

# GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

November 13, 2020

## Contents

1.	Introduction .....	7
2.	Faculty Tracks and Ranks .....	8
2.1	Tenure-Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions .....	9
2.1.1	Instructor .....	9
2.1.2	Assistant Professor .....	9
2.1.3	Associate Professor .....	9
2.1.4	Professor .....	9
2.1.5	University Distinguished Professor .....	10
2.2	Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Positions .....	10
2.2.1	Assistant Lecturer .....	10
2.2.2	Lecturer .....	10
2.2.3	Senior Lecturer .....	10
2.2.4	Clinical Assistant Professor .....	11
2.2.5	Clinical Associate Professor .....	11
2.2.6	Clinical Professor .....	12
2.2.7	Executive Faculty .....	12
2.2.8	Visiting Faculty .....	13
2.2.9	Multi-Year Appointments .....	13
2.3	Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process .....	14
2.3.1	Endowed Chair .....	14
2.3.2	Endowed Professorship .....	14
2.3.3	Endowed Lectureships .....	15
2.3.4	Selection .....	15
2.3.5	Appointment .....	16
2.3.6	Evaluation and Reappointment .....	16
2.3.7	Budgetary Guidelines .....	17
2.4	ABD Faculty Appointment Process .....	18

3.	Areas of Faculty Performance .....	19
3.1	Teaching .....	20
3.2	Research and Publication .....	21
3.3	Service .....	21
4.	Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness .....	22
4.1	Indicators of excellent performance in teaching .....	23
4.2	Indicators of effective performance in teaching .....	23
4.3	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in teaching .....	24
4.4	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching .....	24
4.5	Indicators of excellent performance in research and publication .....	25
4.6	Indicators of effective performance in research and publication .....	25
4.7	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in research and publication ..	26
4.8	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research and publication .....	26
4.9	Indicators of excellent performance in service .....	27
4.10	Indicators of effective performance in service .....	27
4.11	Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in service .....	28
4.12	Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service .....	28
5.	Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure .....	29
5.1	Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty .....	29
5.1.1	Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion to an Associate Professor Position with Tenure .....	29
5.1.2	Performance Expectations for Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to a Professor Position .....	30
5.2	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty .....	32
5.2.1	Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Senior Lecturer .....	32
5.2.2	Clinical or Executive Assistant Professor Seeking a Promotion to Clinical or Executive Associate Professor .....	32
5.2.3	Clinical or Executive Associate Professor Seeing Promotion to Clinical or Executive Professor .....	33
5.3	Promotion and/or Tenure Review Processes .....	34
5.3.1	Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty .....	34
	Initiating the Process .....	34
	Role of the Candidate .....	34
	Role of the Departmental Faculty .....	34
	Role of the Department Head .....	36

Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	36
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair.....	37
Role of the Executive Associate Dean .....	37
Role of the Dean.....	38
5.3.2 Promotion Review Process for Academic Professional Track Faculty.....	38
Initiating the Process .....	38
Role of the Candidate .....	39
Role of Departmental Faculty .....	39
Role of the Department Head.....	40
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	40
Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair.....	41
Role of the Executive Associate Dean .....	41
Role of the Dean.....	42
5.3.3 Faculty Notification during Promotion and Tenure Processes.....	42
5.3.4 Time Table .....	43
6. Annual Review .....	44
6.1 Purpose .....	45
6.2 Focus .....	45
6.3 Time Period of the Annual Review .....	45
6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance .....	45
6.4.1. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching .....	46
6.4.2. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Research and Publication.....	46
6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Service .....	46
6.5 Required Components .....	47
6.5.1 Faculty Member’s Report of Previous Activities.....	47
6.5.2 Written Document Describing the Department Head’s Evaluation .....	47
6.5.3 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member.....	48
6.5.4 Performance Assessment.....	48
6.6 Assessment Outcomes Requiring Action for Tenured Faculty Members.....	48
6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance .....	48
6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance .....	49
6.7 Time Line .....	49
6.8 Complaint Procedure for Failing to Follow Guidelines .....	49
7. Mid-Term Review .....	50

7.1 Purpose .....	50
7.2 Process.....	50
7.3 Feedback from the Mid-Term Review and Non-Renewal of Faculty Appointment.....	52
7.4 Non-reappointment of Untenured Assistant Professors at Other Times .....	53
7.5 Non-reappointment of Academic Professional Track faculty.....	54
8. Post-Tenure Review .....	56
8.1 Purpose .....	56
8.2 Periodic Peer Review Committee.....	57
8.3 Process.....	57
8.3.1. Process when Research Council Makes a Favorable Recommendation on the Appointment to an Endowed Position.....	57
8.3.2 Process in All other Cases.....	58
8.3.3 Submitting to the Dean of Faculties Office.....	59
8.4 Professional Development Review .....	59
8.5 The Professional Development Plan .....	61
8.5.1 Assessment .....	61
8.5.2 Completing the Professional Development Plan.....	62
8.6 Appeal .....	62
8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review .....	62
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status.....	63
9.1 Process.....	63
9.2 Eligibility Criteria.....	63
9.3 Privileges .....	64
Appendix A: Transition to Retirement Program .....	65
A.1 Overview .....	65
A.2 Eligibility .....	65
A.3 Phased Transition Period.....	65
A.4 Modifying the Phased Transition Period.....	66
A.5 Percentage Effort and Workload .....	66
A.6 Compensation and Benefits .....	66
A.7 Other Considerations .....	67
A.8 Process for Requesting Transition to Retirement.....	67
A.9 Administrative Provisions .....	67

Application Form: Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program Proposal .....	68
Appendix B: Faculty Workload Guidelines .....	69
B.1 Workload Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty .....	69
B.1.1. Nominal Teaching Loads.....	69
B.1.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances.....	70
B.1.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads.....	71
B.1.4. Course Buy-Out.....	71
B.2 Workload Guidelines for Academic Professional Track Faculty .....	71
B.2.1. Nominal Teaching Loads.....	71
B.2.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances.....	72
B.2.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads.....	73
Appendix C: Promotion and Tenure Dossier .....	75
C.1. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Candidate .....	75
Section 1: Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service .....	75
Section 2: Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae.....	75
Section 3: Grant Summary Chart .....	76
Section 4: Verification of Contents Statement.....	76
Section 5: Faculty Data Table .....	76
Section 6: Faculty Biography .....	76
Section 7: Candidate External Review Checklist.....	77
Section 8: Teaching Portfolio.....	77
Section 9: Research Portfolio.....	77
Section 10: Service Portfolio.....	78
Section 11: Other Activities .....	78
C.1.1. Exceptions for APT Faculty Members .....	79
C.1.2. Exceptions for Mid-Term Reviews .....	79
C.2. Dossier Materials Included Submitted by the Department and College.....	79
Section 1: Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet.....	79
Section 2: Department Evaluation Teaching Report.....	79
Section 3: Department Evaluation of Research or Other Scholarly Activities Report .....	80
Section 4: Department Evaluation of Service Report .....	81
Section 5: Department Evaluation of Other Activities Report.....	81
Section 6: External Reviewer Chart .....	81

Section 7: Department External Reviewer Checklist .....	82
Section 8: External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Request .....	82
Section 9: External Reviewer Biographies/Justifications .....	83
Section 10: External Evaluations .....	83
Section 11: Department P&T Committee Discussion Report & Recommendation .....	83
Section 12: Department Head Recommendation .....	85
Section 13: College P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation	85
Section 14: Dean Recommendation .....	85
Section 15: Other Materials and Documentation .....	86
Appendix D: Hiring Faculty with Tenure-upon-Hire and/or at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor .....	87
D.1. Regular Process .....	87
D.2. Expedited Tenure Review for the Rank of Professor .....	87
D.3. Contingencies in Offer Letters .....	87
Appendix E: University Distinguished Professor Nomination Guidelines .....	89
E.1. Eligibility Criteria .....	89
E.1.1 Scope of the Award.....	89
E.1.2. Eligibility .....	90
E.2 Nomination Process .....	91
E.2.1 Role of the Candidate.....	92
E.2.2 Role of the Department Head .....	92
E.2.3 Role of the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship.....	93
E.2.4 Role of Faculty UDP Review Committee.....	94
E.2.5 Role of the Executive Associate Dean.....	95
E.2.6 The Joint Roles of ADRS and Dean .....	96
E.3 Nomination Dossier .....	97
E.3.1. Materials Submitted by the Candidate .....	97
E.3.2 Materials Submitted by the Department Head.....	97
E.3.3 Materials Submitted by the Dean.....	98
Appendix F: Adoption and Revision of Mays Guidelines .....	99
F.1. Adoption.....	99
F.2. Revisions .....	100
F.3. Technical Corrections. ....	100

# 1. Introduction

With respect to a vision, Texas A&M University notes that it is “dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity.” Consistent with the focus of the university’s mission, Mays Business School’s *vision* is “To Advance the World’s Prosperity.” Supporting efforts to fulfill this vision are the School’s *mission*: to be a vibrant learning organization that creates impactful knowledge and develops transformational leaders. Appropriate evaluation and review guidelines and reward structures for faculty members to facilitate their pursuit of the School’s vision and mission are essential.

The mission of Texas A&M University and the vision and mission of Mays Business School are not static. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. However, it is necessary, desirable, and feasible to establish a general set of guidelines and criteria for the various faculty positions that are congruent with the mission and core values of Texas A&M University and with Mays Business School’s vision and mission.

The expectations of Mays Business School for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among research and publication, teaching, and service and that they achieve *excellence* and *effectiveness* while completing their work. The nature of scholarly innovation requires flexibility and freedom to pursue value-creating research, teaching, and service projects. Because of this, Mays does not use a single set of metrics to evaluate faculty performance.

In addition to detailing performance expectations and indicators of desired performances, this document serves as the basis for discussions between faculty members and their Department Heads regarding the setting of individual annual and long-term goals that best align with the mission Texas A&M University and the vision and mission of Mays Business School. (Herein, we use the term Department Head broadly to identify the leadership position with whom faculty members interact and to whom they report. Associate Deans, for example, report to the Dean while Department Heads report to the Executive Associate Dean. Thus, the term Department Head in this document references the leader with whom a faculty member has a direct reporting relationship.) Typically, the formal communication regarding a faculty member’s progress is a Department Head’s direct responsibility and includes written documentation that becomes a part of the faculty member’s personnel file.

This document articulates college-level guidelines the five academic departments housed in Mays Business School use for processes related to faculty members’ activities and contributions (e.g., annual performance reviews, promotion and tenure procedures, and Periodic and Post-Tenure review activities). In a few instances, there are slight

variances across departments with respect to implementing certain processes. We describe these variances in appropriate sections of this document.

The document’s contents are consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

TITLE	LINK
12.01.01- Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure	<a href="http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf">http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf</a>
12.01.99.M2 - University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion – Appendix I	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
12.06.99.M0.01 - Post-Tenure Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual & Mid-Term Review	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules">http://dof.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules</a>
Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (published annually)	<a href="http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/">http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/</a>

We seek consistency between Mays’ Guidelines and those of Texas A&M University and the Texas A&M University System. Thus, in the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M University System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System positions take precedence.

We include six appendices at the end of the document. Their content speaks to additional details regarding the policies and processes explained in the document itself:

- In Appendix A we provide guidelines for Mays faculty who are transitioning to retirement
- In Appendix B we provide the faculty workload guidelines at Mays
- In Appendix C we provide guidelines for promotion and tenure dossiers
- In Appendix D we provide guidelines for tenure-upon-hire
- In Appendix E we provide guidelines for nominations for the University Distinguished Professor award
- In Appendix F we detail the process for approving and amending this document.

## 2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

Definitions of faculty ranks and tracks are available from University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion—see section 1). At Mays, there are several categories of faculty with variant performance expectations.



## ***2.1 Tenure-Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions***

### *2.1.1 Instructor*

This is a tenure-track appointment that Mays uses for a person recruited to be an Assistant Professor on tenure-track, but who has not finished all requirements for the appropriate terminal degree prior to the beginning of the appointment. Upon evidence of completion of the expected degree, the appointment title changes to Assistant Professor. We expect Instructors to make significant contributions in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, and service.

### *2.1.2 Assistant Professor*

At a minimum, an Assistant Professor's performances should demonstrate *effectiveness* in teaching and *excellence* in terms of research and publication. The focus of service contributions, while normally limited, is on departmental and Mays academic needs. Further, Assistant Professors should display evidence of progress toward meeting the criteria and performance indicators Mays uses to evaluate candidates' request for promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure.

### *2.1.3 Associate Professor*

At a minimum, an Associate Professor's performance should demonstrate *effectiveness* in the three performance dimensions. In addition, the School expects demonstration of an *excellent* performance in either the research and publication or the teaching performance dimension. Typically, Associate Professors seek *excellence* in terms of research and publication. Although the three performance dimensions are part of the promotion process, research and publication commonly carries the largest weight in the promotion decision. Associate Professors, relative to Assistant Professors, should exhibit increased contributions in terms of service that result in an *effective* or an *excellent* rating in this performance area.

### *2.1.4 Professor*

Professors should demonstrate leadership in pursuing *excellence* and gain national and international prominence because of their contributions. Professors may lead by (1) contributing to the body of knowledge through *excellence* in their research and publication contributions; (2) mentoring junior faculty; (3) excelling in teaching as shown by satisfying one or more of the criteria and performance indicators associated with *excellence* within this performance area; and (4) demonstrating *excellence* in their service activities. While there may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by Professors, there is continued expectation of examples of *excellence* in one or more of the three performance areas.

### *2.1.5 University Distinguished Professor*

The title of University Distinguished Professor is not a Mays but a University title. This title represents the highest level of accomplishment for faculty. The Dean of Faculties determines the eligibility criteria for this title on annual basis. According to the current criteria, “to be eligible for the title of University Distinguished Professor, the candidate will have made one or more original or transformational contributions that are widely recognized to have significantly advanced or redirected scholarship in the relevant field.” The Dean of Faculties defines *Transformational* as work that is “a substantial intellectual leap forward, rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge.”

University policy indicates that faculty members receiving an appointment as a University Distinguished Professor in 2010 and in prior years hold this title as a *rank*. For faculty members appointed as a University Distinguished Professor in 2011 and after, the designation is an *award* rather than a *rank*.

The process described in Appendix E is the one Mays uses to identify nominees for University Distinguished Professor awards.

## ***2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Positions***

### *2.2.1 Assistant Lecturer*

This is an APT appointment for individuals we do not expect to fill a faculty position at Mays Business School for more than five years. Individuals holding these appointments focus on teaching, and are normally not eligible for faculty voting rights in the shared governance processes on campus.

### *2.2.2 Lecturer*

This is an entry-level position for part- and full-time instructors who typically have the following profile:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- Contributions to Mays relate primarily to the teaching performance area
- As determined by the Department Head, may also contribute in areas such as service and engagement.

Excellent performance is necessary for promotion to a Senior Lecturer position.

### *2.2.3 Senior Lecturer*

This is a position for individuals who usually have served a minimum of five years at the rank of Lecturer and whose performance warrants promotion or who have extensive experience in the field of education when Mays hires them. These faculty members typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- A record of teaching that demonstrates *excellent* and *effective* performance on a consistent basis
- Contributions to Mays relate primarily to the teaching performance area
- As determined by the Department Head, may also contribute in areas such as service and engagement.

#### 2.2.4 Clinical Assistant Professor

This is an entry-level position for full time APT faculty members who typically have the following profile:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.)
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals, or through additional teaching.

This faculty title may also be appropriate for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor at another institution. At an appropriate time, promotion is only for those with excellent records.

#### 2.2.5 Clinical Associate Professor

Typically, individuals holding this faculty title served at least five years at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor. Their performance suggests the appropriateness of promoting them to a Clinical Associate Professor position. This faculty title may also be appropriate for individuals who achieved the rank of Associate Professor at another institution. Clinical Associate Professors typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of *excellence* in teaching or service
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals, or through additional teaching
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction.

### 2.2.6 Clinical Professor

This is a position for individuals with at least five years of service at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. A Clinical Professor title may also be appropriate for individuals who achieved the rank of Professor at another institution. Clinical Professors typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., PhD in a business discipline, JD for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of *excellent* teaching or service performance over an extended amount of time
- Contributions to Mays that relate to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations
- With the approval of the Department Head, clinical faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through research publications in respected academic journals, or through additional teaching.
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction.

### 2.2.7 Executive Faculty

The Executive Faculty track is for individuals who do not hold a terminal degree but who have achieved distinguished careers in the private sector and/or government service. Executive professors concentrate on either the teaching or the service performance area. Executive faculty must hold a Master's Degree in the area that relates to their teaching and service.

We use the title of *Executive Assistant Professor* for faculty with fewer than five years of experience in academia and who, at the time of hire, have approximately ten years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

The title of *Executive Associate Professor* is for faculty with at least five years of academic experience and at least ten years of distinguished private-sector service prior to joining academia, or for faculty who, at the time of hire, have approximately 15 years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

The title of *Executive Professor* is for faculty with at least ten years of academic experience and at least ten years of distinguished private-sector service prior to joining academia or for faculty who, at the time of hire, have approximately 20 years of relevant distinguished careers in the private sector.

Executive faculty contribute primarily to the teaching performance area, while fulfilling service expectations. With the approval of the Department Head, executive faculty members may satisfy their service expectations through additional teaching or through intellectual contributions consistent with AACSB's expectations for scholarly practitioners.

### 2.2.8 Visiting Faculty

Periodically, it may be desirable or necessary to employ faculty holding a terminal degree temporarily, on a visiting basis. These faculty members do not have a long-term commitment to Texas A&M University as an employee. In these instances, we hire the faculty member on the visiting faculty track. (For faculty without a terminal degree, the Assistant Lecturer title is appropriate when we do not anticipate employment to exceed five years.)

Visiting faculty titles normally are for cases where we do not expect the faculty appointment to extend beyond three years.

The following guidelines determine the rank within the visiting faculty track:

- A faculty member hired immediately after the completion of his or her terminal degree holds the rank of *Visiting Assistant Professor*.
- If a faculty member served in a tenured or tenure-track appointment at another AACSB-accredited school during the year immediately preceding their employment with Mays Business School, the rank will be the most recent rank at that other school, preceded by the word “visiting.”
- In all other cases, the Dean, Executive Associate Dean, and Department Head work collaboratively to identify the most appropriate rank for a visiting faculty appointment.

Faculty serving on the visiting faculty track are not eligible for promotion within that track. However, with appropriate approvals at all levels, the university may convert the appointment of a visiting faculty to a tenured/tenure-track appointment or to a clinical faculty appointment.

University rules requires the preservation of rank during the conversion process. For example, a faculty serving at the rank of *visiting assistant professor* may only convert to *clinical assistant professor* or to *assistant professor*. If promotion to the rank of “associate” is desirable once the faculty member converts to a new track, the promotion must follow the process detailed in this document pertaining to the particular track to which the faculty member converted. For example, if a *visiting assistant professor* converts to *assistant professor*, promotion to associate professor with tenure is a separate process that follows the requirements applicable to all other untenured assistant professors.

### 2.2.9 Multi-Year Appointments

Appointments of a duration greater than one year but not exceeding five years are possible for faculty members serving in the clinical and executive faculty track, with the approval of the Department Head, EAD, and Dean. These appointments are reserved for APT faculty members who make extraordinary contributions to either the teaching or

service/outreach mission of Mays Business School, and who perform at least at a satisfactory level across all other areas of performance.

APT faculty members with multi-year appointments remain subject to the annual review process outlined in Section 6 of this document. The dismissal of an APT faculty member prior to the expiration of the appointment must be based on good cause (Section 5.1 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2).

