

# Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation

## College of Nursing

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks .....	3
3. Areas of Faculty Performance .....	5
4. Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness.....	7
6. Annual Review.....	15
7. Mid-Term Review.....	20
8. Post-Tenure Review .....	21
9. Granting Faculty Emeritus Status.....	24
Appendix A.....	25

Approved by the College of Nursing November 17, 2020

Approved by the Dean of Faculties Office December 10, 2020

# 1. Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M University **College of Nursing** is to educate professional nurses of today and leaders of tomorrow through excellent educational programs in nursing by identifying, attracting and graduating students of high potential, especially those who have been historically underrepresented in health care in Texas. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential. This document is designed to provide a means to promote and thus retain faculty members whose excellence makes them beneficial members of the academy, while providing them with stability of employment.

The expectations of the College for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach among teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their field of endeavor. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom, thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines ([UR 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2.2](#)). Therefore, this document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the mission of the [University](#) and the College; and such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

This document defines, only where necessary, the context of *TAMU Rules and Guidelines* as they apply to meeting role expectations for promotion and tenure in the CON. All TAMU documents that guide faculty appointments and establish expectations for promotion, tenure, employment, and annual review are relevant to the *CON Guidelines*. Links to university documents are in the below table.

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

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 statements take precedence*.

## 2. Faculty Tracks and Ranks

### 2.1. Faculty Tracks

There are two categories of faculty tracks: “Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty” and “Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure-track)”.

All faculty members having positions with the word Professor in the title will have a terminal degree. On occasion there may be exceptions for academic professional track (APT) assistant professor candidates with clinical or professional expertise needed to meet the CON educational or practice mission, and whose minimum education is at the Master of Science level in nursing. Faculty ranks within are determined as follows:

2.1.1. Assistant as a Qualifier. Assistant as a qualifier in the title indicates an entry-level position in academia. Individuals should have credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field, and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas of performance required by their appointment of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.

2.1.2. Associate as a Qualifier. Associate as a qualifier in the title indicates experience in academia or substantial contributions to the field, and for tenured or tenure-track faculty all of the bullet points listed below. For APT faculty, sections (2.2.2) and (3.2) always apply, but section (3.1) will be evidenced in alignment with the areas required by the individual faculty member’s appointment:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment, as measured against the contributions of others in the field. Professional conduct that will advance the interests of the CON and is:
- Congruent with standards of professional integrity
- Congruent with Aggie Core Values
- An area of specialization germane to the programs of the CON, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintain the level of competence in teaching and research/scholarly activity expected of a tenured faculty member.

2.1.3. Professor as a Qualifier. Professor as a qualifier in the title and with no other rank qualifier (i.e., Assistant or Associate) indicates substantial experience in academia and evidence of significant sustained impact on the discipline or profession. In addition, such faculty members are expected to have demonstrated all of the required attributes listed in (2.1.2.) for faculty members with the Associate qualifier as part of their title and rank.

**2.1.4. Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty:** The tenured/tenure-track recognizes University- employed faculty members who make significant and sustained contributions to the mission of the CON in all three (3) areas of performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or faculty development leave appointments). Assistant Professor is a tenure-track appointment while Associate Professor and Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members.

**2.1.5. Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure track):** The academic professional track (APT) faculty contribute to the mission of the CON in more focused ways, particularly in advancing the teaching and clinical service missions. Normally APT faculty are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of research/scholarly activity or service, or both, as assigned. APT faculty are assigned to and evaluated on a primary area of responsibility (teaching, clinical service, or research/scholarly activity), but are also expected to contribute in a second area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). There is no prohibition for APT faculty to be involved in duties related to all three areas: teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service. APT faculty appointments do not carry tenure potential.

## 2.1.6 Academic Professional Tracks

*Clinical Assistant Professor*: For initial appointment to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor faculty shall hold, as a minimum, a terminal professional degree in nursing or a related field with training and experience in an area of specialization. There must be clear evidence of skill in clinical practice and teaching at the baccalaureate level at a minimum. Clinical Assistant Professors should also have demonstrated potential for contributions in research/scholarship, service, or leadership.

*Clinical Associate Professor*: In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor, individuals appointed to the Clinical Associate Professor rank should ordinarily have had extensive successful experience in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students, fellows, and residents or interns) in clinical activities in the field. Faculty seeking promotion to Clinical Associate Professor must have demonstrated expertise in didactic and clinical teaching. The Clinical Associate Professor may also demonstrate superior research/scholarship, service, or leadership, as assigned.

*Clinical Professor*: In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor shall have demonstrated excellence in clinical practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding national reputation among colleagues. Faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor shall also have demonstrated remarkable leadership in the integration and application of nursing knowledge in the profession in addition to superior accomplishments in either research/scholarship, service, or leadership, as assigned.

The appointment of non-University employees to *Clinical Assistant Professor*, *Clinical Associate Professor*, or *Clinical Professor* is limited to extraordinary instances in which the CON deems the individual has contributed or will contribute to leadership roles in its educational, research, or clinical missions. In general, these appointments will be leadership positions with close collaboration with the CON on key academic, research, or clinical initiatives. Examples of possible “extraordinary instances” include:

- Key leadership positions that will advance the CON’s educational, research, or clinical mission.
- Key directors of training programs within the University.
- Key roles in collaborative clinical initiatives.
- Serving in leadership roles on CON or University standing committees or other ad hoc committees.

*Research Assistant Professor*, *Research Associate Professor*, and *Research Professor*: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of research and scholarly activities and must contribute to either service or teaching. These faculty members typically have no obligation to teach regular courses and typically do not have significant, reoccurring classroom teaching assignments. These faculty are expected to mentor and advise students in their area of scholarly expertise as relevant to the role.

Faculty in these appointments are subject to the guidelines posted by the Dean of Faculties and Vice President for Research (<http://dof.tamu.edu/Hiring/RESEARCH-FACULTY>). These types of appointments require the pre-approval of the position by the TAMU Vice President for Research (VPR).

*Senior Professor* and *Senior Associate Professor*: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Faculty in these appointments have been hired into an APT position following retirement and giving up tenure or moving to a non-tenure track position and giving up tenure. Senior professors are hired in a very specific role and are expected to make significant contributions in one area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). Academic ranks are conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the time of retirement.

*Visiting Lecturer*, *Visiting Assistant Professor*, *Visiting Associate Professor*, and *Visiting Professor*: Appointments are for individuals who are temporarily appointed by the CON, but have continuing academic appointments in other

institutions. Appointments may be renewed yearly for up to three (3) years at the discretion of the CON, although reappointment is possible after three (3) years. Academic ranks are normally conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the academic institution at which he or she holds a continuing appointment. Visiting faculty with the professorial title (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor) are expected to make significant contributions in one area of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). However, faculty with the lecturer title will only be required to contribute to the area of teaching. University rules state that faculty members with the Visiting modifier are not eligible to participate in tenure and promotion decisions of tenure-track faculty, selection and evaluation administrators and faculty senate.

