post-tenure Review

(<http://dof.tamu.edu>)

1. General

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual performance reviews benchmarked to faculty and administrator generated standards for satisfactory performance. Post-tenure review is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected productivity.

2. Post-tenure Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all faculty members and must result in a written document stating the department head's evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities. In addition, the expectations for the ensuing evaluation period for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority, must also be in the document. In order for the annual review to be an integral part of post-tenure review, it will have the additional characteristics:

2.1 In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. The categories established will range from "most meritorious" to "unsatisfactory" by departmental standards.

2.2 An annual review in which an unsatisfactory performance is determined shall state the basis for the ranking in accordance with the criteria.

2.3 A report to the dean of unsatisfactory performance as assessed by annual review will be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement.

3. Professional Review Plan

3.1 Professional Review. A professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. The department head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process.

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

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

3.1.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of professional review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

3.1.4 The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

3.1.5 The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

- 3.1.5.1 no deficiencies identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,
- 3.1.5.2 some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean,
- 3.1.5.3 substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan (see section 4) acceptable to the dean.

4. The Professional Development Plan

4.1 The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria developed under the provision of this rule) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the department head and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- 4.1.1 identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;
- 4.1.2 define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;
- 4.1.3 outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;
- 4.1.4 set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;
- 4.1.5 indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;
- 4.1.6 identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

4.2 Assessment.

The faculty member and department head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.

4.3 Completion of the Plan.

When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community. If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

5. Appeal

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of University Rule 12.01.99.M4 "**Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights.**"

If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.

6. Voluntary Post-tenure Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of the counsel of a professional review committee in evaluating his or her career may request such counsel by making a request to the department head.