### ***2.3 Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process***

Mays supports highly productive faculty members through endowed chairs, professorships and lectureships. The stated priorities and restrictions associated with each endowed position inform selection decisions and budgetary decisions and processes. (Note: Research and publication *excellence* is the key selection criterion for virtually all endowed chairs and professorships in Mays. However, if *excellence* in the teaching performance area were the primary selection criterion for an endowed position, that criterion carries the greatest weight in the selection process.)

The Mays Research Council considers nominees and provides recommendations to the EAD who in turn provides those recommendations to the Dean who has final approval.

Members of the Mays Research Council serve three-year terms. A faculty member from each academic department serves as a member of the Council. Those eligible to serve are full professors in the department who hold an endowed chair. Faculty serving in administrative positions as Department Head, Associate Dean, or Dean are not eligible to serve. Faculty are eligible to serve more than one term, if approved by the Department Head, EAD, and Dean. The Dean appoints Council members upon acceptance of a recommendation from the Department Head and the EAD.

#### ***2.3.1. Endowed Chair***

An appointment to an endowed chair is one of the highest honors for a Mays faculty member. The highest level of performance, and national and international recognition of that performance, are inherent guidelines for appointing a faculty member to an endowed chair. Individuals appointed to endowed chairs satisfy the institutional expectation of unquestionable excellence in at least one of the three performance areas (research and publication, teaching, and service) as well as any specific criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Gift agreements with donors may specify the criteria for a position; however, in the absence of such specification and in general, research and publication are the primary decision criteria. The appointment to an endowed chair may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruiting a new faculty member. In all appointments, *excellence* is a product of several years of outstanding performance based on national and international standards.

#### ***2.3.2 Endowed Professorship***

Individuals appointed to an endowed professorship receive a high honor in recognition of their consistent performance and their ability to continue demonstrating high productivity as a researcher or teacher. In addition to strong performances in the research and publication, teaching, and service performance areas, an individual appointed to a professorship also satisfies any unique criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Generally, research productivity generally takes precedence when selecting individuals to appoint to an endowed professorship. In exceptional cases, an individual who demonstrates ongoing effectiveness in research and outstanding teaching or service accomplishments (such as those who are recipients of teaching awards) may also be considered for appointment, or reappointment, to an endowed professorship. The appointment to an endowed professorship may recognize a current member of the faculty or may be associated with recruiting a new faculty member.

### *2.3.3 Endowed Lectureships*

An endowed lectureship is a general term describing endowed positions available to APT faculty. Individuals appointed to an endowed lectureship hold the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Executive Assistant Professor, Executive Associate Professor, Executive Professor, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer. Some gift agreements may refer to such endowed position by different names, such as Clinical Professorship or Executive Professorship. In this document, we use the term Endowed Lectureship generically to include all endowed positions awarded to APT faculty members.

Those selected for appointment to an endowed lectureship have earned a rating of *excellent* in either teaching or service over an amount of time. For teaching *excellence*, in addition to classroom *excellence*, criteria for this position include contributions such as strong student mentoring, commitment to continuous pedagogical innovations and participation in curricula development. Criteria for *excellence* in service include excellence in program management, employer relations, and external development activities.

### *2.3.4 Selection*

Department Heads begin by identifying faculty member prospects who, in their opinion, qualify for appointment to an endowed position, or faculty members who currently hold an endowed Professorship and are eligible for potential appointment to an endowed Chair. Subsequently, Department Heads prepare a nominations dossier that includes a current *CV* and a nomination letter addressed to the Dean. The nominations letter provides a list of accomplishments that warrant appointment to an endowed position at Mays. The material provided to form the dossier is to be consistent with how Mays measures excellence in terms of research, teaching, and service as specified in these Guidelines.

Department Heads submit the nominations dossier to the Mays Research Council through the EAD. Resulting from the Council's deliberation is a recommendation to the

Dean regarding each candidate. The Dean will evaluate the candidate's dossier, the Department Head's letter, and the Council's inputs to write a letter describing his or her decision.

### *2.3.5 Appointment*

Following the selection of a candidate for appointment to an endowed position (either a chair, a professorship, or a lectureship) the Dean prepares a letter to request appointment approval by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. Recommendations of the Mays Research Council and reasons for the Dean's recommendation accompany the request for appointment approval by this individual.

### *2.3.6 Evaluation and Reappointment*

Every five years (or more often if a review cycle of fewer years is established at the time of initial appointment or a reappointment), the Mays Research Council evaluates the performance of an endowed position holder. This evaluation satisfies the requirement to conduct a Periodic Peer Review for tenured faculty members holding an endowed position. Reappointment to an endowed position is likely if the results of an evaluation indicates that she or he is maintaining *excellence* in his or her work particularly with respect to research and publication (for chairs and professorships) and with respect to teaching for lectureship holders. To facilitate the review process, individuals prepare a summary of how their endowed position supported their work during the term of their appointment and the anticipated benefits of reappointment. The Department Head receives a copy of the summary each candidate for reappointment prepares.

As part of the renewal process, Department Heads solicit those holding an endowed chair, professorship, or lectureship to prepare a dossier (including a current CV) that the candidate will submit to them. In preparing the dossier, the candidate should provide a detailed list of accomplishments that s/he has achieved during the period of time for which s/he held a chair or a professorship. The material provided to form the dossier is to be consistent with how Mays measures excellence in terms of research, teaching, and service as specified in these Guidelines. Once prepared, the faculty member is to submit her/his dossier to the Department Head.

After receiving the dossier, the Department Head evaluates the submitted materials using the criteria shown in Section 2.3 of these Guidelines.

Following the evaluation, the Department Head prepares a letter recommending one of four options: (1) reappointment to the same type of endowed position, (2) reappointment to a different type of endowed position (i.e. chair instead of professorship or vice-versa), or (3) non-reappointment.

Following the evaluation, the Department Head provides a letter addressed to the dean recommending one of the three options. The Mays Research Council then receives materials the candidate develops and the Department Head's letter. Resulting from the



Council's deliberation is a recommendation to the Dean regarding each candidate. The Dean will evaluate the candidate's dossier, the department head's letter, and the Council's inputs to write a letter describing his decision. The Dean of Faculties receives a letter from the Dean describing her or his support for reappointment. If there is a need for a more detailed review process, in collaboration with the Department Head and with the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, the EAD manages the process.

### 2.3.7 Budgetary Guidelines

The original gift agreement and applicable University policies determine the allocation of income generated by chairs, professorships, and lectureships' endowments. Subject to availability of funds, income from the endowment may support activities of those holding an endowed position in the following manner:

- *Endowed chairs:* Two months of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. Each endowed chair also receives an annual faculty development account. The amount of funding in the faculty development account is the same for all endowed chair holders at Mays. In consultation with Department Heads, the EAD determines the annual amount of a chairholder's faculty development account. If an individual wishes to carry forward unused spending account funds into subsequent periods, he or she may request permission from the Executive Associate Dean through the Department Head to do so. Attention is given to thoughtful and justifiable reasons for carrying funds forward (e.g., if an individual plans to apply for a faculty development leave in the near future and anticipates unusually heavy travel expenses during that period). There are no circumstances though under which unused spending account funds are eligible for salary support. Annually, unused balances influence decisions about future allocations to an individual's spending account.
- *Endowed Professorships:* One month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. Each professorship also receives annual faculty development account. The amount of funding in the faculty development account is the same for all endowed professorship holders at Mays. In consultation with Department Heads, the EAD determines the annual amount of a professorship's faculty development account. The same considerations as described for those holding an endowed chair apply to unused balances for those holding an endowed professorship.
- *Endowed Lectureships:* Up to one month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year. The Department Head and EAD work collaboratively to determine the amount of summer salary support for each holder of an endowed lectureship.

If individual endowment accounts fail to generate earnings sufficient to provide this level of annual support, Department Heads may choose to provide supplemental funding from other sources. In the case of endowed chairs and professorships, if Department Heads want to provide this supplement but lack sufficient funds to do so, they may request supplemental funding from the Dean.

## ***2.4 ABD Faculty Appointment Process***

When offered a tenure-track position as an Assistant Professor on the faculty of Mays Business School, there is a clear expectation that an individual will complete the requirements for the terminal degree prior to the date when the appointment commences. If the individual completes the substantive requirements (i.e., defends her or his dissertation successfully) but not the administrative requirements (i.e., submission of final dissertation manuscript to receive the degree), for purposes of these guidelines, we consider the degree completed. However, we require a letter from the dissertation chair or comparable individual certifying this to be the case. Finally, in any event, we also require formal certification from the degree-granting institution when an individual receives the actual degree. The individual's department retains copies of all of these documents.

Failing to complete the degree (as defined above) by the date when appointment commences, results in the following options for an individual:

- The individual may remain in residence at her or his current institution and complete the degree. If a person does this, Mays will hold her or his position until January 15 of the following year. Assuming completion of all degree requirements by January 15, the individual may then join the Mays faculty under the terms of the original offer, including summer support.
- The individual may join the Mays faculty on the initial employment date without completing all degree requirements at the rank of *Instructor*. This rank begins on the first day of employment and ends the last day of the month during which an individual completes all PhD degree requirements. The appointment converts to Assistant Professor on the first day of the following month. For example, a person who joins the faculty on September 1 and who completes all degree requirements by the end of December of a given year would hold the rank of Instructor for the months of September through December. This rank would convert to Assistant Professor on the first day of January of the following year. An individual's salary while serving as an Instructor is the amount specified in her or his signed offer letter.
- At Texas A&M University and at Mays Business School, the rank of Instructor is a tenure-track appointment. Thus, all time served at this rank counts toward an individual's probationary period with respect to the promotion and tenure process. Mays does not delay the timing of the mid-term review and the timing of the mandatory promotion and tenure review for individuals serving initially at the rank of Instructor rather than the rank of Assistant Professor.
- One academic year is the maximum amount of time an individual with an initial appointment as an Assistant Professor may serve at the rank of Instructor. At the conclusion of this one-year period, renewal of an Assistant Professor's appointment is not possible if the faculty member has not completed his or her doctoral degree requirements.

### 3. Areas of Faculty Performance

At Mays Business School, faculty members' performance occurs in three major areas:

- (1) Creating and disseminating impactful knowledge via research and publication
- (2) Teaching
- (3) Service to the institution, the profession, and external constituencies

Thus, at Mays Business School, we base decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit compensation on a faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service. In assessing faculty performance, the School maintains a commitment to the position that the accumulation of activities alone does not constitute desirable performance; indeed, Mays places high value on accomplishments that are of "high quality." Mays Business School recognizes and defines four levels of performance in research and publication, teaching, and service:

- *Excellent performance*: a high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Effective performance*: performance that meets norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Needs improvement performance*: performance that falls below norms and expectations of *effective* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance, as described in section 4 of this document
- *Unsatisfactory performance*: performance that falls below norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance, as described in section 4 of this document

Mays Business School recognizes multiple indicators of various levels of performance and that performance indicators may vary over time for individuals at different career stages. In all instances, we determine a rating (e.g., "*excellent*" or "*effective*") by measuring a faculty member's performance against multiple indicators associated with a particular performance category.

Fifty percent for research and publication, 40 percent for teaching, and 10 percent for service are typical allocations of time among the three performance areas for tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Individual departments may choose to apply higher weights to research, particularly for assistant and associate professors. Generally, however, research weighs no more than 70 percent of the time allocation in the case of assistant professors and no more than 60 percent in the case of associate professors.

For APT faculty members, the allocation of individuals' time toward teaching is greater. For clinical and executive faculty with significant service expectations, the allocation of

time reflects more of a balance, potentially reaching 50 percent in each area. In general, time allocations for APT faculty members result from discussions between each individual and her or his Department Head.

As noted above however, the allocation of a faculty member's time to the three areas may change across the course of a career. Such changes are products of discussions between the faculty member and her or his Department Head. Under no circumstance though can the time allocation drop to a weight of zero in any given performance area without the approval of the EAD and the Dean. The Dean evaluates such requests in accordance with University promotion and tenure guidelines.

Regardless of the percentages of a faculty member's allocation of time among the three performance areas, the desired outcome is that all faculty members perform at a level of *effective* or *excellent* in the three performance areas. The faculty member and her or his Department Head consult about proposed changes to a faculty member's allocation of time as well as the performance expectations associated with the changes. For annual performance review purposes, a reduction in a faculty member's involvement with one performance area (e.g., research/publication) means that she or he will have fewer contributions with respect to the indicators of *excellent* and/or *effective* performance for that particular area. However, reduced effort in a performance area should still result in at least *effective* performance in that area and should avoid performance that falls into either the *needs improvement* or the *unsatisfactory* category. Similarly, for annual performance review purposes, an increase in the percentage of time a faculty member allocates to a performance area (e.g., research and publication) should result in more substantive contributions/outcomes and/or quality relative to the indicators of *effective* and/or *excellent* research and publication performance.

Alternate work assignments (such as administrative/leadership responsibilities) may replace one or more performance areas in certain situations. Those holding the relevant administrative position review and approve, as appropriate, potential changes in terms of an alternate work assignment. For example, Department Heads and Center Directors seeking to reduce their performance expectations to a weight of zero in a category for a specified period consult with the Dean and the Executive Associate Dean. Associate Deans seeking to reduce their performance expectations to a weight of zero in a category for a specified period consult with the Dean. In all instances, the performance of a faculty member going to a weight of zero in a performance category for an agreed-upon period is evaluated in light of the performance expectations associated with the agreed-upon assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

### ***3.1 Teaching***

Teaching is central to reaching Mays Business School's vision and mission. In particular, developing and maintaining a vibrant learning organization is central to faculty members' commitment to be scholarly teachers. Mays requires at least *effective* teaching from all faculty members. For APT faculty, the School expects that they will achieve *excellence* with respect to their teaching-related efforts. In the case of APT

faculty with an exceptional service record and with the approval of the faculty member's Department Head, *effectiveness* in teaching is sufficient for an amount of time, although *excellence* in teaching remains the long-term objective.

Mays Business School expects all faculty members to: (a) contribute to teaching and student development activities, (b) strive continuously to improve their scholarly teaching efforts and (c) promote and diversify the development of teaching programs in Mays. Specific indicators the School uses to assess a faculty member's contributions in terms of achieving teaching *excellence* and *effectiveness* appear in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of this document.

Criteria used to evaluate a faculty member's teaching performance include those of student learning, peer review results, student feedback, and involvement with programs to enhance pedagogy.

### ***3.2 Research and Publication***

Creating and disseminating impactful knowledge is central to the university's mission and Mays Business School's vision and mission. Publications in leading journals for each of the School's academic disciplines is central to valued performance for tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The School expects tenure-track and tenured faculty members to contribute to the creation of new knowledge through their research projects. Working actively with PhD students, serving as a member of editorial review boards, and engaging with colleagues collaboratively as a means of providing mutual support are additional activities demonstrating productivity related to the research and publication performance area. Pending discussions with their Department Head, APT faculty may also emphasize research and publication.

Mays uses a multi-faceted approach to assess faculty members' performance with respect to research and publication. (Specific indicators used to assess research and publication *excellence* and *effectiveness* appear in sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this document.) Mays does this in that no single performance indicator or a small set of indicators captures the complexity associated with creating new knowledge. Journal publications are a primary indicator of productivity and success with respect to this performance area. Publishing scholarly books, serving in editorial capacities for journals, presenting one's scholarship during national and international conferences, and maintaining an active commitment to and involvement with the School's PhD program are examples of additional measures used to assess faculty performance in terms of research and publication.

### ***3.3 Service***

Service is the third primary performance area in which all Mays faculty members contribute. Relative to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors allocate larger percentages of their time to service activities.

Additionally, Mays expects APT faculty serving on the clinical or executive faculty track to devote time to service. In some cases, APT faculty members have significant service expectations such as program management or external development and outreach. APT faculty members who chose to concentrate exclusively on teaching may do so by accepting a higher teaching load.

With the approval of the Department Head, APT faculty serving on a clinical faculty appointment may meet part of their service expectations through publications in respected academic journals, while APT faculty serving on an executive faculty appointment may meet part of their service expectations through intellectual contributions consistent with AACSB's scholarly practitioner classification.

Service contributions flow to the School and its units as a product of a commitment to shared governance. By serving, faculty members demonstrate their desire to influence the School's vision, mission, and activities flowing from them.

Faculty service includes committee and task force work at the University and School levels as well as involvement with the building of programs. Disciplinary service includes a faculty member's editorial contributions and involvement with local communities.

As with the other two performance areas, the School uses multiple criteria to assess service contributions. Active participation in committee and task force opportunities, positive orientations to accepting journal editorial responsibilities, and demonstration of being a "good corporate citizen" are examples of criteria for assessing faculty members' service outcomes. Specific indicators of service *effectiveness* and *excellence* appear in Sections 4.9 and 4.10.

Next, in section 4, we provide indicators of research and publication, teaching and service performance in each of the four categories—*excellent*, *effective*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory*. Some indicators do not fall exclusively into a single performance area from among those of research and publication, teaching, and service. For instance, working successfully with PhD students has a relationship with research and publication and teaching. Similarly, participating in executive development programs has both teaching and service connotations. Mays remains committed to recognizing that completing some activities results in a faculty member contributing to more than a single performance area.

#### **4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness**

As indicated previously, Mays Business School recognizes that there are multiple indicators of faculty performances to use to assess the quality of contributions with respect to research and publication, teaching, and service. Moreover, the performance indicators on which faculty members concentrate may vary across time and career stages.

Herein, we do not describe a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance. Rather, we seek to identify accomplishments with a high probability of leading to positive career development as well as a high probability of earning favorable performance evaluations.

#### ***4.1 Indicators of excellent performance in teaching***

These indicators include the following

- Selection for peer-reviewed University, Mays Business School, or professional society outstanding teaching awards (such as the Association of Former Students award)
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Highly noteworthy teaching performance over a significant period as evidenced by outstanding student ratings, interviews with students and student leaders, or outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction). We consider such evaluations in relation to course expectations (documented through course syllabi), grading practices in relation to comparable course levels/sections, and/or other factors
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high-quality online (remote learning) courses
- High-quality contributions to high-priority instructional programs
- Publication of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations) that are adopted widely
- Major contributions to developing new instructional programs
- Publications with a teaching focus in refereed journals
- Receiving significant peer-reviewed external funding to support developing innovative teaching activities and methods
- Preparing and/or coordinating successful new executive development programs.

#### ***4.2 Indicators of effective performance in teaching***

These indicators include the following

- Selection for student awards for outstanding teaching
- Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses
- Evidence of high quality with respect to class preparation and in terms of student interaction(s)
- Supervision of independent student projects
- Effective coordination of multi-section courses

- Significant contributions to student development through advising and mentoring, including service as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor
- Participation in the Mays Business School/University Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Presentations in executive development programs
- Effective coaching of students for competitions and preparation of students for study abroad programs.

#### ***4.3 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in teaching***

These indicators include the following

- Demonstrating a minimal commitment to using effective classroom pedagogies
- Little evidence of efforts to facilitate student learning inside the classroom
- Student evaluations that are significantly below departmental expectations
- Student feedback expressing concern over an occasional lack of adequate classroom preparation
- Evidence suggesting a failure to update teaching materials regularly
- Declines in student demand for assigned classes
- Infrequent participation in faculty discussions regarding pedagogical enhancements.

#### ***4.4 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in teaching***

These indicators include the following

- Student evaluations that are significantly below the departmental average
- Consistent inputs to the Department Head (from students and/or peers) that the faculty member is ineffective in the classroom
- Failure to establish and/or meet office hours
- Consistent use of outdated materials in the classroom
- Student feedback indicating that the faculty member is unprepared for class consistently
- Failure to provide students with feedback on graded assignments in a timely manner
- Failure to maintain currency with discipline-specific teaching-related practices and knowledge
- Failure to demonstrate a concern about poor and/or declining classroom performances
- Being late for class repeatedly, dismissing class early, canceling classes without valid reasons, or otherwise failing to use class time effectively



- Frequent documented violations of classroom policies (Mays Business School and University).