Lecturer: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Individuals appointed as a Lecturer shall, at a minimum, have a master's degree in nursing. Faculty in these appointments teach, but are generally not required to consistently make significant contributions in the area of scholarly research or creative work, or in the area of service.

Assistant Lecturer: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees and appointed for less than five years for either candidates for a doctoral degree, or individuals who are not expected to fill a permanent faculty position at the CON. These appointments are focused on teaching, and they do not have eligibility for voting rights in shared governance processes on campus.

Joint Faculty: Appointments happen within the context of the University. In a true joint appointment situation, the employee of one University department/college is appointed part of his/her time to work for another University department/college, thereby splitting the full time effort between both departments. In a courtesy joint appointment situation, the request is based on a desire of the University's department/college where the faculty member is housed to have the faculty member perform certain non-remunerated duties for another department/college. A University faculty member appointed under a joint appointment is appointed with the same title held by the faculty member in their home department/college.

### 3. Areas of Faculty Performance

Faculty roles in academic nursing (tenure-track and APT) are scholarly endeavors and all faculty provide instruction and service. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) published a consensus statement regarding this in 1999, the document is entitled, *Defining Scholarship for Academic Nursing* (AACN, 2018). The AACN describes an inclusive model of scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and teaching as defined by Boyer (1999). Scholarship in nursing is significant to the profession, creative, can be documented, replicated or elaborated, and can be peer-reviewed. The key indicator of an individual's scholarship is the cumulative impact of the work on the field of nursing and healthcare." (AACN).

These guidelines begin with criteria for promotion, tenure, mid-term review and post-tenure review for tenure-track/tenured faculty followed by criteria for the APT faculty. In general, application for promotion and tenure is made in the fifth year of the probationary period. (Note that the probationary period can be found in each tenure track faculty member's original letter of hire). These guidelines serve as the basis for performance evaluation in the College of Nursing.

Note that time in rank is not sufficient for promotion; promotion requires demonstration of significant achievement. The key criterion for promotion and for tenure is evidence of impact as a result of one's work. As noted in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provided by the Office of the Dean of Faculties:

*Promotion and tenure decisions are not a matter of meeting numeric targets. Rather, the quality of the contributions and their impact should be evident. The holistic analysis ... should be consistent with standards established by the department, college, and university guidelines. An essential aspect of (the candidate statement) is to place the impact of the candidate's contributions in the context of the specific (college) mission, goals, expectations and criteria.*

The CON values and supports all faculty in their desire to advance through the academic ranks within their track. Per University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1.4, “exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another.

### **3.1 Teaching**

Teaching is central to the mission of the College, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: 1) contribute to instruction and student development; 2) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and 3) promote and diversify the development of the College’s instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, tenure, and promotion.

In the College, teaching occurs across a number of different clinical and didactic settings. Instructional settings can include interprofessional educational activities, clinical simulation, standardized patient care experiences, telehealth and virtual settings. For additional information on the evaluation of teaching, and rank expectations, see the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Appendix A).

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are: multiple sources of information and methods must be considered when assessing teaching. Student evaluations are required but not sufficient to evaluate teaching. Other measures/sources of information may include: 1) self-evaluation; 2) peer-evaluation; 3) student feedback; and 4) student learning.

### **3.2 Research, scholarly activity or creative work:**

Research/scholarly activity is essential to the mission of the CON. The discipline of nursing, by its very nature, crosses disciplines and other health professions; thus, CON scholarship is flexible and broad. In some instances, it intersects greatly with other academic disciplines. Likewise, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within nursing science. Excellence in scholarship often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also nursing practice. For additional information on the evaluation of research and scholarship, see the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Appendix A)

To be considered for tenure and promotion, tenure-track candidates must, at minimum, have achieved peer recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting a high standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of nursing or human health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence and impact in their scholarly accomplishments.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to include standard scholarly metrics and reference the sources if relevant; however, metrics alone are insufficient in determining the overall merit of a candidate’s work. Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty, mentors, and administrators within the discipline and beyond, must contextualize their unique contribution and both identify and define the most relevant evidence of excellence. Most candidates will not be equally strong across scholarship, teaching, and service. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate’s rank, role, and area of scholarship. Criteria on which the evaluation of scholarly impact will be made include: scholarly outcomes; reputation; social impact, if relevant; and funding.

Reputation as an independent scholar who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The CON will weigh the following indicators of excellence:

- Faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure should, at minimum, be on a trajectory toward a national and international reputation as a scholar in the area of focus.
- Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.

For Academic Professional Track Faculty whose primary role is teaching, scholarship is not a major requirement. However, promotion to associate professor requires some demonstration the candidate is emerging or has emerged as a thought leader in the discipline of nursing within the context of the role. This requirement is essential for promotion to

professor on APT lines. Evidence would include publications (related to pedagogy or assessment or, in some cases, peer-reviewed research unrelated to pedagogy), grants for teaching innovation, and presentations related to teaching and innovation at conferences. As is true of other faculty, faculty with primary responsibility for teaching should establish a regional, national, or international reputation for teaching, service, and related scholarly accomplishments.

### **3.3 Service**

Evidence of significant service to the CON, University, or field of nursing is also considered in promotion decisions. For additional information on service expectations and their evaluation and rank expectations, see the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Appendix A). Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or nursing impact or stature within the field. The category of service is understood broadly to include clinical practice (if completed and evaluated as part of the faculty service role), student advising, and pedagogically-related activities outside the classroom. It may in addition, include:

At the level of associate professor, contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on task forces, participation in organizing major conferences, leadership on an accreditation committee, providing continuing education to the field, and/or training other academicians or clinicians.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include chairing a significant ad hoc, standing committees (e.g. peer evaluation committees), or task forces; serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, or leading an accreditation process at the University or CON level.

#### **3.3.1 Practice**

An essential and critical component of professional nursing education is clinical education that is dependent upon the effectiveness of clinical faculty with current clinical knowledge of evidence-based practice. As educating students in the clinical setting is within the scope of practice of Registered Nurses with advanced education, clinical supervision of students is considered practice. Advanced Practice Nurses are required to maintain clinical practice. Expected outcomes for faculty members who primarily engage in clinical practice are as follows:

- Demonstrates leadership in advancing the professional practice of nursing.
- Promotes development of colleagues as clinical experts.

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

The College recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Additionally, performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages.

Teaching excellence is central to the educational mission of the CON and represents a second criterion for advancement for promotion and/or tenure. Discipline specific teaching roles are broad, including clinical instruction, interprofessional education, integration of patient care and instructional technologies, and active learning via clinical simulation and other modalities. Proficiency in teaching is necessary but not sufficient by itself to achieve tenure.