#### ***4.5 Indicators of excellent performance in research and publication***

These indicators include the following

- Publications in leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines
- Publication of acclaimed scholarly book(s)
- Publication of acclaimed practitioner book(s)
- Frequent citation of publications
- Editorship of a major journal(s)
- Editorship of a highly regarded scholarly book
- Associate editorship or section editorship of a major journal(s)
- Receipt of a major fellowship, research, or publication award(s)
- Membership on the editorial board of a major journal(s)
- Receipt of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Membership on review panel(s) for national or international research organization(s)
- Invitation to present a showcase or a keynote paper or to deliver an address at a significant international and/or national conference(s)
- Invitation(s) to present research at peer and/or aspirant schools
- Chair of PhD student committees that lead to top-tier journal publications and/or student placements at peer and/or aspirant schools
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to PhD student development
- Frequent evaluations of promotion and tenure cases for peer and/or aspirant schools
- Frequent media citations of published work
- Consistent involvement in interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary, internationalization and diversity efforts and/or research projects
- Frequent media citations of published scholarship.

#### ***4.6 Indicators of effective performance in research and publication***

These indicators include the following

- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are recognized widely and valued
- Publication of a respected scholarly book(s)
- Publication of a respected practitioner book(s)
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs
- Citation of publications

- Frequent presentation of papers at national or international conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publication of a chapter(s) in a scholarly book(s)
- Chair of and/or membership on PhD student committees
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national and international associations
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings
- Editorship of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Associate editorship or section editorship of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Membership on an editorial board of a respected, refereed journal(s)
- Well-documented contribution(s) (i.e., mentorship) to others' research
- Significant self-development activities such as a faculty development leave
- Evaluation of promotion and tenure cases at respected (peer and aspirant) universities
- Media citations of published scholarship
- Involvement in interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary, internationalization and diversity efforts and/or research projects.

#### ***4.7 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in research and publication***

These indicators include the following

- Publication in refereed journals in appropriate disciplines with minimal peer recognition, provided that such journals are recognized by the Social Sciences Citation Index and/or by the Science Citation Index
- Publication of a scholarly book or a book chapter with minimal peer recognition
- Publication of a practitioner book with minimal recognition by practitioners
- Limited citation of publications
- Few research presentations at national and international conferences and meetings
- Research presentations at regional conferences and meetings only
- Minimal involvement with a department's PhD program
- Ad hoc reviewer for journals and regional meetings
- Minimal research collaborations with colleagues within and outside Mays Business School
- Minimal participation in departmental research seminars.

#### ***4.8 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research and publication***

These indicators include the following

- Publication in non-refereed journals lacking widespread recognition

- Publications in refereed journals that do not appear in the Social Sciences Citation Index or the Science Citation Index
- Failure to maintain currency with the discipline's knowledge
- Failure to initiate new working papers of any type over a three-year or longer period
- Very few citations of published works
- Infrequent or inconsistent involvement with research seminars presented by internal or external scholars
- Infrequent or inconsistent involvement with ad hoc reviewing for any type of journal or academic conference over a three-year or longer period
- Failure to support a department's research mission.

Mays Business School encourages its faculty to demonstrate research leadership and as opportunities become available, to collaborate with others in the process of doing so. Occasional single-authored works and/or a balance of authoring order on publications in disciplines where the order of authorship conveys information regarding relative contribution are examples of demonstrating this type of leadership.

### *Service*

#### ***4.9 Indicators of excellent performance in service***

These indicators include the following

- Officer in a national/international professional organization(s)
- Program chair or a similar position for a national/international meeting(s)
- Administrative leadership role within Mays Business School and/or the University
- Officer in the Faculty Senate
- Chair of a major university committee or task force
- Demonstrated leadership in significant departmental, Mays Business School, University, or system administrative or service roles
- Service on a major governmental commission task force or board
- Attraction of significant external financial support
- External activities that result in improved employment opportunities for Mays students.

#### ***4.10 Indicators of effective performance in service***

These indicators include the following

- Committee chair of a national/international professional organization(s)
- Officer in a regional or state professional organization(s)

- Program chair or a similar position for a regional and/or state professional organizational meeting(s)
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate
- Service on University, Mays Business School, and departmental committees and task forces
- Contribution to external development efforts
- Advisor to a student organization
- Engagement with administrative roles within the department
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups performed on a *pro-bono* basis or in exchange for a nominal honorarium
- Service as a consultant to business organizations and/or governmental agencies
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and/or to the public at large that is commensurate with the faculty member's responsibilities to Mays Business School
- Self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

#### ***4.11 Indicators of “needs improvement” performance in service***

These indicators include the following

- Lack of reasonably active participation in Mays Business School and University-wide committees and task forces
- Infrequent participation with national and regional academic associations
- Infrequent demonstration of informal leadership roles within a department, Mays Business School, and the University
- Infrequent acceptances of opportunities to mentor students and/or junior faculty
- Infrequent participation with school-wide events (e.g., faculty/staff meetings, events to honor faculty and staff colleagues)
- Irregular involvement with faculty recruiting processes.

#### ***4.12 Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service***

These indicators include the following

- No active participation in Mays Business School and University-wide committees and task forces
- No involvement with national or regional academic associations
- Failure to participate appropriately in departmental activities such as faculty meetings and faculty/staff events
- Consistent declines of opportunities for involvement with student activities and/or organizations
- Consistent failure to participate with school-wide events including faculty/staff meetings

- Failure to be an active participant with faculty recruiting processes  
Conduct detrimental to the department or Mays Business School's reputation and/or work climate.

## 5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

### 5.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Mays Business School evaluates faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure in terms of their performance in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and service. Assessments of faculty members' performances focus on the *quality*, *significance*, and *impact* of their work. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, those seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate high potential for continuing *effectiveness* at a minimum with the hope that future performances will show *excellence*.

#### 5.1.1 Performance Expectations for Assistant Professors Seeking Promotion to an Associate Professor Position with Tenure

At a minimum, Assistant Professors must demonstrate *effectiveness* in teaching and *excellence* with respect to research and publication. Departmental and college academic needs are the focus of an Assistant Professor's limited service contributions. Evaluation of a request for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure includes an assessment of the three performance areas, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for Mays include the following:

- An overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in teaching
- Pattern over time of an *excellent* performance in research and publication
- High potential for continued *excellence* in research and publication and hopefully in terms of teaching and service as well

#### *Time Frame*

Typically, decisions regarding promotion to an Associate Professor position and the granting of tenure occur simultaneously. An explanation of the probationary period for an Assistant Professor appears in the initial offer of employment. The maximum probationary period for tenure is seven years, with up to three years credit given for tenure track experience at another university.

The University's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (12.01.99.M2) indicates that: "Under extenuating circumstances, the probationary period

may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the Department Head, Dean, and the Dean of Faculties" (see section 4.3.1). However, it is rare for the University to grant such an extension in the year of mandatory consideration for tenure. The University's guidelines specify the special and unique circumstances for considering an extension of the probationary period.

In general, Assistant Professors should expect to complete their full probationary period at their entry rank. (The actual review and decision process, of course, begins the preceding year.) An individual who compiles an unusually strong and distinguished record of achievement may request early consideration. This includes individuals who served in a tenure-track or visiting faculty position at another institution for an amount of time prior to joining Mays, and who have not claimed credit towards tenure at Texas A&M for time served at such other institution. A request for early promotion is simultaneously a request for early granting of tenure, and vice versa. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration should consult with her or his Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, with the EAD and with the Dean before making a formal request for consideration.

#### *5.1.2 Performance Expectations for Associate Professors Seeking Promotion to a Professor Position*

At a minimum, Associate Professors should produce an *effective* performance in terms of research and publication, teaching, and service. Additionally, Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor should demonstrate *excellence* in research and publication. Relative to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors seeking promotion should exhibit increased contributions in terms of service. An assessment of the three performance areas is foundational to the promotion decision; commonly, research and publication carry the heaviest weight in the decision. In terms of research and publication, Mays expects that Associate Professors will continue producing research at a rate that is close to commensurate with the productivity research and publication productivity required for an Assistant Professor to receive a promotion to an Associate Professor position. The minimum requirements for Mays Business School include the following:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in his or her field
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *excellent* performance in terms of research and publication
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *effective* performance in teaching
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service

### *Time Frame*

Promotion to Professor is a product of cumulative contributions, with special attention given to accomplishments since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Consistent with University guidelines, Mays does not have a “time in grade” expectation for an Associate Professor seeking a promotion to Professor. Section 3.1 of the *Texas AM& University Guidelines to Faculty Titles* notes the following:

Tenured faculty at the Associate Professor level may request that they receive consideration for promotion. There is no requirement that this consideration for promotion occur within a specified timeframe. Normal time in these ranks is determined by not only the ability to contribute significantly and continuously in the areas of scholarly research or creative work, teaching, and service, but by a period of service long enough to mount substantive evidence that their work in these areas is having an important impact locally and where applicable, nationally and internationally.

Experience at Mays suggests that typically, but not always, Associate Professors require five years of service in rank to compile a record necessary for promotion to Professor. Because of the expectations associated with a request by an Associate Professor to receive consideration for promotion to Professor, an individual should consult with her or his Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the Office of the Dean before making a formal request for consideration. Doing this allows a faculty member to become aware of the degree of support among colleagues and administrative leaders with respect to a potential candidacy for promotion to the rank of Professor.

In truly exceptional cases, promotion to Professor may occur for an individual because of her or his outstanding teaching and/or service performance(s). Individuals seeking promotion to Professor relative to either one or both of these performance areas, rather than because of research *excellence*, must stipulate clearly in their promotion packet that they are seeking promotion on the basis of *excellence* in teaching and/or service. In these cases, Mays requires thorough and rigorous documentation to justify consideration of an exception to the normal promotion-related expectations with respect to the research and publication performance area, with a significant emphasis placed on evaluating the impact that the faculty member has made in the profession through his or her teaching, or service contributions. Further, such an individual should expect to spend substantially more time at the rank of Associate Professor before requesting consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor. It is also important to recognize that any such case must be truly exceptional in nature. For instance, achieving positive student ratings over a period of several years, and in the absence of numerous other indicators, is insufficient evidence that an exceptional case exists for promotion to Professor because of teaching and/or service excellence. A candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor on a performance area other than research and publication *excellence* should satisfy multiple *excellent* teaching or service performance indicators.

If the candidate for promotion to Professor also serves as the Head of the Department, the Dean selects either the Executive Associate Dean or the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship to fulfill the role of the Department Head in the review process.

### ***5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty***

As with tenure-track and tenured faculty members, evaluations of requests from APT faculty for a promotion involve an analysis of an individual's contributions with respect to agreed-upon performance expectations. For promotion, APT faculty members must demonstrate a high potential for continued *excellence* in the performance area on which they concentrate (teaching or service). As a criterion, the potential for continued *excellence* is in addition to the expectation that their performance prior to seeking a promotion also is *excellent*. At Mays Business School, most APT faculty concentrate their efforts in the teaching performance area, with service or research and publication being a secondary area of activity. However, with approval from their Department Heads, some APT faculty concentrate their efforts on service, with teaching or research and publication being a secondary area of activity.

#### *5.2.1 Lecturer Seeking a Promotion to Senior Lecturer*

At a minimum, Lecturers are to be *effective* in teaching and render service contributions related to departmental and college academic needs. Assessment of both performance areas, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual to a Senior Lecturer position. The minimum requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer position in Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in their main area of activity (either teaching or service)
- Pattern over time of *effective* performance in the other area of activity
- Potential for continued *excellence* in the main area of activity and *effective* performance in the secondary area
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

In accordance with TAMU System policy, Lecturers serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. An individual who compiles an unusually strong and exceptional record of accomplishment may request early consideration. Normally, only full-time Lecturers are eligible for promotion consideration.

#### *5.2.2 Clinical or Executive Assistant Professor Seeking a Promotion to Clinical or Executive Associate Professor*



At a minimum, Clinical Assistant Professors and Executive Assistant Professors should deliver *effective* performance(s) in teaching and either service *or* research on a consistent basis. Because all clinical and the majority of executive faculty have minimum service obligations, individuals interested in pursuing research and publication should discuss a proposed research agenda with their Department Head to determine their appropriate assignments. In addition, a strong case for promotion requires *excellence* in either teaching *or* service. The minimum requirements for promotion to Clinical or Executive Associate Professor in Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in either teaching *or* service
- Pattern over time of an *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Potential for continued *excellence* in teaching *or* service and *effective* performance(s) in teaching, service *and/or* research and publication
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

In accordance with TAMU System policy, Clinical or Executive Assistant Professors serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion. An individual who compiles an unusually strong and exceptional record of accomplishment may request early consideration. Normally, only full-time clinical or executive faculty are eligible for promotion consideration.

### *5.2.3 Clinical or Executive Associate Professor Seeking Promotion to Clinical or Executive Professor*

At a minimum, Clinical Associate Professors and Executive Associate Professors should deliver *effective* performance(s) on both teaching and service dimensions on a consistent basis. Because all clinical faculty and the majority of executive faculty have a minimum service obligation, individuals interested in pursuing research and publication should discuss a proposed research and publication agenda with their Department Head to determine their appropriate assignments. In addition, a strong case for promotion requires *excellence* in either teaching *or* service. Clinical and Executive Associate Professors generally serve at least five years in this rank prior to seeking promotion to the Clinical or Executive Professor rank. The minimum requirements for promotion to Clinical or Executive Professor at Mays Business School include the following:

- Pattern over time of *excellence* in teaching
- Pattern over time of *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Potential for continued *excellence* in teaching and *effective* performance in service *and/or* research and publication
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University

In accordance with TAMU System policy, Clinical and Executive Associate Professors serve at least five years in rank before seeking promotion. Normally, only full-time clinical and executive faculty are eligible for promotion consideration.

### ***5.3 Promotion and/or Tenure Review Processes***

Transparency and consistency describe the processes Mays uses when completing promotion and/or tenure reviews. This is the case for tenure-track, tenured, and APT faculty.

#### *5.3.1 Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*

##### *Initiating the Process*

Department Heads initiate the process for individuals desiring consideration for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor by soliciting self-nominations. In the case of the mandatory year of consideration for an untenured/tenure-track faculty member, no nomination is necessary. A request for early promotion to Associate Professor indicates a simultaneous request for early tenure. After discussing the promotion and tenure process and clarifying expectations with the Department Head, an individual wishing to have her or his case heard prepares a dossier according to Mays and University requirements. Individuals in their mandatory year for promotion and tenure consideration must also prepare a dossier. Because the University changes its requirements for preparing dossiers from time to time, individuals participating in promotion and tenure processes bear responsibility for ensuring that they follow the most current University guidelines.

##### *Role of the Candidate*

As noted, the candidate has the primary responsibility to prepare the basic information and data for her or his dossier in accordance with Mays and University requirements. As part of the dossier, the candidate is to supply in concise form a statement of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in research and publication, teaching, and service and other accomplishments that are relevant to the position.

##### *Role of the Departmental Faculty*

Departmental faculty review is the first internal step in the process of evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The departmental tenure and promotion committee(s) is subject to the following parameters:

- For faculty pursuing promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure, all tenured Associate Professors and Professors in a department comprise the departmental promotion and tenure committee

- All faculty members at the rank of Professor in a department comprise the departmental promotion and tenure committee for candidates for promotion to Professor in that department
- Confidentiality is the foundation for conducting deliberations
- Committee recommendations are advisory in nature
- Voting members of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee (we describe this committee's composition below in this section) may participate in the departmental deliberations; however, they may not vote on promotion and tenure cases at the departmental level
- The committee is required to hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate; two thirds of the voting members of the committee constitute a quorum
- The Department Head schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend
- Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote
- Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Department Head, containing their personal recommendation; the letter may inform the decision of the Department Head but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

The departmental review process includes a faculty peer review of classroom teaching and instructional materials. For Assistant Professors, this review takes place during the third year at that rank as part of the mid-term review. If any concerns surface during the mid-term review, another review occurs during the fourth year. For Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor, the review may occur early in the year of consideration.

In some departments, a senior faculty member serves as coordinator of the review process. The coordinator is responsible for recording in writing the departmental tenure and promotion committee's recommendation. In other departments, the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member to serve as chair of the departmental P&T committee for a pre-determined amount of time.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey: "by invitation only" and "anonymous."

All members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee know the identity of the coordinator serving as the letter writer (or of the committee chair, as applicable). The

letter writer takes appropriate steps to ensure that she or he conveys the richness of discussion accurately, including positive and negative points. Following submission to the Department Head, she or he adds the written document to the candidate's dossier.

### *Role of the Department Head*

The Department Head is responsible for obtaining outside letters and responding to candidates' questions as they develop their dossiers. To understand the richness of discussion and the outcomes from the deliberations, the Department Head may attend the departmental tenure and promotion committee meeting unless in a written request to the EAD, a majority of the voting members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee asks that the Department Head abstain from doing so. The Department Head may serve as a facilitator and coordinator during the deliberations; alternatively, a faculty member (such as a committee chair or faculty coordinator) may serve in this role. If the Department Head attends the meeting, he or she is encouraged to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the Department Head shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the Department Head abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the Department Head avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The Department Head (and the Executive Associate Dean and Dean, if a member of the relevant department) have no vote at the departmental level.

After receiving the departmental faculty recommendation, the Department Head prepares a letter to present and explain her or his independent recommendation regarding the candidate to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation differs from the departmental committee's recommendation, he or she explains the reasons for the difference when writing a letter.

### *Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee*

The Mays (college-wide) promotion and tenure committee has seven voting members—one elected (full) professor from each academic department, two at-large members appointed by the Dean (both serving at the rank of full professor), and one *ex officio* (non-voting) member appointed by the Dean as well. The *ex officio* member serves as the committee's chair. Tenured Professors, with the exception of Mays and university administrators (Department Head and above), are eligible for election or appointment to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. All tenured faculty members holding academic rank within a particular department are eligible to vote for that department's representative. Typically, Mays promotion and tenure committee members serve three-year staggered terms. The Mays promotion and tenure committee reviews all promotion and tenure cases and transmits, in writing, its recommendations and votes to the Dean. The committee also reviews mid-term review cases.

The committee is required to hold one or more meetings (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. The committee chair, as well as six of the

seven voting members of the committee constitute a quorum. The EAD schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend.

Voting faculty members are required to attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, but within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Dean and submitted through the EAD, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the decision of the Dean but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

As is the case with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, we use a secret ballot to reflect the committee's recommendation. The voting process is similar to that used in departmental promotion and tenure committees, described earlier in this section.

#### *Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair*

The chair of the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee serves as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member. Appointed by the Dean, the chair normally serves a three-year term. The chair facilitates, moderates, and coordinates the process. Active participation by the chair in the substantive discussions about the promotion and tenure decision for each candidate does not occur. Based on the voting members' views (including minority perspectives) and votes, committee members draft letters describing their recommendations. The chair and the committee agree upon the approach for writing letters. Typically, the chair will delegate to different committee members the writing of the first draft of the letter for each candidate. However, the chair has the final responsibility of ensuring that each letter represents the committee's views, deliberations, votes, and recommendation. All voting committee members sign each letter. The chair submits the committee's letters to the Dean for her or his analysis.

#### *Role of the Executive Associate Dean*

The Executive Associate Dean (EAD) ensures that the promotion and tenure process follows the appropriate departmental, college and university guidelines.