Faculty members in the CON provide instruction at the undergraduate or graduate level. Evidence of high quality, innovative, and impactful teaching includes quantifiable teaching outcomes that are at minimum provided by students, peers, experts and/or administrators. Teaching effectiveness is measured through the impact of innovative instructional practices and technologies on nursing education, and ultimately on student achievement in practice, clinical simulation, or interprofessional education.

*Tenure and Promotion for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty*

**4.1** Indicators of *Excellence in Teaching* includes, but is not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award.
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students.
- Exceptional service as a peer evaluator.

**4.2** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Teaching* includes, but is not limited to:

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Selection for a CON outstanding teacher award.
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation.
- Evidence of high quality class/clinical/simulation preparation, interaction, and accomplishments.
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- Effective service as a peer evaluator.

*Mentorship on the part of Tenure and Promotion for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty*

Although candidates for tenure are often protected from heavy undergraduate student mentoring at the assistant level, there should be some evidence of the capacity to successfully mentor students, when applicable. Mentoring can be demonstrated by quantifiable outcomes (e.g., publications with students, documenting the student contribution, independent student publications, and student accomplishments). As with scholarship, quality matters more than quantity. All faculty are expected to mentor less experienced faculty on their teaching team. Candidates for professor are expected to have measurable outcomes that show successful student mentoring in other dimensions. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and junior faculty members in their academic role. Again, the quality of mentorship is vital and mentorship in name only is insufficient. Indicators of mentorship include but are not limited to criteria suggested in University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Appendix I, and contextualized for the discipline of nursing below.

**Indicators of Mentoring Excellence** may include:

- Outstanding direction of undergraduate and interprofessional student research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
- Placement of mentored undergraduate student into significant academic or professional positions.
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the Honors program).
- Outstanding performance as an undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

**Indicators of Mentoring Effectiveness** may include:

- Effective direction of undergraduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction (involving appropriate comparisons to department norms) and student outcomes.

- Meaningful participation in a TAMU or external graduate student thesis, scholarly project, or dissertation research.
- Member of graduate student advisory committees within TAMU or as an external invitation due to expertise.
- Service as undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

Evidence of exceptional teaching (demonstrated by student or peer recognition of creativity and commitment to teaching) is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional teaching provide the grounds for promotion on the tenure track.

**4.3** Indicators of *Effectiveness and Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work* are evaluated in several dimensions: Scholarly Outcomes, Reputation, Social Impact and Funding.

#### Scholarly Outcomes

The generation of new knowledge as well as the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is scholarly work. Research generates new knowledge that advances the discipline using scientific methods. There is no absolute number of manuscripts, book chapters, books, reports, review articles or other outcomes that candidates must publish.

Likewise, given the diversity of the field of nursing, there is no specific level of scholarly metrics (such as h-Index score) that can be considered as a required threshold. The question of whether a candidate has achieved a body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field weighs all of the following indicators of excellence:

- Significance and focus of prior research and the research/scholarship trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement, CV, relevant scholarly outcomes (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
- Publication in quality, peer-reviewed journals. Quality is measured by metrics such as impact factor within the discipline, or if applicable, due to the transdisciplinary nature of the work, other indicators as judged by experts in the candidate's area of focus;
- Number and significance of primary-authored published articles, and those co-authored that reflect transdisciplinary and community-based collaborative work, which is highly valued in the CON;
- Patents and other intellectual property that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts may be relevant to the scholar's area of focus;
- Achievement of an overall outstanding level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at CON peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

However, numbers of publications or grant dollars alone are not meritorious for promotion and tenure. The primary criterion for successful promotion and tenure is demonstration of the impact of your work. The evaluation of impact is guided by the following questions:

- How has the work advanced an area of science, changed policy or practice?
- How does the work make a difference in society?
- Has the work made a difference in health outcomes?
- What is the impact on student success?

*Reputation.* Reputation as an independent scholar who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The CON will weigh all of the following indicators of excellence:

- National or international reputation is typically measured by the depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from peer scholars in the discipline. Section 4 spells out the procedures for tenure and/or promotion, and provides specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.
- Faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure should, at minimum, be on a trajectory toward a national and international reputation as a scholar in the area of focus.

- Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.

*Social Impact.* While social impact is not required for candidate tenure and promotion, the impact of a scholar's work in such areas as clinical practice, health care outcomes, and workforce issues, may be relevant. A tool such as Altmetric™ can offer an objective measure of the concept, and might be used to augment traditional indicators of quality scholarship.

However, a high level of social impact alone is not sufficient as an indicator of scholarly excellence.

*Funding.* The CON does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion or tenure; however, in all fields, research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, competitive external funding serves as an indicator of the candidate's research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are not sufficient for tenure or promotion. The quality of scholarship is the ultimate determinant.

**4.5** Indicators of *Excellence in Service* may include but is not limited to:

- Service as an officer, committee chairman, or board member in a professional nursing organization.
- Fulfilling the role of committee chair in the CON or University.
- Active membership in a state, national or international committee, task force, or board.
- Significant community or national service in a nursing or health related professional organization.
- Testimony on legislative issues at the state or federal level.
- Partnership or consultation with health care organizations.
- Mentorships of junior faculty.
- Election to any branch of the Academy (National Academy of Science, American Academy of Nursing).

**4.6** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Service* includes, but is not limited to:

- Active service on CON or University committees and task forces.
- Recruitment and/or mentorship of students with diverse cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.
- Active service as a committee member in local, state, and national professional organizations.
- Membership in one or more national professional organizations.
- Promotion of national and/or international experiences for students.
- Service as an advisor to student organizations.
- Serving in administrative roles within the CON.

Faculty are expected to demonstrate currency of clinical practice, with a particular focus on engaged practice on the part of Academic Professional Track Faculty members.

**4.7** Indicators of *Excellence in Practice* may include but is not limited to:

- Recognized by peers for clinical expertise and quality care in the practice setting.
- Mentors students in clinical practice.
- Implements/evaluates standards of practice.
- Contributes to development of and revision of clinical practice guidelines.
- Collaborates with clinical partners in innovative quality initiatives.
- Advocates for public policy relevant to clinic expertise.
- Leads development of evidence-based practice.
- Leads initiatives to improve the health of the community.
- Develops and implements an outcomes database to track the impact of clinical practice on patient outcomes and/or health system outcomes.

**4.8** Indicators of *Effectiveness in Practice* may include but is not limited to;

- Evidence of satisfactory performance in a professional nursing role including clinical supervision of professional nursing students.
- Acquires and maintains board certification in one's clinical specialty or specialties (if available).
  - Integrates evidence into practice.
  - Uses quality indicators in practice to improve care delivery and patient outcomes.
  - Contributes to practice-education collaborative relationships.
  - Serves as a clinical consultant within the practice setting.

## **5. Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure**

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

Faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure on accomplishments in each of their areas of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service), with primary emphasis on the **quality, significance, and impact** of their work. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. A faculty member's career and professional development continue to evolve after tenure is awarded. Some individuals may concentrate more of their effort in selected areas. The configuration of professional activities should reflect the interests and abilities of the faculty member and the needs of the CON. A faculty member's decision to concentrate his/her professional contributions in particular areas should involve consultation with the Assistant/Associate Dean, both of whom must agree with the configuration of responsibilities. These agreements should be reflected in the faculty member's post-tenure review, which follows separate CON guidelines. The aim is not to require faculty to clear the tenure bar repeatedly. Tenure is awarded based on actual accomplishments, but it also carries the expectation that faculty continue on a satisfactory professional trajectory.

### **5.2 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)**

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty in the CON (e.g., clinical, research, or lecturer) who are candidates for promotion on non-tenure-accruing track lines should demonstrate excellence in one area, in addition to service. Expectations are not, however, necessarily limited to only two areas, as described below. Per University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2, APT faculty "should have significant responsibilities beyond solely teaching (or research for research faculty)."

Offer letters for APT positions should clearly state whether faculty members are responsible for excellence in teaching (and the number of courses to be taught) or research (and any expectations for external grant support) and the nature of their responsibilities.

Per University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.4, consideration for promotion normally occurs after five years in a given rank, though faculty may seek promotion earlier.

Faculty in the CON report to an Assistant or Associate Dean who oversees their work assignments. There are no department heads in the College of Nursing.

### **5.2.1. Clinical Track Faculty (or Lecturer) with Teaching as a Primary Expectation**

Clinical track (or lecturer) faculty with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate excellence in instruction/teaching and render service contributions related to CON academic needs. Assessment of both performance dimensions, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual. For additional information on rank and promotion expectations see the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Appendix A).

#### **5.2.1.1. Teaching.**

Teaching excellence is central to the educational mission of the CON and represents a major criterion for APT faculty promotion. Proficiency in teaching is essential to achieve promotion for clinical track and lecturer track faculty. Discipline specific teaching roles are broad, including clinical instruction, interprofessional education, integration of patient care and instructional technologies, and active learning via clinical simulation and other modalities. An APT faculty member with teaching as a primary role will demonstrate exceptional teaching and instructional excellence.

Faculty members in the CON provide instruction at the undergraduate or graduate level. Measurable evidence of high quality, innovative, and impactful teaching includes teaching outcomes that are at minimum provided by students, peers, experts and administrators.

Measurable impact of integrating innovative instructional or patient care technologies (e.g., for program and course delivery or for teaching students via practice, clinical simulation, or interprofessional education), is an outcome indicator of excellence.

Instructional Activity. Student evaluations of formal classroom, clinical, or simulation lab instruction are necessary, but not sufficient, to judge instructional excellence. In addition to the discipline context described in the preceding paragraph, Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2 suggests additional indicators of instructional excellence. Note: These are examples, some are contextualized for the CON and this is not a checklist.

Indicators of **Instructional Excellence** may include:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Exceptional service as a peer evaluator

Indicators of **Instructional Effectiveness** may include:

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a CON outstanding teacher award
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self- evaluation
- Evidence of high quality class/clinical/simulation preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course

- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Effective service as a peer evaluator

*Mentorship.* Candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor in the APT track should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students effectively. APT candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship:

- Student mentorship: Candidates with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for professional, academic or research positions.
- Faculty mentorship: Candidates for any promotion with teaching as a primary responsibility must also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the instructional and, if appropriate, clinical practice or research. Faculty could meet this criterion by serving as an outstanding peer evaluator.

#### *5.2.1.2. Scholarly Activities*

While scholarship is not a major requirement, promotion to associate professor requires some demonstration that the candidate is emerging or has emerged as a thought leader in the discipline of nursing within the context of the role. This requirement is essential for promotion to professor on APT lines. Evidence would include publications (related to pedagogy or assessment or, in some cases, peer-reviewed research unrelated to pedagogy), grants for teaching innovation, and presentations related to teaching and innovation at conferences. As is true of other faculty, faculty with primary responsibility for teaching should establish a regional, national, or international reputation for teaching, service, and related scholarly accomplishments.

#### *5.2.1.3. Service*

Evidence of significant service to the CON, University, or field of nursing is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or nursing impact or stature within the field. The category of service is understood broadly to include clinical practice (if completed and evaluated as part of the faculty service role), student advising, and pedagogically-related activities outside the classroom. It may in addition, include:

At the level of associate professor, contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on task forces, participation in organizing major conferences, leadership on an accreditation committee, providing continuing education to the field, and/or training other academicians or clinicians.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include chairing a significant ad hoc, standing committees (e.g. peer evaluation committees), or task forces; serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, or leading an accreditation process at the University or CON level.

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for promotion. Candidates should provide a strong statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the CON, TAMU, and/or the discipline.

### **5.2.2. Academic Professional Track Faculty with Research as a Primary Expectation**

#### *5.2.2.1. Research/Scholarly Activity*

Research/scholarly activity is essential to the mission of the CON. The discipline of nursing, by its very nature, crosses disciplines and other health professions; thus, CON scholarship is flexible and broad. In some instances, it intersects greatly with other academic disciplines. Likewise, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within nursing science. Excellence in scholarship often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also nursing practice.

To be considered promotion, research faculty candidates must, at minimum, have achieved peer recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting a high standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of nursing or human health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence and impact in their scholarly accomplishments.

Candidates for promotion are expected to verify standard scholarly metrics if relevant; however, metrics alone are not sufficient in determining the overall merit of a candidate's work. Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty, mentors, and administrators within the discipline and beyond, must contextualize their unique contribution and both identify and define the most relevant evidence of excellence. Ultimately committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate's rank, role, and area of scholarship. Criteria on which the evaluation of scholarly impact will be made include: scholarly outcomes; reputation; social impact, if relevant; and funding.

*Scholarly Outcomes.* The generation of new knowledge as well as the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is scholarly work. Research generates new knowledge that advances the discipline using scientific methods. There is no absolute number of manuscripts, book chapters, books, reports, review articles or other outcomes that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of nursing, there is no specific level of scholarly metrics (such as h-Index score) that can be considered as a required threshold. The question of whether a candidate has achieved a body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field weighs all of the following indicators of excellence:

- Significance and focus of prior research and the research/scholarship trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement, CV, relevant scholarly outcomes (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
- Publication in quality, peer-reviewed journals. Quality is measured by metrics such as impact factor within the discipline, or if applicable, due to the transdisciplinary nature of the work, other indicators as judged by experts in the candidate's area of focus.
- Number and significance of primary-authored published articles, and those co-authored that reflect transdisciplinary and community-based collaborative work, which is highly valued in the CON.
- Patents and other intellectual property that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts may be relevant to the scholar's area of focus.
- Achievement of an overall outstanding level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at CON peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

*Social Impact.* At both the level of associate professor and professor, evidence of the candidate's national or international reputation is typically measured by the depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from peer scholars in the discipline. While social impact is not required for candidate promotion, the impact of a scholar's work in such areas as clinical practice, health care outcomes, and workforce issues, may be relevant. A tool such as Altmetric™ can offer an objective measure of the concept, and might be used to augment traditional indicators of quality scholarship. However, a high level of social impact alone is not sufficient as an indicator of scholarly excellence.