The EAD also ensures that the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee members receive the dossiers for all promotion and tenure candidates and that the committee completes its review process within the required amount of time as stipulated by the University. The EAD also ensures that timely elections (by faculty vote) to the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee occur.

The EAD is available, at the discretion of each department faculty, to attend the departmental review process to capture the richness of the discussion regarding each promotion and tenure candidate. This participation may consist of attendance throughout

the peer review process or a briefing by the departmental faculty involved in the review process at the conclusion of the departmental evaluations.

### *Role of the Dean*

After the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its deliberations, the Dean receives the candidate's dossier, which at this point includes the following:

- All materials created and/or obtained for inclusion in the dossier
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee (with its vote)
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the departmental committee (with its vote)
- Written recommendation from the Department Head

The Dean prepares her or his own independent summary assessment of a candidate. If the Dean's assessment differs from the Department Head's assessment and recommendation, he or she will inform the Department Head of the reasons for those differences; in turn, the Department Head will inform the departmental promotion and tenure committee of the Dean's decision and the reasons for it. The departmental review committee then has an opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials are a part of the candidate's dossier, including relevant arguments supporting the candidate's case. Identifying germane new evidence or new and different arguments might lead to submission of a newly organized case for reconsideration at the school level.

If the Dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation differs from the Department Head's recommendation, the Dean informs the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for the recommendation. The faculty member then has an opportunity to offer a stronger case for promotion and tenure or for a promotion only in the instance of an Associate Professor seeking a promotion to Professor. The Dean and the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee review this case prior to forwarding a final recommendation to the Provost through the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

### *5.3.2 Promotion Review Process for Academic Professional Track Faculty*

#### *Initiating the Process*

By soliciting self-nominations, Department Heads initiate the process for individuals desiring consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, Executive Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, or Executive Professor. After discussing the process and clarifying expectations with the Department Head, an individual desiring to be a candidate for promotion prepares a dossier according to Mays and University requirements. When preparing their dossier, APT faculty seeking promotion typically focus on performance indicators related to teaching and service (and, in some cases, research and publication as substitute for service). Individuals

seeking promotion bear responsibility for ensuring that they follow the most current University and Mays Business School guidelines.

### *Role of the Candidate*

As noted, the candidate bears the primary responsibility to prepare the basic information required for her or his dossier in accordance with Mays and University guidelines. As one part of the dossier, the candidate supplies, in concise form, a statement of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in teaching, service and other accomplishments relevant to the position.

### *Role of Departmental Faculty*

Departmental faculty review is the first step in the process of evaluating requests from APT faculty for promotion. The following parameters guide the departmental review committee's deliberations:

- All full-time faculty members in the department serving at a rank higher than that of the candidate comprise the departmental promotion review committee for APT faculty members (Appendix C, Section 11 contains all promotion and tenure committee structures)
- Absolute confidentiality accompanies the review committee's deliberations
- Committee recommendations are advisory in nature
- The committee must hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. Two thirds of the voting members of the committee constitute a quorum
- The Department Head schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend
- Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote
- Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote. However, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting these individuals may write a separate letter addressed to the Department Head containing their personal recommendation; the letter may inform the decision of the Department Head but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

In some departments, a senior faculty member serves as coordinator of the review process. The coordinator is responsible for recording in writing the departmental tenure and promotion committee's recommendation. In other departments, the Department Head appoints a senior faculty member to serve as chair of the departmental P&T committee for a pre-determined amount of time.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more

than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey “by invitation only” and “anonymous.”

All members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee know the identity of the coordinator serving as the letter writer (or of the committee chair, as applicable). The letter writer takes appropriate steps to ensure that she or he conveys the richness of discussion accurately, including positive and negative points. Following submission to the Department Head, she or he adds the written document to the candidate’s dossier.

To review promotion cases of APT faculty located in a non-departmental unit, the EAD appoints an ad-hoc committee that serves as the departmental review committee. The ad-hoc committee consists of five full-time faculty, with representation from at least two APT faculty of ranks higher than the candidate.

#### *Role of the Department Head*

The Department Head is responsible for responding to candidates' questions as they develop their dossiers. To understand the richness of discussion and the outcomes from the deliberations, the Department Head may attend the departmental tenure and promotion committee meeting unless a request to the EAD in writing by a majority of the voting members of the departmental promotion and tenure committee asks that the Department Head abstain from doing so. The Department Head may serve as a facilitator and coordinator during the deliberations; alternatively, a faculty member (such as a committee chair or faculty coordinator) may serve in this role. If the Department Head attends the meeting, he or she is encouraged to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the Department Head shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the Department Head abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the Department Head avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The Department Head (and the Executive Associate Dean and Dean, if a member of the relevant department) have no vote at the departmental level.

After receiving the departmental faculty recommendation, the Department Head prepares a letter to present and explain her or his independent recommendation regarding the candidate to the Dean. If the Department Head's recommendation differs from the departmental committee’s recommendation, he or she explains the reasons for the difference when writing a letter.

#### *Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee*

The Mays (college-wide) promotion and tenure committee has seven voting members—one elected (full) professor from each academic department, two at-large members appointed by the Dean, and one *ex officio* (non-voting) member appointed by the Dean



as well. The ex officio member serves as the committee's chair. Tenured Professors, with the exception of Mays and university administrators (Department Head and above), are eligible for election or appointment to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. All tenured faculty members holding academic rank within a particular department are eligible to vote for that department's representative. Typically, Mays promotion and tenure committee members serve three-year staggered terms. The Mays promotion and tenure committee reviews all promotion cases and transmits, in writing, its votes and recommendations to the Dean.

The committee must hold a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of each candidate. The committee chair, as well as six of the seven voting members of the committee constitute a quorum. The EAD schedules this meeting with sufficient advance notice to ensure that all voting members are available to attend.

Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote; however, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, these individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the Dean, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the decision of the Dean but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

As is the case with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, a secret ballot will reflect the committee's recommendation. The voting process will be similar to that used in departmental promotion and tenure committees, described earlier in this section.

#### *Role of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair*

The chair of the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee serves as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member. Appointed by the Dean, the chair normally serves a three-year term. The chair facilitates, moderates, and coordinates the process. Active participation by the chair in the substantive discussions about the promotion and tenure decision for each candidate does not occur. Based on the voting members' views (including minority perspectives) and votes, committee members draft letters describing their recommendations. Typically, the chair will delegate to different committee members the writing of the first draft of the letter for each candidate. However, the chair has the final responsibility of ensuring that each letter represents the committee's views, deliberations, votes, and recommendation. All voting committee members sign each letter. The chair submits the committee's letters to the Dean for her or his analysis.

#### *Role of the Executive Associate Dean*

The Executive Associate Dean (EAD) ensures that the promotion process follows the appropriate departmental, college and university guidelines.

The EAD also ensures that the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee members receive the dossiers for all promotion candidates and that the committee completes its review

process within the required amount of time as stipulated by the University. The EAD also ensures that timely elections (by faculty vote) to the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee occur.

The EAD is available, at the discretion of each department faculty, to attend the departmental review process to capture the richness of the discussion regarding each promotion candidate. This participation may consist of attendance throughout the peer review process or a briefing by the departmental faculty involved in the review process at the conclusion of the departmental evaluations.

### *Role of the Dean*

After the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its deliberations, the Dean receives the candidate's dossier, which at this point includes the following:

- All materials created and/or obtained for inclusion in the dossier
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the Mays Promotion and Tenure committee (with its vote)
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the departmental committee (with its vote)
- Written recommendation from the Department Head

The Dean prepares her or his own independent summary assessment of a candidate. If the Dean's assessment differs from the Department Head's assessment and recommendation, he or she will inform the Department Head of the reasons for those differences; in turn, the Department Head will inform the departmental promotion and tenure committee of the Dean's decision and the reasons for it. The departmental review committee then has an opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials are a part of the candidate's dossier, including relevant arguments supporting the candidate's case. Identifying germane new evidence or new and different arguments might lead to submission of a newly organized case for reconsideration at the school level.

If the Dean recommends against promotion and that recommendation differs from the Department Head's recommendation, the Dean informs the Department Head and the candidate of the reasons for the recommendation.

### *5.3.3 Faculty Notification during Promotion and Tenure Processes*

A faculty member learns of the recommendation for or against promotion at each level of review. The University requires that the Department Head handle all such communications. At Mays Business School, the Dean may also choose to communicate with the candidate, in addition to the official communication from the Department Head.

In the event of a negative decision, the faculty member is entitled, upon request, to a written statement of the reasons contributing to that decision. The Department Head provides a statement of reasons to the faculty member after the Board of Regents or

Chancellor have ruled on the University's promotion and tenure or promotion-only recommendations.

If a non-tenured faculty member alleges that the decision to deny tenure results from a violation of academic freedom, a violation of civil rights, or any other form of illegal discrimination, the faculty member may appeal the decision with the President of Texas A&M University within twenty (20) business days of receiving the formal tenure decision. (University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Sections 9.2 and 9.3).

A faculty member receives written notice of the official decision regarding a promotion decision as soon as possible after the Chancellor or the Board of Regents have acted on the President's recommendations.

At any point in the process, a candidate may elect to withdraw from further promotion consideration by submitting a written request.

#### *5.3.4 Time Table*

On an annual basis, the University's timetable specifies the specific dates for the promotion and tenure process. The approximate timetable is as follows:

- May—Nominations due
- June-August—Preparation of dossier, receipt of external reviews
- August-September—Departmental reviews
- September—Departmental recommendations to the Dean
- October—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its evaluations
- October-November—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee submits its recommendations to the Dean
- December—Dean submits recommendations to the Provost by sending complete files to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
- January—Dean meets and reviews recommendations with the Provost and the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
- February—Provost forwards recommendations to the President. President forwards recommendations to the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System who, in the case of candidates for tenure, further forwards the recommendations to the Board of Regents of the Texas A&M University System.
- March/April—Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases. The Chancellor renders decisions about promotion-only cases.
- September 1—Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.

To meet this timetable, departments complete their review processes and the faculty dossiers by the first week of September. Obtaining external letters often requires considerable time and effort; accordingly, requesting these letters in June or before is appropriate.

Faculty members who seek promotion (other than those who are subject to mandatory review) are required to notify their Department Head no later than the second Monday in May. Those who are subject to mandatory review follow the deadlines communicated by their Department Head.

## **6. Annual Review**

Mays Business School conducts annual performance reviews in a manner consistent with Section 2.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2. All faculty members, regardless of rank, receive an annual evaluation of their performance. Faculty members receive the results of the annual review from their Department Head in a written format. To coincide with the University's deadlines for such activities, this annual review occurs in the spring of each academic year.

There are occasions, however, when assessing an individual's overall record occurs at another time. Mid-term reviews and promotion and/or tenure reviews, which take place in the fall, are the most obvious situations when this occurs. When reviewed in this manner, it is appropriate for the annual review process to reference the outcome of this earlier review.

Department Heads complete annual performance reviews. In some cases, Department Heads will choose to solicit input from other members of the Mays or departmental faculty who have direct interactions with the faculty member regarding her or his teaching, research, or service activities. In all cases, each faculty member receives a single performance review from the Department Head, which addresses all areas of responsibility.

To inform the annual evaluation process, the Department Head requests information annually from each faculty member in his or her department pertaining to faculty performance activities and indicators for the preceding year (the Professional Activities and Accomplishments Report, or PAAR). All faculty use a common reporting routine (such as Digital Measures or Faculty 180, as directed by the EAD). Department Heads have the discretion to request additional performance-related information for their own use.

All tenured faculty in each of the School's five academic departments evaluate and provide feedback on the performance of untenured Assistant Professors. The emphasis of this evaluation is the progress an individual is making regarding earning a promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure. All Professors evaluate and provide feedback on the performance of Associate Professors particularly with respect to their progress toward earning a promotion to Professor. Some departments may choose to conduct annual peer-review meetings for this purpose. Department Heads may participate fully during such peer-review meetings.

Department Heads evaluate the performance of Professors and that of APT faculty. Department Heads may delegate the performance evaluation of APT faculty to a senior APT faculty member who serves as Assistant or Associate Department Head.

### ***6.1 Purpose***

The purposes of the annual performance review include the following:

- Creating a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations
- Providing evaluative feedback regarding how well the individual is performing currently relative to the norms and expectations for her or his faculty position
- Providing developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved
- Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant

### ***6.2 Focus***

The focus of the annual review process varies by academic rank and a faculty member's career stage at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued *effective* and/or *excellent* performance and where relevant, progress toward the next promotion. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward a positive promotion and tenure decision. For APT faculty, the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable (see section 2.4.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion—for additional details).

### ***6.3 Time Period of the Annual Review***

At Mays Business School, annual performance reviews focus on a previous twelve months of activities. Four of our departments—the James Benjamin Department of Accounting, the Department of Information and Operations Management, the Department of Management and the Department of Marketing, use the calendar year as the relevant twelve-month period for the annual evaluation. The twelve-month period our Department of Finance uses is March 1 through February 28/29. All five departments use a rolling three-year window to evaluate an individual's research and publication performance.

Departments have the option to adopt any of the following four twelve-month evaluation periods: (i) January 1 to December 31, (ii) February 1 to January 31, (iii) March 1 to February 28/29, and (iv) April 1 to March 31. Department Heads who wish to change their department evaluation period should consult with the EAD for further guidance.

### ***6.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance***

As noted in Section 3 above, Mays Business School uses the criteria of *excellent*, *effective*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory* to assess faculty members' performances annually. The indicators for each of these performance categories appear in section 3 above. We remind all faculty members that these performance indicators appear in this document, the Mays Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Appointments.

#### 6.4.1. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of teaching that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*
- *Effective*—performance in terms of teaching that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of teaching that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of teaching that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

#### 6.4.2. Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Research and Publication

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of research and publication that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*
- *Effective*—performance in terms of research and publication that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of research and publication that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of research and publication that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* performance as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

#### 6.4.3 Performance Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Service

- *Excellent*—a high level of performance in terms of service that meets or exceeds departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *excellence*

- *Effective*—performance in terms of service that meets the departmental norms and expectations and that is reflected by substantive indicators of *effective* performance
- *Needs improvement*—performance in terms of service that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent* and *effective* performances as reflected by substantive indicators of *needs improvement* performance
- *Unsatisfactory*—performance in terms of service that falls below departmental norms and expectations of *excellent*, *effective*, and *needs improvement* as reflected by substantive indicators of *unsatisfactory* performance.

## **6.5 Required Components**

Consistent with section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, the Mays annual performance review includes several components. The components used are consistent with section 2.4.5 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

### *6.5.1 Faculty Member's Report of Previous Activities*

The exact form of the report faculty members complete to describe the activities they completed during an annual performance evaluation period may vary slightly across the five departments in Mays Business School. In all cases though, the form in use has the following characteristics:

- The report focuses on the previous annual review period as specified by the faculty member's department (see section 6.3 above for details)
- The report allows the faculty member to discuss current and longer-term projects and their status. The faculty member provides these descriptions with respect to teaching, research and publication, and service
- Faculty members describe their short- and long-term performance goals as they relate to teaching, research and publication, and service.

### *6.5.2 Written Document Describing the Department Head's Evaluation*

The Department Head prepares a written evaluation to describe her or his assessment of the faculty member's annual performance. Part of the written document addresses performance expectations for the faculty member with respect to teaching, research and publication, and service for the upcoming academic year. If the Department Heads had delegated the evaluation to others (such as to a senior APT faculty member or to tenured faculty members), the Department Head must still prepare a written evaluation letter; however, the performance assessment prepared by the delegate informs the Department Head's evaluation.

The faculty member receives a copy of the written document. The faculty member signs the document to acknowledge receipt of it. Once signed, the Department Head adds the document to the faculty member's personnel file. If a faculty member chooses not to the written document to acknowledge receipt of the document, the Department Head notes

this in the faculty member's personnel file. Faculty members have the right to provide written comments regarding the document they receive from the Department Head; these comments become part of their personnel file.

No faculty member may receive an overall *excellent* or *effective* performance rating if she or he failed to comply with all required System and University training programs during the performance evaluation year (see System Regulation 33.05.02—Required Employee Training). In instances where a faculty member received notification of a mandatory training program requirement near the end of the annual performance evaluation period, she or he has 30 days to complete the requirement. To verify compliance with the System and the University's training programs, faculty members during the annual review process acknowledge that they have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

### *6.5.3 Meeting between the Department Head and the Faculty Member*

Annually, there is an opportunity for a faculty member to visit with her or his Department Head to discuss the results of her or his annual performance review and performance-related expectations for the next academic year. In some instances, a faculty member and her or his Department Head may agree to meet more frequently.

### *6.5.4 Performance Assessment*

In assessing a faculty member's annual performance, the weights allocated to teaching, research and publication and service are consistent with the expectations associated with her or his appointment, the results of previous annual reviews, and with the faculty member's overall contributions to the department's and Mays Business School's strategic plans, her or his department's strategic plan, and the University's mission.

## ***6.6 Assessment Outcomes Requiring Action for Tenured Faculty Members***

As per University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 concerned with Post-Tenure Review, the following annual performance evaluation and Periodic Peer Review ratings require additional action.

### *6.6.1 Unsatisfactory Performance*

Being evaluated as *unsatisfactory* in any single category—research and publication, teaching, or service or in any other assigned responsibility (e.g., administration)—or as *needs improvement* in any two categories yields an overall rating of *unsatisfactory* for a tenured member of the faculty.

An annual review resulting in an overall *unsatisfactory* rating expresses in writing the basis for the rating in accordance with the specified performance indicators. The Dean and EAD receive a copy of each report specifying an *unsatisfactory* rating for a faculty member.



A written improvement plan accompanies each report the Dean and EAD receive in which faculty members earned an *unsatisfactory* performance review. The plan is a product of collaborative work between a faculty member and her or his Department Head. The plan specifies actions the faculty member will take to bring about near-term improvements in her or his performance. If deemed necessary, because of an *unsatisfactory* annual performance evaluation, the Department Head may request that the faculty member undergo a Periodic Peer Review. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall rating of *unsatisfactory* for three consecutive annual performance reviews or who receives an *unsatisfactory* rating during a Periodic Peer Review is subject to a Professional Development Review (see University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01—Post-Tenure Review).

### *6.6.2 Needs Improvement Performance*

When a tenured faculty member receives a *needs improvement* rating in any single area of faculty performance (teaching, research and publication, and service) during the annual evaluation process or during a Periodic Peer Review, she or he must work with her or his Department Head immediately to develop a plan for near-term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In research and publication, three years may be required for the faculty member to complete the plan successfully. The rating of *needs improvement* can remain as *needs improvement* as long as the faculty member is meeting predetermined milestones in the improvement plan. If the faculty member is not satisfying the approved milestones, her or his rating converts to *unsatisfactory*. When a faculty member completes all milestones of an agreed-upon improvement plan, her or his performance rating converts to *effective*.

### *6.7 Time Line*

The annual review process concludes prior to the beginning of the annual budgeting process. This sequencing allows Department Heads to assess faculty members' performances when considering merit increases (if any merit increases are available). This is important in that a stipulation from the Dean of Faculties' office requires the completion of all annual reviews before recommending merit increases (if any). On an annual basis, June 30 is the last day to complete annual reviews.

### *6.8 Complaint Procedure for Failing to Follow Guidelines*

A faculty member who believes that her or his annual review *process* lacks compliance with college and departmental procedures, or in the absence of access to published guidelines, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the Dean of Mays Business School through the EAD (with a copy of the letter going to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost). The Dean reviews the complaint and reaches a decision about its merits. A faculty member may appeal the Dean's decision to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. University guidelines (see section 2.4.3.6 of University Rule

12.01.99.M2) indicate that there is no formal appeal or grievance regarding the *substance* of an annual review.