*Funding.* The CON does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion; however, in all fields, research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, competitive external funding serves as an indicator of the candidate's research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are not sufficient for promotion. The quality of scholarship is the ultimate determinant.

*Mentorship.* Although not the primary consideration, candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on research faculty lines should demonstrate some capacity to mentor other faculty and/or students effectively. Faculty members promoted to professor non-tenure accruing lines must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship.

- Student mentorship: Candidates with research as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for a research role.
- Faculty mentorship: Candidates for promotion with research as a primary responsibility should also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the research track or the tenure-track.

### *5.2.3. Service to the CON, University, and the Discipline*

Evidence of excellent service to the CON, University, or discipline of nursing is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly impact or stature within the field.

At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in planning major conferences and serving on task forces. Service that advances the mission of the CON, HSC, and TAMU is expected. Contributing significantly to accreditation of the CON or TAMU, when possible, is an indicator of excellence. Service to the discipline and/or profession is intentionally planned in such a way to advance from state/local to regional engagement with highly regarded professional organizations.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of top-tier journals in the field of nursing or the candidate's sub-specialty, chairing significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, and serving on or chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, CDC, HRSA, NIOSH, etc.).

Service within the CON and TAMU is recognized for excellence in leading initiatives that advance the mission of each. Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for promotion for faculty on APT lines. Candidates should provide a strong statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the CON, University, and/or the discipline.

### *5.3. Process for Promotion and/or Tenure in the College of Nursing*

For information regarding criteria, standards, expectations and process related to promotion and tenure in the College, see the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Appendix A).

## 6. Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads, directors, or supervisors are responsible.

In terms of annual reviews for budgeted joint appointments, department heads, directors, or supervisors will need to collaborate with the heads, directors, or supervisors of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews, (Section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

In the case of budgeted joint appointments, It is recommended that heads, directors and supervisors collaborate to provide one annual review letter for the faculty member.

In terms of annual reviews for faculty whose area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., associate deans, department heads, or directors), annual reviews will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For a faculty member with an administrative appointment that has faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head, director, or supervisor regarding the faculty member's performance in those areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, director, or supervisor with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

### **6.1 Purpose**

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding the faculty member's performance relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant.
- See [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#). For tenured associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward promotion to professor. For professors and tenured associate professors the annual review should also be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.
- Create a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations.

### **6.2 Focus**

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career 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 tenure and promotion. For academic professional track faculty (non-tenure track), the annual review evaluates performance and serves as assessment of progress towards retention and/or promotion, as applicable, section 2.4.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### **6.3 Time Period of Review**

Annual reviews will focus on the immediately previous calendar or academic year, but may also include an expanded window, e.g., three years, for the review period. Each unit will determine the appropriate review window.

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

During an annual evaluation, performance in each of the areas of faculty performance (see Section 4.) will be rated on at least three categories: "Unsatisfactory," "Meets expectations/Satisfactory," "Exceeds Expectations." A unit might decide to use more than three categories and for merit, it is advised that more than three are used. These might include: "Unsatisfactory", "Needs Improvement", "Satisfactory", "Exemplary", and "Most Meritorious" based on evidence of **effectiveness** and **excellence**. Overall performance will also be described using these terms. Individual units may also choose to use more than five categories for rating faculty performance and/or different terms for rating performance.

#### **6.4.1 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Teaching are:**

- *Unsatisfactory* – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** or **excellence** in teaching.
- *Needs Improvement* – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.

- Satisfactory – appropriate evidence of **effectiveness** in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member’s teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of **effectiveness** is the minimum requirement for **satisfactory performance**. The unit should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the members of the unit.

#### 6.4.2 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work** are

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by, **for example**, funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, book chapters, and so forth.
- Satisfactory – strong evidence of **effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by, **for example**, high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. **Examples of this evidence** might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. **Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.**
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

#### 6.4.3 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Service** are:

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of **effectiveness** in service.
- Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- Satisfactory – adequate evidence of **effectiveness** in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service **appropriate for their career stage and time assignment** and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- Exemplary – strong evidence of both **effectiveness** and **excellence** in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an **exemplary** faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

#### 6.4.4 Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of **Practice** (if applicable) are:

- Unsatisfactory – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in patient care.

- *Needs Improvement – minimal evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in management of cases and medical records.*
- *Satisfactory – strong evidence of effectiveness in patient care. Effectiveness can be supported by case load, peer review, and timely management of medical records.*
- *Exemplary – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in patient care. Faculty in this category will be leaders in patient care through such factors as leadership in professional societies, external recognition by trainees, awards, and invited presentations.*
- *Most Meritorious – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally recognized as clinicians through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in nursing organizations.*

## **6.5 Required Components**

The annual review will contain the below components in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion).

### **6.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities.**

Each member of the faculty will submit an annual self-review using specific outcomes and impact statements, summarizing activity across the prior 12-month calendar year period (January – December), along with a list of measurable professional goals for the next year, and a current copy of the faculty member's curriculum vitae, using the CON standard CV template.

Goals should be focused on personal, continued professional development, aligned with College and University strategic priorities, and lead to professional growth over time. Goals should be specific and measurable, with at least one per category (teaching, scholarship, service).

### **6.5.2 A written document stating the department head's, program director's, or supervisor's evaluation and expectations.**

The Dean or supervisor will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual review document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member acknowledges receipt by signing a copy of the document and should be allowed to provide written comments for the file if they so choose. A faculty member refusing to sign the acknowledgment of the document will be noted in the file. This memorandum, and/or the annual review and any related documents, will be placed in the faculty member's unit personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual review shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service. This memorandum and/or annual review should include an informed judgement by the department head, director, or supervisor of the extent to which the faculty member complies with applicable rules, policies, and procedures.

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all required System and University training programs ([System Regulation 33.05.02](#) Required Employee Training). In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the "ACKNOWLEDGEMENT" portion of the department head's, director's, or supervisor's written evaluation and the faculty member must initial:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory Texas A&M University System training.

### **6.5.3 Meeting between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.**

The Dean or supervisor may meet with the faculty member to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year. In some cases, there may be a need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head/director/supervisor or faculty member.