## **7. Mid-Term Review**

In addition to the annual performance review, at the end of a tenure-accruing Assistant Professor's third year as a member of the Mays faculty, he or she receives a more detailed and comprehensive review, also known at Mays as the “third-year review.” This review is in accordance with Section 4.5.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

Comprehensive in nature, this review is mandatory for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period of five years or more.

### ***7.1 Purpose***

The purpose of a mid-term review is to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid mid-point of their probationary period. This review familiarizes the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensures that she or he understands the expectations of those entities with ultimate responsibility for the tenure and promotion decision. This review also ensures that the faculty member has a clear understanding of her or his status and progress.

The mid-term review mimics the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however, the Department Head may solicit internal letters of recommendation rather than external letters of recommendation.

As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review includes review by the department’s promotion and tenure committee, the Department Head, the Mays P&T committee, and the Dean. The Dean may delegate the evaluation of mid-term performance to the Executive Associate Dean.

This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and publication, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.

According to university rules, the mid-term review may replace the annual faculty performance review. However, Mays Business School requires that a faculty member receive an annual review even during the year when she or he participates in the mid-term review.

### ***7.2 Process***

The Mid-Term review focuses on:

- The individual's teaching performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's research and publication performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's service performance during the first three years of employment
- Providing an explicit statement of whether the individual is *on, above, or below trajectory* for a positive promotion and tenure decision at the appropriate time
- Providing an explicit statement of what area(s) of performance with respect to research and publication, teaching, and service, if any, is/are of concern.

The individual faculty member is responsible for assembling a dossier of materials related to her or his teaching, research and publication, and service contributions for review. To the extent possible, this dossier should mirror those required for the promotion and tenure process (with the exception of outside letters).

The mid-term review process calls for the tenured department faculty and the Department Head to first review the individual's dossier. A coordinator of the tenured faculty (or the chair of the departmental promotion and tenure committee, if applicable) and the Department Head prepare separate feedback memoranda. These memoranda address the five points above describing the purpose of the mid-term review.

University rules provide some flexibility regarding the timing of the mid-term review. The mid-term review may take place between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year and December of the target year. For example, for a faculty member hired in calendar year 2020, the target year of the mid-term review is 2023-2024. The review can take place any time after March 2023 with the end of December 2023 being the deadline for completion (See the following table.)

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2020	7 years	Mar – Dec 2023 (due before December 2023 of AY 2023-2024)

At Mays business school, the mid-term review follows the same calendar as that used for promotion and tenure cases. The review process begins during May of the academic year prior to the target academic year and concludes in December of the target year. Specifically:

- May-June—Department Heads notify candidates subject to the mid-term review of the requirement to prepare their dossiers
- June-August—Preparation of dossier
- August-September—Departmental reviews
- September—Departmental recommendations to the Dean
- October—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee completes its evaluations

- October-November—Mays Promotion and Tenure committee submits its recommendations to the Dean
- December—Dean prepares her or his independent evaluation. The Dean may delegate this task to the Executive Associate Dean.

### ***7.3 Feedback from the Mid-Term Review and Non-Renewal of Faculty Appointment***

The Department Head is responsible for meeting with the mid-term review candidate to discuss his or her feedback as well as the feedback from faculty in her or his department. The Department Head places her or his memorandum as well as the one the departmental faculty prepared into an individual's dossier. The Department Head then transmits the dossier to the Mays promotion and tenure committee. The Mays promotion and tenure committee conducts its own review and adds its letter to the faculty member's dossier.

The Office of the Dean receives the dossier with the results of the Mays promotion and tenure committee's deliberations included. The Dean and/or Executive Associate Dean meet with each individual. During this meeting, they provide their own feedback and answer questions/address concerns or issues she or he may surface. The Dean (or the Executive Associate Dean) prepares a summary memorandum of this meeting and shares it with the Department Head after placing it into the individual's dossier.

The Department Head and the EAD meet to review the outcome of the mid-term review. If the results of the mid-term review indicate a lack of sufficient progress by a tenure-track faculty member toward earning a promotion to an Associate Professor position with tenure, not renewing the individual's annual contract may be an appropriate decision.

At Mays Business School, the Department Head makes a non-renewal decision regarding a tenure-track assistant professor. The Department Head makes this decision with the advice and consent of the tenured faculty in that department and with the approval of the Dean and Executive Associate Dean.

A non-renewal decision about a tenure-track assistant professor must meet the "adequate consideration" standard explained below. This is a higher standard than the "at will" default standard in Texas labor laws.

Section 5.2 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 stipulates that "a decision not to renew the tenure-track appointment of a non-tenured faculty member ... shall be based upon *adequate consideration* of the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination."

Section 4.5.2 of the same rule defines "adequate consideration" as follows:

*Adequate consideration* of a promotion or tenure case consists of a conscientious review, which seeks out and considers all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the faculty member, and assumes that the various academic units follow their approved procedural guidelines during the promotion or tenure review process. Adequate deliberation over the evidence in light of relevant standards and exclusive of improper standards is the basis of such consideration. An improper standard is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member. The evaluation of a promotion or tenure case should constitute a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgment.

At Mays Business School, “adequate consideration” follows this process:

1. The Dean (or EAD as applicable), at the conclusion of the mid-term review process, determines that the candidate’s progress towards promotion and tenure is *below trajectory*; and
2. Following the Dean’s determination, a majority of tenured faculty in the department recommend non-renewal by secret ballot; and
3. The Head of the Department considers the recommendation of the tenured faculty.

If, following the above-mentioned process, the Department Head decides against renewing the appointment of an untenured, tenure-track assistant professor, she or he drafts a memorandum addressed to the faculty member, routed through the Executive Associate Dean and Dean. The memorandum informs the candidate of the decision and explains how adequate consideration of the faculty member’s performance is the basis for the decision. The candidate must receive such memorandum prior to May 31 of the academic year during which the mid-term review took place.

A tenure-track assistant professor who receives a non-renewal notice at the outcome of the mid-term review remains employed by her or his department on a full-time basis during the subsequent academic year. Her or his employment with the university and Mays Business School terminates on May 31 of the academic year that immediately follows the non-renewal decision.

A successful outcome of the mid-term review process does not guarantee any particular outcome for the mandatory (tenure) review process.

#### ***7.4 Non-reappointment of Untenured Assistant Professors at Other Times***

The period prior to or immediately following the outcome of the mid-term review provides an opportunity for the Dean, Executive Associate Dean, Department Head, and tenured faculty to evaluate the performance of assistant professors when considering renewal of their faculty appointments.

A non-reappointment decision regarding a tenure-track assistant professors may also occur outside the mid-term review process. Because assistant professors receive annual renewals of their appointment, a non-renewal decision may take place at any other time. However, the standard of “adequate consideration” continues to apply. When a non-renewal decision occurs for an untenured assistant professor at a time other than that of the mid-term review, Department Heads meet the standard of “adequate consideration” as follows:

1. Department Heads assemble and provide to the EAD significant evidence of major performance deficiencies, which, in the opinion of the Department Head result in a very low likelihood of a successful promotion and tenure decision. Documentation of these deficiencies is in the form of annual review letters, written reprimands, or other evidence that is acceptable to the EAD. Example of such deficiencies include pervasive and repeated insubordination and unsatisfactory evaluations; and
2. Department Heads obtain, by secret ballot, a vote of the majority of the tenured faculty in the department in favor of non-renewal. The tenured faculty must have access to the evidence mentioned in the previous paragraph and must be given ample opportunity to deliberate before the vote takes place; and
3. Department Heads seek the approval of the Executive Associate Dean and Dean before making the non-renewal decision.

Due to the absence of a peer-review process at the college level, Mays reserves non-renewal decisions outside the mid-term review process for the most serious, egregious cases when continuation of the faculty member’s appointment is clearly detrimental to the vision and mission of Mays Business School.

Decisions to renew a candidate’s appointment in any particular year, or over a period of time, do not guarantee any particular outcome for the mid-term review process or for the mandatory (tenure) review process.

If a non-tenured faculty member alleges that the non-reappointment decision results from a violation of academic freedom, a violation of civil rights, or any other form of illegal discrimination, the faculty member may appeal the decision with the President of Texas A&M University within twenty (20) business days of receiving the formal non-reappointment decision. (University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Sections 9.2 and 9.3).

### ***7.5 Non-reappointment of Academic Professional Track faculty***

Renewal of appointments for APT faculty members is “At Will,” both in the case of annual appointments and in the case of multi-year appointments. “At Will” means that the Department Head, with the Executive Associate Dean’s approval, may decide to not renew the appointment for any reason or for no particular reason, provided that a

decision to not renew a faculty member’s appointment has no coverage by a statutory exception or by a common law exception.

(Exceptions to “At Will” are available on the website of the Texas Workforce Commission at [https://www.twc.texas.gov/news/efte/wrongful\\_discharge.html](https://www.twc.texas.gov/news/efte/wrongful_discharge.html).)

APT faculty members who do not receive a renewal of their appointment receive notification of their non-renewal decision in writing within a “reasonable time” from when the department has decided against renewal, except when University Rule 12.01.99.M2 requires one-year advance notice.

APT faculty members are entitled to receive one-year advance notice as indicated in the table below.

Rank	Faculty members entitled to receive one-year advance notice of non-renewal	
	Years of Full-Time Service	
	Fewer than five	Five or more
Adjunct Assistant Professor	No	No
Adjunct Associate Professor	No	No
Adjunct Professor	No	No
Visiting Assistant Professor	No	No
Visiting Associate Professor	No	No
Visiting Professor	No	No
Assistant Lecturer	No	No
Lecturer	No	Yes
Senior Lecturer	Yes	Yes
Clinical Assistant Professor	No	Yes
Clinical Associate Professor	Yes	Yes
Clinical Professor	Yes	Yes
Executive Assistant Professor	No	Yes
Executive Associate Professor	Yes	Yes
Executive Professor	Yes	Yes

A major programmatic revision or a budgetary cutback are the basis for exceptions to the one-year advance notice requirement. The Department Head submits such requests, with appropriate documentation, through the EAD, Dean, Dean of Faculties, and Provost to the President of Texas A&M University for approval.

An APT faculty member who does not receive a renewal may present a grievance in person to the Dean. The Dean considers the grievance and renders a decision, which is final.

## **8. Post-Tenure Review**

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year but no less often than once every six years after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at an institution. The evaluation considers the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research and publication, scholarship, or creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities. This evaluation includes peer review of the faculty member.

This comprehensive evaluation is one part of the Periodic Review and the Post-Tenure Review process. For tenured faculty members, the Post-Tenure Review seeks to promote continued academic professional development. The review also enables a faculty member who has fallen below performance expectations and norms for her or his academic rank to pursue a peer-coordinated development plan. Resulting from effective implementation of this plan are improvements by an individual with respect to her or his performance in one or more of the three performance areas—teaching, research and publication, and service. Post-Tenure Review has two components:

- (1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6 above) conducted by a faculty member's Department Head (or another person responsible for completing an annual review of the faculty member's performance)
- (2) Period Peer Review by a committee of peers (see section 8.2 below)

### ***8.1 Purpose***

The purposes of the Periodic Peer Review are to:

- Assess whether an individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member holding a particular rank
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development
- Assist faculty members in efforts to enhance their professional skills and goals
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.



## ***8.2 Periodic Peer Review Committee***

The following guidelines describe the formation of the committee in charge of evaluating Associate Professors and Professors for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review:

- For Associate Professors and Professors who hold an endowed position (a chair or a professorship), *and who are reappointed to an endowed position*, the Periodic Peer Review committee is the Mays Research Council. The Periodic Peer Review occurs concurrently with the review the Research Council conducts to appoint (or reappoint) an individual to an endowed position.
- For Associate Professors and Professors *not holding an endowed chair or professorship*, or for *those who do not receive a reappointment to an endowed position*, those holding the rank of Professor in a faculty member's department form the Periodic Peer Review committee. This committee formation process applies when the faculty member's Department Head is not a member of the committee and when at least three faculty members are eligible to serve (that is, the department has at least three eligible Professors). If less than three faculty members are eligible to serve, the Dean appoints Professors from other departments to serve on the Periodic Peer Review committee so that a minimum of three Professors comprise the committee.

## ***8.3 Process***

### ***8.3.1. Process when Research Council Makes a Favorable Recommendation on the Appointment to an Endowed Position***

For Associate Professors and Professors for whom the Research Council recommends, by majority vote, in favor of reappointment to an endowed position, the periodic review concludes with the submission of such recommendation to the Executive Associate Dean. At that time, Mays concludes that the faculty member has had an effective performance in all areas of activity for the purpose of the Periodic Peer Review.

Appointments to a different type of endowed positions also satisfy the requirements of the Periodic Peer Review. These include faculty members serving previously in an endowed professorship position who receive an appointment to an endowed chair, or those previously serving in an endowed chair position who are appointed to an endowed professorship.

However, if the Research Council, by majority vote, recommends against reappointment to any endowed position of any type, Mays convenes a Periodic Peer Review committee to review the case, as explained in sub-section 8.3.2.

### 8.3.2 Process in All other Cases.

In all other cases, the Periodic Peer Review follows the process outlined in this Sub-Section. This includes cases where the Mays Research Council reviews an individual's performance and recommends against reappointment to an endowed position and cases where a stand-alone Periodic Peer Review committee at the department level reviews the faculty member.

Additionally, an individual experiencing a Periodic Peer Review prepares a one-page document describing the allocations of her or his time among research and publication, teaching, and service during the relevant six-year period with respect to these three performance areas.

#### 8.3.2.1 Materials Submitted

The materials submitted are comprehensive in nature. Because of this, they typically provide information and data that inform the conduct of a Periodic Peer Review. However, faculty members and administrators may use additional materials when they deem them helpful. A faculty member's assigned duties are the basis for completing a Periodic Peer Review. Members of committees evaluate a faculty member's performance to determine if it meets the expectations of a tenured member of the department's faculty.

#### 8.3.2.2 Materials Reviewed

The Periodic Peer Review committee reviews materials submitted by the individual experiencing such a review and then prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The committee provides an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings are identical to those used for Annual Performance Reviews (*excellent, effective, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory*).

#### 8.3.2.3 Effective Performance

If the Periodic Peer Review committee assesses a faculty member's performance to be *effective*, she or he will experience another review after six years as specified by School and University guidelines. However, receiving three consecutive ratings of *unsatisfactory* during Annual Performance Reviews completed by a faculty member's Department Head triggers a Periodic Peer Review.

#### 8.3.2.4 Unsatisfactory Performance

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *unsatisfactory* performance in any performance area during a Periodic Peer Review process shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria featured in

these guidelines. An *unsatisfactory* Periodic Peer Review triggers a Professional Development Review (see section 8.4 below).

#### *8.3.2.5 Needs Improvement Performance in Two Categories*

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *needs improvement* in any two of the three performance areas during a Periodic Peer Review process shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria featured in these guidelines. A finding of *needs improvement* in any two of the three performance areas triggers a Professional Development Review.

#### *8.3.2.6 Needs Improvement Performance in a Single Category*

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor, a finding of *needs improvement* in a single category during a Periodic Peer Review requires a specific, written explanation of the identified deficiencies. This explanation informs the immediate development of a near-term improvement plan. The faculty member and her or his Department Head collaborate to develop the improvement plan.

#### *8.3.2.7 Tenured Faculty with Joint Appointments*

For a tenured Associate Professor and for a tenured Professor with budgeted joint appointments, University and School guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (that is, where her or his Ad Loc resides) determines the conduct of the Period Peer Review, unless the faculty member requests a review by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department, the Department Head shares the report with her or his counterpart in the secondary unit.

#### *8.3.3 Submitting to the Dean of Faculties Office*

No later than May 31 of a year, each Department Head provides a list of faculty members undergoing a Periodic Peer Review during the current academic year to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, through the EAD and Dean. Also provided to these parties are the outcomes of the reviews completed and the dates of the last Periodic Peer Review the faculty members experienced. The Department Head places these documents into a faculty member's personnel file.

### ***8.4 Professional Development Review***

A Professional Development Review takes place when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall *unsatisfactory* annual review ratings or an *unsatisfactory* Periodic Peer Review, or upon a faculty member's request. The Department Head informs the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review and of the nature and procedures of the review. When substantive mitigating circumstances exist (e.g., illness), a Department Head, with the consent of the EAD, may recommend that the faculty member be exempt from a Professional

Development Review during that academic year. The Dean has final approval of such a recommendation. If the results of the Professional Development Review identify substantial or chronic deficiencies with respect to a faculty member's performance, the review committee describes the deficiencies in writing. The faculty member, Department Head, EAD and Dean receive a copy of the written report. The faculty member, review committee, and Department Head then work together to prepare a Professional Development Plan that the Dean finds acceptable.

The purposes of a Professional Development Review are to: (1) identify and acknowledge officially substantial or chronic deficiencies in performance, (2) develop a specific Professional Development Plan by which to remedy deficiencies, and (3) monitor progress toward taking the actions specified in the Professional Development Plan.

An ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee) conducts the Professional Development Review, unless the faculty member requests that the Department Head conduct it. The Dean appoints the three-member ad hoc faculty review committee in consultation with the Executive Associate Dean, the Department Head and faculty member for whom a review is to take place. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities, as directed by the Dean in consultation with the EAD.

Individuals holding the rank of Professor form the three-person ad hoc review committee. The Dean consults with the faculty member who is to receive a review and her or his Department Head to identify the Professors in the relevant department with interests and experiences aligned most closely with those of the faculty member scheduled for a review.

The faculty member scheduled for a review prepares 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 that a Professional Development Review is to occur. The dossier includes all materials submitted by the faculty member. Although review dossiers will differ, at a minimum, each dossier includes a copy of the faculty member's current *Curriculum Vitae*, a teaching portfolio, and a statement detailing current research, scholarship, or creative work.

The Department Head adds 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 the Department Head adds 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 Professional Development Review process.

The Professional Development Review occurs in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The Professional Development Review results in one of three possible outcomes:

- The results of the report identify no deficiencies. The committee informs the faculty member, Department Head, the EAD, and Dean in writing about this outcome. The committee's report suspends the outcome described in the prior annual review.
- The committee finds some deficiencies, but concludes that they are not substantial or chronic. The review committee details the deficiencies in writing and provides a copy of that document to the faculty member, the Department Head, the EAD, and the Dean.
- The committee finds substantial or chronic deficiencies when completing its work. The review committee details the deficiencies in writing and provides a copy of that document to the faculty member, Department Head, the EAD, and Dean. The faculty member, review committee, Department Head and EAD then collaborate to develop a Professional Development Plan that the Dean accepts.

### ***8.5 The Professional Development Plan***

The Professional Development Plan indicates the remedies for specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental or college-wide performance criteria and indicators). The Professional Development Plan grows out of a collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head, the EAD, and the Dean. The plan should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and Mays Business School. A faculty member participates in forming a Professional Development Plan. A faculty member has an obligation to be a part of efforts to develop a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement it.

Individual circumstances dictate the development of individual Professional Development Plans. In all instances though, a plan: (1) identifies specific deficiencies requiring attention; (2) defines specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; (3) outlines activities to undertake to achieve desired outcomes; (4) sets timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving outcomes; (5) indicates the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and (6) identifies institutional resources needed to support the plan.

#### ***8.5.1 Assessment***

The faculty member and Department Head meet annually to review her or his progress toward remedying deficiencies. The review committee, the EAD and the Dean receive annual progress reports from Department Heads. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular performance evaluation process (e.g., Annual Performance Reviews) may draw from the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals of her or his Professional Development Plan.

### *8.5.2 Completing the Professional Development 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 Professional Development Plan, the Department Head prepares and sends a final report to the faculty member, the EAD, and Dean. Completing the Professional Development Plan successfully is the positive outcome all parties seek through this process. Re-engaging a faculty member's talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

If after consulting with the review committee the Department Head, EAD and Dean agree that the faculty member failed to meet the Professional Development Plan's goals and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may begin under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

### ***8.6 Appeal***

If at any point during the process a faculty member believes that unfair use of post-tenure review provisions occurs, she or he may file a grievance under the provisions of University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01 "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

If the faculty member wishes to challenge the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to a specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, she or he can appeal to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consulting with the faculty member, Department Head, and Dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost regarding the committee's composition is final.

If a faculty member wants to challenge the validity of the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, she or he 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 that is acceptable to the Dean, mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost is the path through which a plan takes shape.

### ***8.7 Voluntary Post-Tenure Review***

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Post-Tenure Review may seek the counsel of peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review by making a request to her or his Department Head.

## **9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status**

University Rule 31.08.01.M2 states the following: “Every individual who at the time of separation holds a tenured appointment at Texas A&M University and has served the University at least ten years must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he or she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than ten years, may also be considered.” Faculty titles eligible for emeritus status include Professor, Associate Professor, (Adjective) Professor, (Adjective) Associate Professor, and (Adjective) Assistant Professor (except Visiting and Adjunct), Senior Lecturer and Lecturer.

### **9.1 Process**

The process for emeritus appointment begins *after* the candidate separates from the university.

- Each candidate for emeritus status submits a comprehensive *Curriculum Vita* to her or his Department Head
- All faculty members eligible, those holding tenured positions, receive and evaluate the candidate’s *Curriculum Vitae*
- Eligible faculty vote “yes,” “no,” or “abstain” regarding an individual’s candidacy for a position of emeritus faculty
- The Department Head prepares a memorandum stating her or his recommendation, the manner in which the faculty member performed in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and service that merits emeritus status and indicates if the individual retired in good status; the Department Head routes the memorandum, along with the candidate’s *Curriculum Vitae*, to the Provost through the EAD, Dean and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
- The EAD and Dean review the Department Head’s recommendation, and forward the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice President, through the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost

The emeritus designation may be requested to be added to an administrative title (Dean, Provost, Vice President, Vice Provost or Associate Provost) when a faculty member either leaves the administrative position and returns to his/her full-time faculty position or leaves the university. The Provost initiates nominations for emeritus designation for a Dean, Vice President, Vice Provost or Associate Provost; the President receives these requests. The President initiates nominations for emeritus designation for a Provost. Recommendations from the President go to the Chancellor, who makes recommendations to the Board of Regents for their confirmation.

### **9.2 Eligibility Criteria**

Faculty members are eligible for the emeritus designation if they have made a positive contribution to the mission of the university and have retired from the university in good standing. Good standing means that the faculty member demonstrated conduct “in a

manner consistent with the code of ethical conduct in accordance with System Policy 07.01, Ethics, throughout the individual's employment.”

The EAD, with the concurrence of the Dean, determines if the faculty member was in “good standing” at the time of separation from the university. The tenured faculty and Department Head jointly determine if the faculty member made a positive contribution to the mission of the university and to Mays’ vision and mission. Meeting the above-mentioned standards is sufficient for the emeritus designation.

### ***9.3 Privileges***

Emeritus faculty are encouraged to continue their participation in the many varied activities associated with campus life and, consistent with established policies, to avail themselves of University facilities.

With appropriate approval, emeritus personnel can receive invitations to participate in graduate faculty activities and to accept appointment on graduate committees.

Emeritus faculty may retain access to their Mays email account and may remain listed in the Mays directory. Emeritus faculty must notify their Department Head of their preferences as soon as possible following approval of the emeritus title.

Emeritus faculty may request office space through the Department Head. The Department Head, in consultation with the EAD, is responsible for determining whether appropriate space is available and for assessing the extent to which the emeritus faculty member contributes directly to department’s mission and goals. Office space granted to emeritus faculty may be different from prior assigned space. The Dean, in consultation with the EAD is the final authority for initial and subsequent office assignments to emeritus faculty. Therefore, Department Heads should address requests for space allocation to the EAD and provide a brief justification for the request. Department Heads may elect to require brief reports of activities from emeritus faculty annually in preparation for seeking approval for office space.



## **Appendix A: Transition to Retirement Program**

### ***A.1 Overview***

The Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program (TRP) offers eligible faculty members the opportunity to make a staged transition from full-time faculty status to retirement. The TRP allows faculty members to retain tenure and some benefits while decreasing responsibilities and commitments according to a predetermined schedule. The application form appears at the end of this appendix.

### ***A.2 Eligibility***

A full-time faculty member is eligible to apply for the TRP if at the time of proposed entry into the program the individual:

- Holds tenure at Texas A&M University
- Has completed at least ten years of full-time employment at Texas A&M University
- Earned a performance evaluation of *effective* or better in the categories of teaching, research and publication, and service during the most recent academic year
- Holds an Ad Loc position in Mays Business School
- Receives 100% of her or his pay from Mays Business School.

### ***A.3 Phased Transition Period***

By participating in the TRP, eligible faculty members elect to reduce their percentage of effort for a defined phased transition period (normally up to a maximum of three years). Using then current Mays criteria and guidelines, departments continue evaluating the performance of those pursuing the transition program. Typically, the expectation is that a person involved with the TRP will concentrate on teaching during the transition period. These individuals must earn a minimum rating of *effective* (and hopefully *excellent*) during the transition period when concentrating on teaching to retain program eligibility. Failure to earn at least an *effective* rating in teaching for those concentrating on that performance area results in possible discontinuance of the transitioning program.

A desire to concentrate on research and publication during the transition process is possible. A request to emphasize research and publication while transitioning to retirement must receive Department Head approval and subsequently, approval by the EAD and the Dean. Faculty members concentrating on research and publication during the transition program must earn a minimal rating of *effective* (and hopefully *excellent*) regarding research and publication to maintain program eligibility. Failure to earn at least an *effective* rating in research and publication for those concentrating on this performance area results in possible discontinuance of the program.

Participating faculty members retain their tenure and faculty title (e.g., Professor, Associate Professor) during the phased transition period. At the end of the phased transition period, participating faculty members relinquish tenure and separate from

employment by retiring. Faculty members agree to relinquish tenure and separate employment at the date mutually agreed upon before the phased transition period begins; this agreement is irrevocable (subject to conditions detailed in Section A.4).

#### ***A.4 Modifying the Phased Transition Period***

During the phased transition period, a participating faculty member may petition for an extension or other modification(s). A participating faculty member may also choose to resign before the end of the predetermined phased transition period. No approval is required; but to allow an affected department time needed to adjust its plans regarding teaching in particular, a program participant should inform her or his Department Head of her or his intention at least one semester in advance.

#### ***A.5 Percentage Effort and Workload***

During the phased transition period, a participating faculty member receives an appointment at no more than 75% effort (75% FTE) or less. Workload and compensation during the phased transition period is determined in advance as part of the written agreement. It is important to note that any reduction in FTE below 75% but higher than or equal to 50% results in a reduction in the employer's state group insurance premium (SGIP). Any reduction below 50% FTE results in employee ineligibility for tenure and for SGIP coverage.

Workload and compensation may be constant over the course of the transition period or may vary by a predetermined amount during the period of the transition. For example, an individual may propose to be at 75% FTE in the first year, 50% FTE in the second year, and 25% FTE in the third year. University policies regarding SGIP coverage should inform an individual's decisions regarding variances in work percentages across time.

Workload and compensation may be constant within a given year or workload and compensation may be unbalanced. For example, if a participating faculty member has a 50% appointment the appointment may be 50% over the full nine-month academic year or it could be at a rate of 100% effort for four and one-half months and zero percent effort for the remaining four and one-half months.

In all cases the distribution of courses taught during an individual's participation in the TRP may not have a negative effect on a department's academic programs.

#### ***A.6 Compensation and Benefits***

Participating faculty members receive compensation according to their percentage of effort during the phased separation period (e.g., at 50% of their nine-month base salary if effort is 50% for the full nine-month period). Participation in TRP has implications for both benefit coverage and benefit costs. Accordingly, we encourage faculty members considering participation in the TRP to consult the Texas A&M Division of Human

Resources and Organizational Effectiveness for guidance on benefits both during the TRP and after separation.

### ***A.7 Other Considerations***

If an individual teaches in a Mays-sponsored program for additional compensation (e.g., CED, EMBA, PMBA, etc.) during the TRP, the compensation for such teaching is at the then contemporaneous standard pay rate offered to faculty who teach in these programs.

If at the time of entry into the TRP a faculty member holds an endowed position, she or he typically resigns it at the beginning of the agreed-upon transition period. This allows allocation of an endowed position to another Mays colleague working on a full-time basis. However, a faculty member may consult with the EAD and Dean regarding the possibility of retaining some portion of her or his endowed position. The Dean's decision regarding this possibility is final. If desired, an individual entering into a phased transition period may request appointment as an Emeritus Professorship Holder or as an Emeritus Chair Holder. The Dean has final approval regarding such requests. An individual relinquishing an endowed position when entering the transition program may request some research support by visiting with her or his Department Head. If supportive, but if the department lacks funds, the Department Head may submit a request for financial support to the EAD and Dean, who has final approval authority.

### ***A.8 Process for Requesting Transition to Retirement***

Eligible faculty members interested in participating in the TRP submit an application to the Dean through their Department Head and the EAD.

Applications must specify:

- the proposed date of entry into the TRP
- the proposed duration of the TRP, and
- the proposed workload and responsibilities during the TRP

For eligible faculty members with joint appointments all relevant unit heads must approve the proposal.

Once a TRP proposal receives approval, the Dean's office prepares, and the Dean signs, a formal Separation Agreement (the Agreement), which includes the participant's signature as well.

### ***A.9 Administrative Provisions***

The School may amend the TRP or terminate it if changes in funding, system policy or regulation, University rules, or other unforeseen circumstances require such actions.

***Application Form:  
Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program Proposal***

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Start Date of Phased Transition Period \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Retirement from TAMU \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed workload and duties during phased transition period. Describe teaching expectations, research and publication commitments, and service obligations. Include additional pages if necessary:

I am applying for the Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Approval:**

The faculty member meets the eligibility criteria of the Mays Business School Transition to Retirement Program. The proposed workload and duties meet the needs of the department.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Associate Dean Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **Appendix B: Faculty Workload Guidelines**

In general, the norm is for Mays faculty members to be involved with teaching activities during each academic year. In this section, we describe the guidelines used to determine workloads for members of the Mays Business School faculty.

### ***B.1 Workload Guidelines for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty***

#### *B.1.1. Nominal Teaching Loads*

The following policies and guidelines inform teaching loads for Mays Business School tenured and tenure-track faculty without administrative appointments.

##### *Three Courses per Year*

An annual load of three course per year (with the Department Head approval) applies in the following instances when a faculty member maintains an *effective* performance in teaching and service:

- Untenured faculty for whom a reduced load is a market necessity and who have an active on-going research and publication program
- Faculty who hold the rank of University Distinguished Professor and continue demonstrating *excellence* in terms of research and publication
- Faculty who have maintained for many years and continue to maintain an *excellent* research and publication record resulting in high levels of national and international visibility.

##### *Four Courses per Year*

An annual load of four courses is modal for faculty members who do not meet one of the three criteria mention above but who demonstrate on-going *effectiveness* in research and publication in combination with on-going *effectiveness* in teaching and service.

##### *Five Courses per Year*

An annual load of five courses is modal for faculty members whose performance in research and publication *needs improvement* and who demonstrate ongoing *effectiveness* in teaching and service.

##### *Six Courses per Year*

For faculty members who receive one or more ratings of *unsatisfactory* in research and publication during the most recent three years, an annual teaching load of six courses is the norm, provided that the faculty member demonstrates ongoing effectiveness in teaching and service.

## *B.1.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances*

### *B.1.2.1. Exceptional Teaching and Service*

In addition to evaluating performance in the area of research and publication, Department Heads take into account other considerations such as the nature and scope of a faculty member's teaching and service contributions to the profession and/or the institution. In light of special teaching situations (such as individuals teaching large sections, remote learning courses through on-line delivery mechanisms, and/or other especially time-demanding classes) and/or special service situations (such as chairing a major university committee, providing *excellent* service to an inordinately large number of committees, or directing a high-impact educational program), adjustments to these workloads are possible in the form of one or two course releases per year. Any such adjustment applies only as long as the special circumstances exist.

### *B.1.2.2. Teaching in the Full-Time MBA Program*

Faculty members who regularly teach two sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every two years and those who regularly teach one sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every four years.

### *B.1.2.3. One-time Course release for Assistant Professors*

In exceptional cases, Department Heads may grant a one-time course release of one course section in an academic year to faculty members serving at the rank of assistant professors for competitive market reasons. Such an exemption is also possible when Mays requests an assistant professor to teach a new course that requires significant preparation. Department Heads may offer this course release only once during the period of time when the faculty member serves at the rank of Assistant Professor. The EAD approves these requests.

### *B.1.2.4. Dean Approval Required for all other Cases*

With the two exceptions noted above (teaching in the full-time MBA program and one-time course releases for assistant professors), teaching loads of less than three courses for tenured and tenure-track faculty members requires approval from the EAD and Dean. In addition, the Dean and the Executive Associate Dean must also approve course releases in excess of two courses per academic year.

The EAD and Dean also approve course loads higher than six courses a year for tenured and tenure track faculty. In rare instances, a tenured faculty member may choose to meet their service expectations through additional teaching.

### *B.1.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads*

Without adverse effect on academic programs, a faculty member may request an unbalanced teaching load to block time for other professional activities. For instance, an individual with a three-course load may request that she or he teach the three courses in either a fall or a spring semester, allowing an individual to concentrate on research projects during the non-teaching semester.

If approved, the semester in which he or she lacks a teaching assignment does not allow a faculty member to conclude that she or he is on “paid leave” in any sense of this word.

During a non-teaching semester, a faculty member maintains an active presence in the department and continues fulfilling her or his service commitments. If a faculty member expects to be away from campus and outside the Bryan/College Station area for any meaningful amount of time during a non-teaching semester, she or he must complete an Alternative Work Location (AWL) form, unless the absence is related to approved business travel.

AWL requests require approval from the Department Head, the EAD, the Dean, and the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. Due to international taxation issues, Mays does not approve AWL requests for locations outside the United States. Mays considers exceptions to this policy; but only in rare and exceptional cases of *force majeure* and with the approval of the Provost. Approved AWL requests occur when absence from the campus yields benefits for Mays and when such absence permits continuing fulfillment of an individual’s assigned duties.

### *B.1.4. Course Buy-Out*

Faculty who wish to “buy out” of one or more courses with a research grant during the academic year can do so with her or his Department Head’s approval. Mays reduces the nine-month base salary by 1/6 for each course the faculty member buys out.

## ***B.2 Workload Guidelines for Academic Professional Track Faculty***

At Mays, most APT faculty choose teaching as the focus of their work, with research *or* service being a second performance area in which they contribute. Department Heads consult with APT faculty members to determine if research and publication *or* service will be their secondary area of emphasis.

With the approval of their Department Head, other APT faculty choose service as the focus of their work, with teaching being a second performance area in which they contribute.

### *B.2.1. Nominal Teaching Loads*

Below, we list the nominal teaching loads for APT Faculty employed on a full-time basis in Mays Business School.

- Clinical faculty:        six courses per academic year with service expectations similar to those of tenured faculty
- seven courses per academic year with a minimal level of service expectations
- eight courses per academic year without service expectations
- Executive faculty:      six courses per academic year with service expectations similar to those of tenured faculty
- seven courses per academic year with a minimal level of service expectations
- eight courses per academic year without service expectations
- Lecturer faculty:        eight courses per academic year
- Visiting faculty:        three to eight courses per academic year depending upon the extent to which research, particularly high-impact research, is an expectation of the position. Mays expects visiting faculty with significant research expectations to have a nominal teaching load of three or four courses per year while those with significant teaching and service expectations to have a nominal teaching load of five or six courses per year. Visiting faculty without any research or service expectations normally have a teaching load of eight courses per year.

For APT faculty appointed on a part-time basis, Mays reduces the nominal teaching load in proportion to the percentage FTE appointment. When the reduction results in a fractional number of courses, Department Heads consult with the EAD about the appropriate teaching load.

Department Heads determine the nominal teaching loads of APT faculty taking into account the appropriate mix of teaching and service contributed by each faculty member.

### *B.2.2. Course Releases for Special Circumstances*

#### *B.2.2.1. Exceptional Teaching and Service*

Department Heads take into account other considerations such as the nature and scope of a faculty member's teaching and service contributions to the profession and/or the institution. Special teaching and/or service situations may result in adjustments to a



faculty member's teaching load. Large sections, delivering remote learning courses through on-line delivery mechanisms and other time-demanding classes are examples that might result in a reduced teaching load. Chairing a major university committee, providing *excellent* service to a large number of university and/or Mays committees and directing high-impact educational programs are examples of service responsibilities that might result in a reduced teaching load. Any such adjustment applies only as long as the special circumstances exist.

#### *B.2.2.2. Teaching in the Full-Time MBA Program*

Faculty members who regularly teach two sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every two years and those who regularly teach one sections per year in the full-time MBA program receive a course release of one course section every four years.

#### *B.2.2.3. Research and Intellectual Contributions*

With the approval of the Department Head and EAD, clinical faculty members who regularly publish their research in respected academic journals may receive course releases. Similarly, executive faculty members with ongoing intellectual contributions that meet the AACSB scholarly practitioner standard may receive course releases.

#### *B.2.2.4. Dean Approval Required for all other Cases*

Teaching loads of less than four courses per year for APT faculty members requires approval from the Executive Associate Dean.

#### *B.2.3. Concentration of Teaching Loads*

Without adverse effect on academic programs, an APT faculty member may request an unbalanced teaching load to block time for other professional activities. For instance, an APT faculty member with a teaching load of eight courses per year may request to teach five courses in the fall semester and three courses in the spring semester. This request might occur if the APT faculty member is serving on a University committee that has a heavier workload in fall terms compared to spring terms. The Department Head accommodates such requests if she or he concludes that accepting them supports the faculty member's efforts and does not harm the department's teaching mission.

If an APT faculty member obtains approval to concentrate his or her teaching load in a single semester, the semester in which he or she lacks a teaching assignment does not allow a faculty member to conclude that she or he is on "paid leave" in any sense of this word.

During a non-teaching semester, a faculty member maintains an active presence in the department and continues fulfilling her or his service commitments. If a faculty member expects to be away from campus and outside the Bryan/College Station area for any

meaningful amount of time during a non-teaching semester, she or he must complete an Alternative Work Location (AWL) form, unless the absence is related to approved business travel.

AWL requests require approval from the Department Head, the EAD, the Dean, and the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. Due to international taxation issues, Mays does not approve AWL requests for locations outside the United States. In rare and exceptional cases, Mays considers exceptions to this policy in instances of *force majeure* and with the approval of the Provost. Approved AWL requests occur when absence from the campus yields benefits for Mays and when such absence permits continuing fulfillment of an individual's assigned duties.

## **Appendix C: Promotion and Tenure Dossier**

Candidates for promotion and/or promotion with tenure assume the lead role in preparing a dossier for various parties' review. At various stages in the review process, those responsible for individual stages of the process add appropriate materials. The University may alter its format and content expectations for dossiers annually. Currently, the University is using Interfolio as the platform through which promotion and/or promotion and tenure packages reach the Dean of Faculties Office.

The dossier description that follows is relatively general in nature. Awareness of annual University requirements rests with individual candidates and reviewers (relative to their respective roles).