#### **6.5.4 Performance Assessment.**

In assessing performance, the weights given to teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service shall be consistent with the expectations of the individual's appointment, the annual review, and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the College of Nursing and University.

#### **6.5.5 Assessment outcomes that require action**

As per [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), the following annual evaluation and periodic peer review ratings require further action:

##### **6.5.6 Unsatisfactory Performance**

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care...), or a rating of "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty performance.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the unit established criteria (see Section 7.4.). Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean. The report to the Dean of each "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member shall be accompanied by a written plan developed by the faculty member and department head, program director, or supervisor, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the Dean may request a "Periodic Peer Review" (see Section 9.2.) of the faculty member. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall annual rating of "Unsatisfactory" for three consecutive annual reviews or who receives an "Unsatisfactory" periodic peer review (see section 9) shall be subject to a professional development review, as provided for by [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review).

##### **6.5.7 Needs Improvement Performance**

If a tenured faculty member receives a "Needs Improvement" rating in any single area of faculty performance during the annual evaluation or periodic peer review (see section 9), they must work with the Dean immediately to develop a plan for near term improvement. For teaching, this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity/creative work), this plan may take up to three years to complete successfully. The rating of "Needs Improvement" can stay as "Needs Improvement" as long as predetermined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory". The rating of "Needs Improvement" should be changed to "Satisfactory" when pre-determined milestones are met.

#### **6.6 Time-Line**

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads, directors, or supervisors to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties' Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, "These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than **June 15** of each year."

#### **6.7 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines**

A faculty member who believes that his or her annual review process did not comply with the College of Nursing published annual review guidelines, or in their absence those published by the college, may file a complaint in writing addressed to the dean of the college with a copy to the Dean of Faculties. The Dean will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the Dean may be appealed to the Dean of Faculties. See section 2.4.3.5 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#).

There is no formal grievance or appeal regarding the substance of an annual review. See section 2.4.3.6 of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#)

## 7. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University SAP 12.01.99.M2](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years), be conducted (normally by December of the third year) to determine the progress towards tenure.

- A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.
- This review will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.
- This review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.
- This review should mimic the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member; however internal letters of recommendation may be solicited by the unit rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the tenure and promotion process, the mid-term review will include review by the unit's P&T committee, department head/director/supervisor, the college P&T committee, and dean.
- This review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, patient care, and service to date as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period.
- This review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review. It is recommended that an annual review be done even in the year when the faculty member goes through a midterm (or tenure) review. If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action not to renew the contract of the individual may be appropriate.

### 7.1 Process

The mid-term review should be conducted between March of the academic year *prior* to the target academic year, and December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2022 and December 2022. See below example for faculty member hired in calendar year 2019.

Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar Year 2019	7 years	Mar – Dec 2022 (due before December 2022 of AY 2022-2023)

Information regarding the materials to be submitted as part of the review, is provided in the *College of Nursing Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (Section 4.4).

### 7.2 Feedback from midterm review

Feedback is required for faculty members going through midterm review. Suggested feedback to the faculty member includes summaries of reports and recommendations for going forward from the Dean or designee.

## 8. Post-Tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure review comprises:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 6.) conducted by the department head, director, or supervisor (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation).
- 2) Periodic review by a committee of peers (see Section 8.2.).

### **8.1 Purpose**

- Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member.
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development.
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals/objectives.
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

### **8.2 Peer Review Committee**

A faculty member's career and professional development continue to evolve after tenure is awarded. Some individuals may concentrate more of their effort in selected areas. The configuration of professional activities should reflect the interests and abilities of the faculty member and the needs of the CON. A faculty member's decision to concentrate his/her professional contributions in particular areas should involve consultation with the Assistant/Associate Dean, both of whom must agree with the configuration of responsibilities. These agreements should be reflected in the faculty member's post-tenure review, which follows separate CON guidelines. The aim is not to require faculty to clear the tenure bar repeatedly. Tenure is awarded based on actual accomplishments, but it also carries the expectation that faculty continue on a satisfactory professional trajectory.

### **8.3 Process**

- 8.3.1 Materials to be reviewed by Peer Review Committee:
  - Curriculum Vitae
  - Brief Statement from Candidate
- 8.3.2 The Peer Review Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance, providing an evaluation rating in the categories of assigned responsibilities, as well as an overall evaluation. The criteria for the individual and overall performance ratings follow the criteria established in the unit guidelines and should be consistent with annual evaluations.
- 8.3.3 If all of the relevant review categories are satisfactory, the faculty member will be subjected to periodic peer review again in six years or fewer, as determined by college/department guidelines, or following three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations by the department head, director, or supervisor, whichever is earlier.
- 8.3.4 A finding of "Unsatisfactory" performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
- 8.3.5. A finding of "Needs Improvement" in any two categories shall state the basis for that

finding in accordance with the criteria described in the unit guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.

- 8.3.6. A rating of “Needs Improvement” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near term improvement plan developed in collaboration between the department head, director, or supervisor and the faculty member.
- 8.3.7 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the unit where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units.<sup>1</sup> If reviewed only by the primary unit, the department head, director, or supervisor will share the report with the other department head, director, or supervisor of the secondary unit.
- 8.3.8 **By no later than May 31<sup>st</sup>**, each unit will provide to the dean and the Dean of Faculties, the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. The Peer Review Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents will be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.

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

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 7.) or an “Unsatisfactory” Peer Review (see Section 9.2.4.4.) or upon request of the faculty member (see Section 9.6). The Dean will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to a Professional Development Review, and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head, director, or supervisor and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. For more information on the process of the Professional Development Review see [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review). If substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified, the review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and Dean shall then work together to draw up a “Professional Development Plan” (see Section 9.4.) acceptable to the dean.

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

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

8.4.2a The unit will describe the process for the composition/selection of the ad hoc review committee, specifically, what “consultation” means.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recommended that faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments complete the post-tenure review in both units.

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

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

8.4.5 The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

8.4.5.1 No deficiencies are identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the ad hoc committee report,

8.4.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near term improvement plan of Section 2.4, 4.1.5.3

Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see section 5) acceptable to the dean.

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

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated criteria in the unit guidelines under the provision of this procedure) will be remedied. The plan will be developed with the collaboration among the faculty member, the review committee, the department head, director, or supervisor and the dean, and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the unit, and the college. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted. For more details on the Professional Development Plan see Section 9 of [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#) (Post-Tenure Review)

### ***8.6 Appeal***

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of the Post-tenure review are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University SAP 12.99.99.M0.01](#) (Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interest with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost. After consultation with the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

If the faculty member, department head/director/supervisor, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

### **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 the department head, director, or supervisor (section 6, [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01](#)).

## **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 10 years, must be considered for emeritus status unless the faculty member requests in writing that he/she not be so considered. Non-tenured faculty, or those who have served less than 10 years, may also be considered.

For faculty without tenure or who have served the University for fewer than 10 years, see [Institutional Rule 31.08.01](#), which indicates the process for this situation.

See the Dean of Faculties website for [procedures and forms](#) for nominating a faculty member for emeritus status.

Units should work with their faculty to identify the criteria for granting faculty emeritus status.

Appendix A  
**CON Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY  
College of Nursing

# **Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure**

**Originally Approved:** May 13, 2019

## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Faculty Rank and Tracks .....	2
2.1.	Faculty Rank.....	2
2.1.1.	Assistant as a Qualifier .....	2
2.1.2.	Associate as a Qualifier.....	2
2.1.3.	Professor as a Qualifier.....	2
2.2.	Faculty Tracks .....	2
2.2.1.	Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty .....	3
2.2.2.	Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure track).....	3
3.	Criteria for Promotion and Tenure .....	6
3.1.	Tenure and Promotion for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty .....	7
3.1.1.	Research/Scholarly Activity .....	7
3.1.2.	Teaching.....	9
3.1.3.	Service to the CON, University, and the Discipline.....	11
3.1.4.	Mid-Term Review .....	12
3.1.5.	Post-Tenure Review.....	12
3.2.	Criteria for Promotion for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty.....	13
3.2.1.	Clinical Track Faculty (or Lecturer) with Teaching as a Primary Expectation .....	13
3.2.1.1.	Teaching.....	14
3.2.1.2.	Scholarly Activities.....	15
3.2.1.3.	Service .....	15
3.2.2.	Clinical Track Faculty with Research as a Primary Expectation .....	16
3.2.2.1.	Research/Scholarly Activity .....	16
3.2.3.	Service to the CON, University, and the Discipline.....	18
3.2.4.	Mid-Term Review .....	19
3.2.5.	Professional Development Support for Academic Professional Track Faculty.....	19
4.	Procedures for Tenure and Promotion.....	20
4.2.	Responsibilities of the Tenure-track/Tenured Faculty Member .....	20
4.1.1.	Provide an accurate and current CV.....	20
4.1.2.	Provide a candidate impact statement .....	20
4.1.2.1	The statement of scholarship .....	20
4.1.2.2.	The statement of teaching .....	21
4.1.2.3.	The service statement .....	21

4.1.3.	Submit and verify other required documentation .....	21
4.1.4.	Submit names of appropriate potential reviewers. ....	21
4.2.	Responsibilities of the APT Track Faculty Member with a Primary Responsibility for Research. ....	22
4.2.1.	Provide an accurate and current CV.....	22
4.2.2.	Provide a candidate impact statement .....	22
4.2.2.1.	The statement of scholarship .....	22
4.2.2.2.	The educational contributions statement.....	22
4.2.2.3.	The service statement .....	22
4.2.3.	Submit and verify other required documentation .....	23
4.2.4.	Submit the names of appropriate potential reviewers .....	23
4.3.	Responsibilities of the APT Track Faculty Member with a primary responsibility for teaching.....	24
4.3.1.	Provide an accurate and current CV.....	24
4.3.2.	Provide a candidate impact statement. ....	24
4.3.2.1.	The statement of scholarship .....	24
4.3.2.2.	Include a Teaching Portfolio .....	24
4.3.2.3.	Provide a service statement .....	25
4.3.3.	Submit and verify other required documentation .....	25
4.3.4.	Submit the names of appropriate potential reviewers. ....	25
4.4.	Dossier Preparation .....	26
4.4.1.	Management of external review letters (Tenure Accruing Candidates).....	26
4.4.2.	Management of external review letters (APT Candidates) .....	27
4.4.3.	Assistant/Associate Dean Responsibilities .....	27
4.4.4.	Administrative Support Responsibilities .....	28
4.4.5.	Reconsideration of a Case. ....	28
4.5.	Responsibilities of the CON Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	28
4.6.	Responsibilities of the Dean of the CON. ....	29
Appendix A	.....	30

## 1. Introduction

The *College of Nursing (CON) Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (i.e., *CON Guidelines*) provide a discipline-specific framework for distinctive academic performance at Texas A&M University (TAMU). The *TAMU Rules and Guidelines* establish the general expectations and performance standards that apply to all faculty and provide the guidelines for tenure and promotion as written in [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (“University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion”) and in the “[University Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines](#)” issued annually by the Dean of Faculties.

This document defines, only where necessary, the context of *TAMU Rules and Guidelines* as they apply to meeting role expectations for promotion and tenure in the CON. All TAMU documents that guide faculty appointments and establish expectations for promotion, tenure, employment, and annual review are relevant to the *CON Guidelines*. An online accessible list of the key TAMU documents that relate to promotion and tenure is located in Appendix A.

The CON expects faculty seeking promotion and tenure to demonstrate meritorious performance in their tenure-track or academic professional track (APT) role. This document is intended to guide faculty and to inform the CON in reviewing and recommending a proposal for advancement to tenure and/or promotion. The guidelines cover Promotion, Tenure, and Post- Tenure Review.

## 2. Faculty Rank and Tracks

### 2.1. Faculty Rank

All faculty members having positions with the word **Professor** in the title will have a terminal degree. On occasion there may be exceptions for academic professional track (APT) assistant professor candidates with clinical or professional expertise needed to meet the CON educational or practice mission, and whose minimum education is at the Master of Science level in nursing. Faculty ranks within are determined as follows:

**2.1.1. Assistant as a Qualifier.** Assistant as a qualifier in the title indicates an entry-level position in academia. Individuals should have credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field, and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas of performance required by their appointment of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service.

**2.1.2. Associate as a Qualifier.** Associate as a qualifier in the title indicates experience in academia or substantial contributions to the field, and for tenured or tenure-track faculty all of the bullet points listed below. For APT faculty, sections (2.2.2) and (3.2) always apply, but section (3.1) will be evidenced in alignment with the areas required by the individual faculty member's appointment:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment, as measured against the contributions of others in the field,
- Professional conduct that will advance the interests of the CON and is:
  - Congruent with standards of professional integrity
  - Congruent with Aggie Core Values
  - Conducive to a collegial work environment
- An area of specialization germane to the programs of the CON, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintain the level of competence in teaching and research/scholarly activity expected of a tenured faculty member.

**2.1.3. Professor as a Qualifier.** Professor as a qualifier in the title and with no other rank qualifier (i.e., Assistant or Associate) indicates substantial experience in academia and evidence of significant sustained impact on the discipline or profession. In addition, such faculty members are expected to have demonstrated all of the required attributes listed in (2.1.2.) for faculty members with the Associate qualifier as part of their title and rank.

### 2.2. Faculty Tracks

There are two categories of faculty tracks: "Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty" and "Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure-track)".

**2.2.1. Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty:** The tenured/tenure-track recognizes University- employed faculty members who make significant and sustained contributions to the mission of the CON in all three (3) areas of performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or faculty development leave appointments). Assistant Professor is a tenure-track appointment while Associate Professor and Professor are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members.