### ***C.1. Dossier Materials Submitted by the Candidate***

The sections of the dossier listed below are those that Mays expects the candidate to prepare and submit to the department for review. Currently, the candidate submits these materials through Interfolio by using the sections in the "Candidate Packet" portion of the Interfolio dossier.

#### *Section 1: Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service*

The candidate provides, in concise form (a maximum of three pages, single spaced), a statement describing his or her goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out her or his professional responsibilities with respect to teaching, research and publication, service and other relevant activities, if any. This statement provides a context for review of the file at each level; however, the statement is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or tenure.

The candidate's acknowledgment of the contents of the promotion and tenure dossier as submitted to the departmental review committee (not including outside letters) appears under the first section of the Interfolio dossier.

#### *Section 2: Candidate's Curriculum Vitae*

A candidate's *Curriculum Vitae* should be concise and current when submitted for consideration.

Refereed publications appear separately from publications (or other creative works) that were not refereed. Complete documentation for each citation, including date of publication and inclusive page numbers, appears on the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*.

Also presented separately are "in press" manuscripts (that is, those accepted but not published). The candidate includes the acceptance document (letter or email) in this section. Manuscripts under review appear in a separately captioned list. Where relevant as evidence of research and publication performance, a candidate notes the amount of

funded research as well as her or his role in the projects (for example, principal investigator, co-principal investigator, etc.).

### *Section 3: Grant Summary Chart*

In this section, the candidate includes a copy of the Grants Summary Chart using the template prescribed by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. The chart accurately lists the grant information provided at the end of the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*. This chart can include the career long awards to the faculty member. The candidate verifies that the grants and associated details listed in the *CV* and the Grant Summary Chart are congruent.

### *Section 4: Verification of Contents Statement*

In this section, the candidate describes and certifies the authenticity of the materials she or he is submitting for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration. The list of materials might include items such as: the three-page impact statement, *Curriculum Vitae*, articles, books, portfolios (teaching, research and publication, service, other), student evaluations, list of suggested external reviewers, list of "do not contact" external reviewers, and any other materials the candidate submitted. Departmental reports, outside letters, or other materials the candidate is not submitting are not a part of the list of materials.

### *Section 5: Faculty Data Table*

This section contains a faculty data table, completed using the format prescribed by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. The data table includes career totals that the Dean of Faculties and other Texas A&M University officials use to respond quickly to questions and requests for information. Candidates leave cells of the table blank if they do not apply to their particular situation.

### *Section 6: Faculty Biography*

The Faculty Biography is a 200-word maximum bio of the candidate that appears in the spring recognition booklet featuring newly tenured and/or promoted faculty. Items for inclusion in the Faculty Biography are the following:

- Candidate's name
- Terminal degree, institution where earned, year earned
- Year and rank she or he joined the Texas A&M faculty
- Focus areas for teaching
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to teaching and/or teaching impact (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Teaching awards or honors (if applicable, optional)
- Focus areas for research and/or scholarship

- Notable accomplishments and impact related to research and/or scholarship or and creative activities (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Research awards or honors (if applicable, optional)
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to service (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Service awards or honors (if applicable, optional).

#### *Section 7: Candidate External Review Checklist*

The candidate submits a form, available from the Office of the Dean of Faculties, disclosing the names of the external reviewers she or her recommends to the department and the names of any potential reviewers on the “do not contact list.” In addition, the candidate certifies that the external reviewers he or she selected satisfy the University’s criteria and conditions.

#### *Section 8: Teaching Portfolio*

To facilitate the evaluation of teaching, the candidate prepares and submits the following materials and items for review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee:

- Summary of teaching assignments and evaluations over the last five years
- Summary of graduate student committees and chairperson roles over the last five years
- Materials documenting instructional innovation(s)
- Listing of teaching awards
- Any other materials relevant to the performance indicators appearing in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Mays Guidelines for Faculty Appointments and Evaluations concerned with *excellence* and *effectiveness* in teaching.

#### *Section 9: Research Portfolio*

For the evaluation of research performance, the candidate prepares and submits materials such as the following:

- List of publications with complete citations (including data of publications and inclusive page numbers) organized as:
  - Refereed journal articles
  - Books or chapters of books
  - Proceedings and presentations
  - Other, including non-refereed journals
  - Work in progress
- Manuscripts accepted for publication but not published appear as “in press” entries; a received acceptance letter or email is included
- Submitted but unaccepted items/manuscripts appear in a separately captioned list
- Summary of reviewing and/or editorial activities
- List of research grant(s) and contract(s) funded and report(s) to sponsor(s)

- Other materials relevant to the indicators appearing in sections 4.5 and 4.6 in the document mentioned above concerning *excellence* and *effectiveness* in research and publication
- Reprints (copies) of three of the most significant publications.

### *Section 10: Service Portfolio*

To facilitate the evaluation of service, the candidate prepares and submits the following materials and items for review by the departmental promotion and tenure committee:

Evidence of *excellent* or *effective* performance in service engagements such as

- Officer, committee chair, or program chair in a professional organization(s)
- Program chair or a similar position for a national/international meeting(s)
- Administrative leadership role within Mays Business School and/or the University
- Officer or member of the Faculty Senate
- Chair or member of a major university, school, or departmental committee or task force
- Significant departmental, Mays Business School, University, or system administrative or service roles
- Service on a major governmental commission task force or board
- Attraction of significant external financial support or other contributions to external development efforts
- External activities that result in improved employment opportunities for Mays Students
- Advisor to a student organization
- Performance of administrative tasks within the department
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups performed on a *pro-bono* basis or in exchange of a nominal honorarium
- Service as a consultant to business organizations and/or governmental agencies
- Professional service to the local community and/or to the public at large that is commensurate with the faculty member's responsibilities to Mays Business School
- Self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

### *Section 11: Other Activities*

This section of the dossier is for materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include unsolicited letters from students, peers or collaborators that were not part of a structured evaluation process or letters from TAMU faculty members. Annual performance evaluations by a candidate's Department Head and results from the mid-term review report may also appear in this section.

### *C.1.1. Exceptions for APT Faculty Members*

Promotion decisions regarding APT faculty members do not require external review letters. Accordingly, APT candidates for promotion do not complete Section 7 of the candidate dossier.

Moreover, APT candidates for promotion typically do not complete Section 9 of the candidate dossier (Research Portfolio). However, Clinical faculty members for whom research and publication is an expectation do complete Section 9. Even though these candidates complete Section 9, they remain exempt from completing Section 7 (external reviewer checklist).

### *C.1.2. Exceptions for Mid-Term Reviews*

Mid-term reviews of assistant professors do not require external review letters. However, internal review letters may be included if requested by the Department Head. Accordingly, assistant professor candidates for mid-term reviews do not complete Section 7 of the candidate dossier.

## ***C.2. Dossier Materials Included Submitted by the Department and College***

The sections of the dossier listed below are those that the department and college complete according to University guidelines. Currently, these sections fall within the “Internal Sections” category in Interfolio.

### *Section 1: Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet*

The department generates a cover sheet for each dossier, using the format prescribed by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. The cover provides basic personnel data about the candidate.

### *Section 2: Department Evaluation Teaching Report*

A departmental peer review committee typically prepares this document with the author noted. Subsequent reviewers should be able to find documented evidence for statements made in the report.

The departmental evaluation of teaching includes one or more of the following items, as appropriate:

- Peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine levels of scope, rigor and quality of the candidate’s course offerings
- Comments from peers regarding a candidate’s student ratings. Also prepared are summaries of the student evaluations, a longitudinal perspective regarding a candidate’s teaching performance, and an analysis of numerical data within the

context of departmental standards and norms. This document contains a listing by academic year of the courses taught. In brief, a complete chronological summary of student ratings of an individual's teaching over a five-year period (as applicable) appears in tabular form. However, the basis of evaluations of an individual's teaching performance includes more than student ratings

- Peer evaluation of development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses
- Peer evaluation of special efforts the candidate made to improve her or his teaching or to develop new teaching materials
- Peer evaluation of publications with a teaching focus in refereed journals, including journals dedicated to education in the faculty member's discipline
- Documentation and evaluation of participation in honors programs and development of honors courses (if any participation)
- List of awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, with explanation as appropriate.
- List of external invited presentations describing and discussing teaching innovations
- List of competitive, refereed, externally funded grants for projects with a strong teaching focus
- Evaluations by former students or exiting students, if gathered in an unbiased way
- Evaluation of publication of instructional materials, including textbooks
- Other evidence of teaching quality as deemed important by the department and as evaluated by peers
- Peer evaluation of the candidate's performance in classroom teaching situations. This evaluation includes mention of the methods and frequency of observation as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department engages in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service to develop her or his teaching ability, these evaluations are natural additions to the dossier. Faculty engaged in the review of classroom instruction are to be familiar with the process of effective observation of instruction. The Center for Teaching Excellence is a resource for information on the effective observation of classroom instruction.

### *Section 3: Department Evaluation of Research or Other Scholarly Activities Report*

A departmental peer review committee typically prepares this document with the author noted. The indicators of *effectiveness* and *excellence* in research and publication (see sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this document) serve as the basis for committee's assessment.



External reviewers' letters are extremely important when evaluating an individual's research productivity. Assertions of "quality" of publications and research require evidence. When using grant activity as an indicator of research quality, the candidate includes information about the extent of peer review in the competitive process.

#### *Section 4: Department Evaluation of Service Report*

A departmental peer review committee typically prepares this document with the author noted. Peer evaluation of the quality of service to the candidate's department, Mays Business School, University, or other relevant constituencies is part of the review process. This section of the report may also include service beyond the campus, such as service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

#### *Section 5: Department Evaluation of Other Activities Report*

This section includes the departmental evaluation of the quality of other activities, if any, that are relevant to the visions and/or missions of the University, Mays Business School, and the candidate's department. No information appears in this section if it lacks relevance with respect to the candidate's performance.

#### *Section 6: External Reviewer Chart*

This section lists all external reviewers, from whom the department requested letters, using a template provided by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. For each reviewer, the department indicates if the candidate or the department provided her or his name.

The name(s) of reviewers who do not maintain an arm's length relationship with the candidate are listed in this chart, as are the name(s) of reviewers who were asked to write a letter but declined to do so (along with a reason for declining).

From the candidate and department reviewer lists, a group of at least seven are selected and contacted by the Department Head or by the Chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (when applicable) if the Department Head chooses to delegate this role to the Chair.

Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, promotion to full professor and promotion for must include a minimum of five arms' length letters, although seven is preferred.

The department is responsible for ensuring receipt of least five letters. Thus, the person responsible for requesting and tracking the external reviewer letters (Department Head or Chair of the Departmental P&T Committee) follows up as needed to verify receipt and acknowledgment of the letters as well as acting on them the required timeline.

Currently, Texas A&M University expects that external reviewers serve at the rank of full professor at peer or aspirational peer universities. It is possible to seek letters from faculty members at top academic programs from other institutions, and from preeminent experts at other institutions. In these instances, it is necessary to provide justification in the form of program ranking and expertise credentials. This justification comes in the form of a request initiated by the Department Head addressed to the Dean through the Executive Associate Dean.

Department Heads take care in selecting external letter writers to ensure that:

1. They are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, no co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors (unless the department has more than the minimum five letters on hand)
2. They hold at rank of full professor at a peer or aspirational school, unless the Dean grants an exception. Generally, Department Heads should ensure that they can produce at least five letters from full professors at peer and aspirational schools before seeking such exemptions from the Dean
3. The candidate did not identify any of the external letter writers as unacceptable.

The recommendation is that each department solicit an equal number of letters for all candidates, and about equal numbers from the candidate and department list.

All letters received for each candidate must be included in the dossier.

The expectation is that departmental promotion and tenure committee, the Department Head, and the Dean will address negative comments appearing in outside letters as well as positive comments where the ultimate recommendation is negative. These comments inform the understanding of those who are part of the review process and provide them with additional information required to reach a decision.

#### *Section 7: Department External Reviewer Checklist*

The department submits a form, available from the Office of the Dean of Faculties, disclosing the names of the external reviewers selected by the department. In addition, the Department Head or a designee thereof must certify that the external reviewers he or she selected satisfy the criteria and conditions established by the university.

#### *Section 8: External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Request*

In this section, the department provides a sample letter used to solicit external reviews. All solicitation letters must use the University Standard External Review template prescribed by the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

Colleges have the option to modify the letter based on the need of their discipline; however, they must obtain approval from the Office of the Dean of Faculties prior to

modification. Department Heads who seek to solicit such modifications must seek permission from the Dean of Faculties and route their request through the EAD.

### *Section 9: External Reviewer Biographies/Justifications*

This section includes a document listing the name, title, affiliation, contact information and a half a page (maximum) biography highlighting specific qualifications and credentials for each reviewer listed on the chart, using the following format:

- External Reviewer Name:
- Title (Include Faculty Title):
- Affiliation:
- Contact Information (Email & Phone Number):
- Short Biography Paragraph

Departments do not submit a *CV* for each reviewer nor do they copy and paste the reviewer's *CV*. This should be a short biography.

The external reviewer biographies follow the same order as listed in the external reviewer chart.

In the case of external reviewers not holding the full professor rank at peer or aspirational universities, this section also presents a request, approved by the Dean, to include that particular individual on the list of external reviewers.

### *Section 10: External Evaluations*

This section includes all external review letters received in relation to the candidate's review for promotion or for promotion and tenure.

Department Heads who solicit internal review letters for mid-term review candidates use this section of the dossier to include the internal letters.

### *Section 11: Department P&T Committee Discussion Report & Recommendation*

This section includes the eligibility for sitting on a departmental P&T committee, and the complete departmental report and recommendation.

In each department at Mays, the Departmental P&T committee includes all full-time faculty members serving at superior rank to that of the candidate receiving consideration for a promotion (or for promotion and tenure).

The chart below defines "superior rank" and guides eligibility for membership on the Departmental P&T committee.

<b>Rank of faculty member being reviewed</b>	<b>Tenured faculty rank?</b>	<b>Rank eligible for tenure?</b>	<b>Superior ranks for the purpose of serving in the Departmental P&amp;T committee</b>
Professor	Yes		N/A
Associate Professor	Yes		Professor
Assistant Professor	No	Yes	Associate Professor, Professor
Clinical Professor	No	No	N/A
Clinical Associate Professor	No	No	Clinical Professor, Professor
Clinical Assistant Professor	No	No	Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Associate Professor, Professor
Executive Professor	No	No	N/A
Executive Associate Professor	No	No	Executive Professor, Professor
Executive Assistant Professor	No	No	Executive Associate Professor, Executive Professor, Associate Professor, Professor
Senior Lecturer	No	No	N/A
Lecturer	No	No	Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Executive Associate Professor, Executive Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

The P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendations is advisory in nature. The main purpose of this report is to convey the essence of the departmental committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and impact of her or his work as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure.

The report verifies that committee members gave adequate consideration to teaching, research and publication, service, and/or other activities (when applicable), and that the current set of promotion and tenure guidelines promulgated by the college are the basis of the recommendation. A mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate's demonstrated abilities and the committee's concerns.

The report reflects the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate's case and the committee's recommended action. For example, "the majority thought the quantity of publications was good, but questioned the quality," or "a minority was concerned about the rate of productivity," or "the research and scholarly publications were excellent but a few committee members expressed concerns about the quality of the teaching."

All committee members review the contents of the committee discussion report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and

voting outcome with their signature. Electronic signatures obtained via DocuSign are acceptable when completed from the committee member's DocuSign account.

#### *Section 12: Department Head Recommendation*

This section includes the Department Head's independent assessment of the candidate. She or he includes in this section a discussion of the peer review committee's evaluations and recommendations as well as the external letters and any further evaluation she or he wishes to make.

This report should include a discussion of the departmental P&T committee evaluations and recommendations, as well as the external letters (if applicable) and any further evaluation the Department Head desires to offer. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's scope (quality, productivity overtime) and impact of her or his performance in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and departmental vision, mission, expectations and criteria.

#### *Section 13: College P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation*

This section includes the complete report and recommendation of the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee. Similar to the departmental P&T committee report, this document reflects the college committee's discussion, primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other, and the final committee vote. This report addresses the candidate's accomplishments and her or his impact in the context of the college's goals and expectations. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's impact in all the areas of responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and college Mays' vision, mission, expectations and criteria.

All committee members review the contents of its discussion report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature. Electronic signatures obtained via DocuSign are acceptable when completed from the committee member's DocuSign account.

#### *Section 14: Dean Recommendation*

This section includes the Dean's independent evaluation and recommendation. Similar to the Department Head's report, the Dean's report is an analysis of the case that provides a general basis for strengths or weakness, addresses any mixed or negative votes, and explains the vote of the Dean. If the Dean's vote is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations that fact should be clearly and specifically addressed.

The report from the Dean should make an independent determination helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing or quoting other materials in the package. An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's impact in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific discipline and college mission, goals,

expectations and criteria. This is especially important for cases that have generated strong differences in recommendation during the evaluation process.

*Section 15: Other Materials and Documentation*

This section includes other materials and documentation deemed pertinent to the case, but not placed in one of the other sections. Letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process are example of other materials that could be included. Annual performance evaluations by the Department Head and mid-term review reports to the candidate may also be included in this section. However, publications and student evaluations do not appear in this section.

## **Appendix D: Hiring Faculty with Tenure-upon-Hire and/or at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor**

### ***D.1. Regular Process***

Hiring external faculty candidates with tenure-upon-hire and/or at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor follows as closely as possible the process used for the granting of tenure and/or promotion for current Mays faculty members. The exception is that it is possible to submit such requests outside of the standard promotion and tenure cycle.

Accordingly, the Department Head of the potential hiring department assumes responsibility for creating a dossier that includes all of the documents required of internal candidates. The current process calls for using Interfolio to assemble the review documents (as indicated in Appendix C), followed by a submission of the complete P&T packet in the DOF Portal.

### ***D.2. Expedited Tenure Review for the Rank of Professor***

In exceptional cases (full professors with tenure from peer or aspirant institutions, national academy members, recipients of a Nobel Prize), candidates for tenured positions at the rank of Professor are eligible for an expedited tenure review. The expedited process applies for both tenure and appointment at rank.

The process for Expedited Tenure Review is the same as that used for internal candidates, with the following exceptions:

- The Department Head requests a minimum of three arms-length external review letters, in addition to reference letters received as part of the hiring package. Department Heads consult with the Office of the Dean about the process for requesting these three arms' length external reviews.
- It is not necessary to receive individual reports on teaching, research and publication and service reports as long as the department committee's summary report addresses teaching, research and service.
- In cases of time pressure, the review by departmental and the Mays Promotion and Tenure committees may be conducted electronically. However, P&T committees must make every effort to meet and discuss the expedited tenure case under review.

### ***D.3. Contingencies in Offer Letters***

A department is free to make its own hiring recommendation decisions prior to completing the dossier. Moreover, with the consent of the Office of the Dean, candidates may receive an offer prior to the official completion of the tenure and promotion review process. In such cases, however, the offer letter must indicate that the offer at rank and/or with tenure upon hire arrival is contingent on a positive outcome of the tenure and review process at all levels.

Given the lead times necessary to obtain external letters and to prepare dossiers, Department Heads keep all relevant parties informed as to their intentions regarding hiring with tenure upon hire and/or at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For example, it may be useful to discuss anticipated hiring recommendations with the chair of the Mays promotion and tenure committee in advance.

If a department desires to appoint a newly hired faculty member to an endowed chair or to an endowed professorship (in addition to tenure and/or advanced rank), the Mays Research Council also reviews the dossier and makes recommendations to the Dean regarding the candidate's qualifications for an endowed position. Typically, the Mays Research Council completes its review after the Mays promotion and tenure committee completes its review. In some cases, however, these reviews may occur simultaneously. However, since the appointment to an endowed position requires Dean of Faculties' approval, the offer letter to the candidate indicates that such appointment is subject to final approval at the university level.



## **Appendix E: University Distinguished Professor Nomination Guidelines**

Submitting nominations for the University Distinguished Professor award is the Dean of Mays Business School's prerogative. No candidate advances to the university selection committee without a Dean's recommendation.

However, to achieve fairness and transparency, each college adopts an internal selection process that is consistent with university requirements. Additionally, college Deans prepare and make available to faculty a document outlining college procedures to include the selection process used in the college as well as the criteria for selecting UDP candidates.

At Mays Business School, the selection process and nomination criteria appear in this Appendix.

Mays Business School forwards no more than three nominations each academic year. However, the School may not forward any nominations in one or multiple academic years.

### ***E.1. Eligibility Criteria***

#### *E.1.1 Scope of the Award*

The University Distinguished Professor (UDP) award is an honorific title recognizing extraordinary contributions as well as national and international eminence in the area of research. The words traditionally used to describe the contributions of a University Distinguished Professor are *transformational, seminal, and impactful*. The university and Mays Business School believe these words connote outcomes from a scholar's research portfolio that demonstrate eminence in her or his field. These words represent the fundamental criteria for the UDP award.

The definition and use of the term "research" encompass all creative and scholarly contributions in our business disciplines, consistent with the culture of each discipline.

Mays expects each business discipline to have metrics and qualitative measures that define eminence (as specified in the paragraph above) and extraordinary standing among peers. The context of an academic discipline informs the use of these factors to evaluate a candidate for the University Distinguished Professor award.

The eligibility criteria and selection process detailed in this Appendix follow the published university guidelines closely and are consistent with the 2020 recommendations of the University UDP Selection Task Force formed by Provost Carol Fierke.

### *E.1.2. Eligibility*

At a minimum, a candidate for the UDP award must be without question, in the “top 2%” of his or her peer group. At Mays Business School, the peer group is the group of full professors in the candidate’s discipline with full-time faculty appointments at peer and aspirational universities.

The “top 2%” assessment is a qualitative, not statistical, evaluation. Meritorious performance in teaching and service, however excellent, do not receive consideration in the selecting UDP award recipients.

Candidates for the UDP award will have made one or more original or transformational contributions that many others in an academic discipline recognize to have significantly advanced or redirected scholarship in the relevant field. Transformational implies that the work was a substantial intellectual leap forward, rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge. Moreover, the impact of the candidate’s contribution should result in the candidate’s recognition as a pre-eminent world authority in his or her field. Receiving major national and international awards exemplifies these types of accomplishments. We recognize that individuals with unique career paths, or fields with few or no awards, may provide other indicators of intellectual leadership within their field, such as membership in professional associations in the field that demand outstanding, exemplary achievement of their members.

Viable candidates for receiving a UDP award are those whose peers recognize, through written statements, to be among the most pre-eminent active individuals worldwide in their area of research or scholarship. Mays requires a minimum of ten letters of evaluation from leading scholars in a candidate’s field. Mays seeks letters written by distinguished researchers from national and international academic institutions. The letters should confirm that the candidate meets the meritorious standards set forth above and that accordingly, the letter writer endorses the granting of a UDP award to the candidate.

The following accomplishments, in themselves, are insufficient to qualify for the University Distinguished Professor award:

- A substantial and sustained record of high-quality research productivity;
- Testing, applying and/or implementing original work done by others.

In addition, while DP nominees are typically excellent teachers and mentors, these criteria do not factor into the analysis of a nomination of an individual to receive a UDP award. Accordingly, comments about teaching accomplishments are absent in the nomination package.

Candidates must be active, full-time faculty members at Texas A&M University for a minimum of one year before nomination and consideration for the title of University

Distinguished Professor. The rules of the faculty senate determine the full-time status of a faculty member.

Candidates may hold administrative assignments; but administrative competency is not an evaluation criterion.

Before submitting a UDP nomination, each Department Head must submit to the Office of the Dean descriptions of those criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative that define how faculty judge eminence in their academic discipline. These criteria flow from consultation with the departmental faculty; the EAD, the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, and the Dean approve them. Following approval, all departmental faculty receive a copy of the criteria. The Associate Dean for Research and Scholarships (ADRS) applies the approved criteria as part of his or her independent assessment of the candidate. The university selection committee also receives a copy of these criteria.

Every year, each Department Head, with faculty input and with approval of the EAD, ADRS, and Dean, update or revalidate these criteria.

## ***E.2 Nomination Process***

At Mays Business School, the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship (ADRS) is the “unit head” in charge of the nomination process for UDP awards.

Department Heads typically initiate the nomination process for UDP. Other paths through which nominations surface are: (a) a current UDP at Mays, (b) a submission from the Mays Research Council (by majority vote), or (c) through petition from three or more faculty members.

All UDP nominations within a department go first to the Department Head. No formal letter is necessary at this stage because the ADRS writes the formal nomination letter at the conclusion of the review process.

When the nominator is a person other than the Department Head, the nominator sends a short email to the Department Head to nominate the candidate. When the Department Head receives such email, or if the Department Head is the nominator, the Department Head contacts the candidate to assess his or her interest in receiving a nomination for the UDP award.

If the candidate accepts the nomination, the Department Head directs the candidate to prepare his or her dossier as described below in Section E.2.1.

The initiation of the nomination process occurs annually through an announcement from the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

### *E.2.1 Role of the Candidate*

A candidate receiving a nomination for a UDP award submits to the Department Head the following information:

1. A complete *Curriculum Vitae* that satisfies the following specifications:
  - Refereed publications (or other types of creative works) listed separately from non-refereed publications, with the lists captioned accordingly
  - Complete documentation for each citation, including a date of publication and inclusive page numbers
  - Items accepted but not published receive this designation; items that are under review, but not accepted, appear in a separately captioned list
  - If any coauthors are the candidate's graduate students (past or present), they are delineated in such a manner that this relationship is discernible
  - Any major invited presentations and major awards won. For awards, the candidate provides a brief description of the selectivity and process for winning such an award.
2. The names of six outside reviewers who are distinguished researchers at peer or aspirational schools, and/or at leading international universities.
  - The reviewers are individuals at universities of high repute, similarly ranked and distinguished scholars in the business discipline of the candidate; the preference is for letters from scholars who are qualified to hold the same rank and distinction as the candidate if they were faculty members at Texas A&M University
  - Between two and three of the outside reviewers hold positions at leading international universities
  - In addition to their professional accomplishments, reviewers are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, reviewers may not be co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors of the candidate
  - The candidate submits a statement discussing the credentials and qualifications of the outside reviewers
  - The candidate submits a signed statement certifying that each reviewer meets the stated arm's length criteria.
3. A detailed statement of three to five pages in length, emphasizing the candidate's transformational contributions to the discipline, with specific reference of how these contributions satisfy the departmental criteria developed by the faculty and approved by the Dean (see Section E.1, above).

### *E.2.2 Role of the Department Head*

Upon receipt of the candidate's materials, the Department Head verifies that the dossier is complete, and that there is approval from the Dean's office of the list of criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the

assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above.

The Department Head then forwards the candidate's materials to the ADRS and to the Executive Associate Dean.

### *E.2.3 Role of the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship*

The ADRS approves the list of reviewers the candidate selected, for compliance to these guidelines.

Subsequently, the ADRS selects six additional outside reviewers who are distinguished researchers at peer or aspirational schools, and/or at leading international universities.

- The reviewers are individuals at universities of high repute, similarly ranked and distinguished scholars in the candidate's business discipline; the preference is for letters from scholars with qualifications to hold the same rank and distinction as the candidate if they were faculty members at Texas A&M University
- Between two and three of the outside reviewers hold faculty positions at leading international universities
- In addition to their professional accomplishments, reviewers are persons whose objectivity is unquestionable – that is, reviewers may not be no co-authors, longtime friends, former students, or former mentors of the candidate
- The ADRS prepares a statement discussing the credentials and qualifications of the outside reviewers
- The ADRS submits a signed statement certifying that each of the reviewers satisfies the stated arm's length criteria.

The ADRS solicits outside letters of reference from the twelve outside reviewers (those recommended by the candidate and those selected by the ADRS). When soliciting outside letters, the ADRS:

- Explains the criteria and standards required for the UDP award at Texas A&M University
- Includes the candidate's statement and *Curriculum Vitae*
- Solicits from each reviewer a specific evaluation of the candidate in relation to the criteria set forth in Section E.1, emphasizing that the evaluation must provide a rank of the candidate's pre-eminence in the discipline in relation to peers, and that it must specifically identify and discuss one or more original or transformational contributions of the nominee and the impact of those contributions
- Includes the following statement "Your letter will be kept confidential; however, under Texas law your letter may be relinquished through an open records request."

The ARDS includes a copy of the written request in the appropriate section of the candidate's dossier (see below).

The ADRS is responsible for ensuring that no fewer than ten external letter writers submit a letter for subsequent review.

The ADRS documents all cases when an outside reviewer declines to write a letter, or fails to write the letter after accepting the invitation previously. The ADRS also documents any reasons given by outside reviewers for declining the invitation or for not being able to complete the letter.

#### *E.2.4 Role of Faculty UDP Review Committee*

After receiving the ten review letters, the ADRS forms a *Faculty UDP Review Committee*. All full-time Mays faculty members holding the title or the rank of University Distinguished Professor are part of this Committee. The ADRS, in consultation with the Dean and with the university-level DP Executive Committee, may invite UDPs from other colleges to join the Committee.

The ADRS convenes a meeting of the Committee at a time when all voting committee members are available. At the beginning of their meeting, Committee members elect a committee Chair by secret ballot. The EAD or the ADRS administers the vote. The ballot format appears at the end of this subsection.

The committee holds a meeting (in person or via remote means) to deliberate on the merits of the candidate. A quorum is present when no more than one voting member is absent.

The ADRS attends the meeting of the Faculty UDP Review Committee. The role of the ADRS is to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the ADRS shares information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the ADRS abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the ADRS avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The ADRS has no vote on the committee.

Voting faculty members must attend the entire discussion of the candidate in order to exercise the right to vote. Voting faculty members who do not attend the meeting relinquish their right to vote; however, within 48 hours of the conclusion of such meeting, such individuals may write a separate letter, addressed to the ADRS, containing their personal recommendation. The letter may inform the recommendation made by the ADRS but does not affect the votes tallied at the conclusion of the meeting.

The Committee reviews the candidate's dossier and outside review letters and recommends to the ADRS whether Mays Business School should nominate the candidate for the UDP award.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Committee drafts a written report addressed to the ADRS. With specificity, the report evaluates the extent to which:

- The candidate is thought to be pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her area of research or scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)
- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)
- The candidate has had a major impact on his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and many scholars conclude that her or his scholarship redirected conversations in the field).

The report concludes with an overall summary of the candidate's qualifications in relation to the UDP nomination criteria, and provides a specific recommendation to the ADRS for or against forwarding the nomination to the university level.

If four or more nominees receive review in any particular year, the Committee also drafts a separate recommendation addressed to the ADRS to recommend which nominees, if any, who should advance for consideration at the university level, keeping in mind that no more than three nominees may go forward in any given year.

A secret ballot reflects the committee's recommendation. Ballot formats include paper and ballot box, or an online voting or survey platform where each committee member receives a unique, anonymous link to cast a vote. If an online platform is the choice, the administrator of the voting process ensures that no committee member may vote more than once and that the vote of each committee member remains secret to all parties involved in the process. For example, if Qualtrics is the voting method in use, ballot secrecy happens by choosing the following settings for a survey "by invitation only" and "anonymous."

#### *E.2.5 Role of the Executive Associate Dean*

The Executive Associate Dean (EAD) ensures that all stages of the nomination process remain in compliance with this Appendix and with applicable college and university guidelines.

The EAD is also responsible for submitting a complete dossier to the Dean of Faculties Office at the conclusion of the review process.

The Executive Associate Dean (EAD) may attend the meeting of the Faculty UDP Review Committee unless otherwise requested in writing by a majority of the voting members of the committee to abstain from doing so. If the EAD attends the meeting, he or she serves as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if individuals present inaccurate statements, the EAD shares information to assist in

clarifying or presenting the facts. However, the EAD abstains from efforts to influence the thinking or voting of the faculty. For instance, the EAD avoids championing or advocating for a positive or negative outcome. The EAD has no vote on the committee.

At the request of the Dean, or in cases of a vacancy in the ADRS position, the EAD may substitute for the ADRS during any or all stages of the review process.

#### *E.2.6 The Joint Roles of ADRS and Dean*

After receiving the report of the UDP committee, the ADRS performs her or his own independent assessment of the candidate.

If the ADRS supports the nomination, he or she prepares a detailed *Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar*. The statement specifically addresses the extent to which:

- The candidate is thought to be pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her business discipline scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)
- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)
- The candidate has had a major impact in his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and he/she is widely recognized to have redirected scholarship in the field).

The Statement also provides a detailed description of the process used to select the outside reviewers.

The ADRS forwards the nomination dossier to the Dean through the EAD. If the Dean agrees with the ADRS's recommendation, the Dean writes a short affirmation and returns the complete dossier to the EAD who forwards it to the Dean of Faculties office.

If the ADRS does not support the nomination, she or he will inform the candidate that the nomination will not move forward to the university level. The candidate may appeal the ADRS' decision to the Dean.

The expectation of this process is that the Dean follows the recommendation of the ADRS except under very rare and unusual circumstances that receive clear explanation.

If the Dean agrees with the ADRS decision, the Dean informs the candidate and the case does not move forward to the university.

If the Dean disagrees with the ADRS decision, the Dean writes the *Detailed Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar* and the EAD forwards the dossier to the Dean of Faculties office. The statement specifically addresses the extent to which:



- The candidate is considered pre-eminent in his or her own field (at a minimum, the candidate must be among the top 2% of active researchers in his or her area of research or scholarship among full professors at leading and aspirational institutions)
- The candidate has made at least one highly documented transformational contribution (i.e. the work caused a substantial intellectual leap forward in the discipline rather than an incremental extension of existing knowledge)
- The candidate has had a major impact in his/her field (i.e. his/her work is central in any narrative of the field, and she or he is a person many prominent scholars see as producing work that redirected scholarship in the field).

The Statement also provides a detailed description of the process used to select the outside reviewers.

In all cases, the Dean's decision is final.

### ***E.3 Nomination Dossier***

#### *E.3.1. Materials Submitted by the Candidate*

The candidate who accepts the nomination submits to his or her Department Head the following materials to initiate the review process:

1. A complete *Curriculum Vitae* that meets the specifications of Section E.2.1
2. The names of six outside reviewers who meet the criteria mentioned in Section E.2.1
3. A detailed statement of three to five pages in length, emphasizing the candidate's transformational contributions to the discipline, with specific reference of how these contributions meet the departmental criteria developed by the faculty and approved by the Dean (see Section E.1, above)
4. A short verification statement by the candidate that accurately identifies the materials submitted for review.

#### *E.3.2 Materials Submitted by the Department Head*

The Department Head submits to the Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship the following documents:

1. The dossier submitted by the candidate (item E.3.1, above)
2. A list of criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above; this list requires previous approval by the Office of the Dean.

### *E.3.3 Materials Submitted by the Dean*

The Dean submits the following materials for review at the university level:

1. The form titled “Dossier Cover Sheet – University Distinguished Professor” provided by the Office of the Dean of Faculties
2. A *Statement on Quality and Impact of the Candidate as a Scholar* prepared by the ADRS or Dean, as mentioned above in Section E.2.6
  - a. If the ADRS is the author of this Statement, the Dean includes a short letter of affirmation and support
  - b. This section also includes the departmental criteria, metrics, measures, and characteristics, quantitative and qualitative, that define the assessment of faculty eminence in their respective business disciplines, as required in Section E.1., above
3. The candidate’s complete *Curriculum Vitae* (item #1 of Section E.2.1)
4. A minimum of ten outside review letters obtained using the process described in Section E.2.
  - a. This section includes copies of the written requests the ADRS sent to solicit these letters
  - b. We also include clear documentation of the internal Mays process used to identify and select the outside reviewers
5. The report of prepared by the Faculty UDP Review Committee (Section E.2.4)
6. The following biographical materials
  - a. A 250-word paragraph in Word format that includes the following information, in this order:
    - i. Name
    - ii. Terminal degree, year, and institution
    - iii. Year they joined the Texas A&M faculty
    - iv. Area(s) of specialty
    - v. Description of her or his contribution to the scholarship in the candidate’s field.
    - vi. Any notable honors or awards received
  - b. A digital photograph that is a head or upper-body shot, in which the head is one inch high. Digital photos are of high quality with a minimum of 300 dpi.

## **Appendix F: Adoption and Revision of Mays Guidelines**

### ***F.1. Adoption***

The following shared-governance process is in use at Mays Business School to adopt these guidelines:

1. The Department Heads from the five academic departments meet to review the proposed document. Together, they consider implementing those changes and suggestions that are likely to gather broad support from the faculty and to advance the vision and mission of Mays Business School in significant ways.
  - i. Some proposed changes may be departmental-specific, others will be college-wide changes
  - ii. Most changes related to research and publication and teaching standards, workload, and promotion and tenure requirements likely require college-wide approval
  - iii. At the same time, some level of variance in terms of processes and difference in emphasis across the five departments may surface
  - iv. Changes must be consistent with Mays Business School's vision and mission, with AACSB requirements, and with university requirements; the document may not, under any circumstance, deviate from university or AACSB requirements
  - v. The five Department Heads consult with the EAD where appropriate during this process.
2. If the Department Heads agree to a common set of changes, they propose the revised document to the EAD for approval. If the EAD requests further changes, the Department Heads continue to work on the document until the proposed revisions are acceptable to the Dean's Office. The EAD consults with the Dean at this stage.
3. After the document is acceptable to the Dean's Office, the Department Heads from each academic department solicit input from departmental faculty. Department Heads have broad discretion to select within their departments the most appropriate shared-governance mechanism for soliciting input.
4. After obtaining faculty input, the Department Heads meet with the EAD to review the faculty input and to consider further changes to the document. The EAD consults with the Dean at this stage.
5. If the five Department Heads and the EAD jointly agree to a final set of revisions, they submit the document to the Dean for final approval. Otherwise, the process reverts to a previous step for a new iteration.

6. If, after three iterations, the Department Heads and the EAD do not agree on a final document, the Dean of Mays Business School, after consulting with the EAD, with the Department Heads, and with other relevant constituencies determines the final content of the document.
7. In all cases, the Dean of Mays Business School approves the final document.

### ***F.2. Revisions***

The following shared-governance process is in use at Mays Business School to revise these guidelines over time:

1. At any time, each of the five Department Heads may recommend to the EAD that revisions to the guidelines be a topic of discussion. When this occurs, the person who initiates this conversation states the reasons for recommending such revision.
2. Departments may establish internal procedures to allow faculty members to recommend revisions; however, these revisions must go through the Department Head and receive her or his approval.
3. Upon receiving from a Department Head a request for revision, the EAD consults with the Dean and convenes a meeting of the five Department Heads. The meeting's purpose is to solicit the Department Head's views about the necessity of a revision. If the Dean, the EAD, and at least three of the five Department Heads concur, the EAD initiates the revision process.
4. The Dean or the EAD may also initiate revisions to this document.
5. Following an initiation of a revision, we follow the process outlined in Section F.1 for adoption.

### ***F.3. Technical Corrections.***

The revision process outlined in Section F.2 applies to major, substantive revisions. Minor, technical corrections require approval of the five Department Head, the EAD, and Dean.

Trivial corrections (such as typos) require approval of the EAD only.

Mays circulates the guidelines to the Dean and to the five Department Heads after each technical correction made under the provisions of Section F.3.