**2.2.2. Academic Professional Track Faculty (non-tenure track):** The academic professional track (APT) faculty contribute to the mission of the CON in more focused ways, particularly in advancing the teaching and clinical service missions. Normally APT faculty are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of research/scholarly activity or service, or both, as assigned. APT faculty are assigned to and evaluated on a primary area of responsibility (teaching, clinical service, or research/scholarly activity), but are also expected to contribute in a second area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). There is no prohibition for APT faculty to be involved in duties related to all three areas: teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service. APT faculty appointments do not carry tenure potential.

Clinical Assistant Professor: For initial appointment to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor faculty shall hold, as a minimum, a terminal professional degree in nursing or a related field with training and experience in an area of specialization. There must be clear evidence of skill in clinical practice and teaching at the baccalaureate level at a minimum. Clinical Assistant Professors should also have demonstrated potential for contributions in research/scholarship, service, or leadership.

Clinical Associate Professor: In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Assistant Professor, individuals appointed to the Clinical Associate Professor rank should ordinarily have had extensive successful experience in clinical or professional practice in a field of specialization, and in working with and/or directing others (such as professionals, faculty members, graduate students, fellows, and residents or interns) in clinical activities in the field. Faculty seeking promotion to Clinical Associate Professor must have demonstrated expertise in didactic and clinical teaching. The Clinical Associate Professor may also demonstrate superior research/scholarship, service, or leadership, as assigned.

Clinical Professor: In addition to the qualifications required of a Clinical Associate Professor, the Clinical Professor shall have demonstrated excellence in clinical practice and teaching sufficient to establish an outstanding national reputation among colleagues. Faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor shall also have demonstrated remarkable leadership in the integration and application of nursing knowledge in the profession in addition to superior accomplishments in either research/scholarship, service, or leadership, as assigned.

The appointment of non-University employees to Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor is limited to extraordinary instances in which the CON deems the

individual has contributed or will contribute to leadership roles in its educational, research, or clinical missions. In general, these appointments will be leadership positions with close collaboration with the CON on key academic, research, or clinical initiatives. Examples of possible “extraordinary instances” include:

- Key leadership positions that will advance the CON’s educational, research, or clinical mission.
- Key directors of training programs within the University.
- Key roles in collaborative clinical initiatives.
- Serving in leadership roles on CON or University standing committees or other *ad hoc* committees.

Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of research and scholarly activities and must contribute to either service or teaching. These faculty members typically have no obligation to teach regular courses and typically do not have significant, reoccurring classroom teaching assignments. These faculty are expected to mentor and advise students in their area of scholarly expertise as relevant to the role.

Faculty in these appointments are subject to the guidelines posted by the Dean of Faculties and Vice President for Research (<http://dof.tamu.edu/Hiring/RESEARCH-FACULTY>). These types of appointments require the pre-approval of the position by the TAMU Vice President for Research (VPR).

Senior Professor and Senior Associate Professor: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Faculty in these appointments have been hired into an APT position following retirement and giving up tenure or moving to a non-tenure track position and giving up tenure. Senior professors are hired in a very specific role and are expected to make significant contributions in one area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). Academic ranks are conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the time of retirement.

Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor: Appointments are for individuals who are and temporarily appointed by the CON, but have continuing academic appointments in other institutions. Appointments may be renewed yearly for up to three (3) years at the discretion of the CON, although reappointment is possible after three (3) years. Academic ranks are normally conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the academic institution at which he or she holds a continuing appointment. Visiting faculty with the professorial title (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor) are expected to make significant contributions in one area of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). However, faculty with the lecturer title will only be required to contribute to the area of teaching. University rules state that faculty members with the Visiting modifier are not eligible to participate in tenure and promotion decisions of tenure-track faculty, selection and evaluation administrators and faculty senate.

Lecturer: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees. Individuals appointed as a Lecturer shall, at a minimum, have a master's degree in nursing. Faculty in these appointments teach, but are generally not required to consistently make significant contributions in the area of scholarly research or creative work, or in the area of service.

Assistant Lecturer: Appointments are for individuals who are University employees and appointed for less than five years for either candidates for a doctoral degree, or individuals who are not expected to fill a permanent faculty position at the CON. These appointments are focused on teaching, and they do not have eligibility for voting rights in shared governance processes on campus.

Joint Faculty: Appointments happen within the context of the University. In a true joint appointment situation, the employee of one University department/college is appointed part of his/her time to work for another University department/college, thereby splitting the full time effort between both departments. In a courtesy joint appointment situation, the request is based on a desire of the University's department/college where the faculty member is housed to have the faculty member perform certain non-remunerated duties for another department/college. A University faculty member appointed under a joint appointment is appointed with the same title held by the faculty member in their home department/college.

### 3. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Faculty roles in academic nursing (tenure-track and APT) are scholarly endeavors and all faculty provide instruction and service. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) published a consensus statement regarding this in 1999, the document is entitled, [Defining Scholarship for Academic Nursing \(AACN, 2018\)](#). The AACN describes an inclusive model of scholarship that includes discovery, integration, application and teaching as defined by Boyer (1999). Scholarship in nursing is significant to the profession, creative, can be documented, replicated or elaborated, and can be peer-reviewed. The key indicator of an individual's scholarship is the cumulative impact of the work on the field of nursing and healthcare." (AACN).

This section begins with criteria for promotion, tenure, mid-term review and post-tenure review for tenure-track/tenured faculty followed by criteria for the APT faculty. In general, application for promotion and tenure is made in the fifth year of the probationary period. (Note that the probationary period can be found in each tenure track faculty member's original letter of hire.)

Similarly, five-year time in rank is advised for APT faculty. Minimum time in rank before an APT candidate may apply for promotion is three years. While all faculty are encouraged to work toward promotion, there is no upper limit to time in rank on the APT track.

Note that time in rank is not sufficient for promotion; promotion requires demonstration of significant achievement. The key criterion for promotion and for tenure is evidence of impact as a result of one's work. As noted in the [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#) provided by the Office of the Dean of Faculties:

*Promotion and tenure decisions are not a matter of meeting numeric targets. Rather, the quality of the contributions and their impact should be evident. The holistic analysis ... should be consistent with standards established by the department, college, and university guidelines. An essential aspect of (the candidate statement) is to place the impact of the candidate's contributions in the context of the specific (college) mission, goals, expectations and criteria.*

University resources are available for additional information. These include:

[University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion. Note Appendix I for a detailed list of indicators of merit.

The CON values and supports all faculty in their desire to advance through the academic ranks within their track.

Per University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.1.4, "exceptional" performance in one dimension cannot compensate for "inadequate" performance in another.

### 3.1. Tenure and Promotion for Tenure-Accruing and Tenured Faculty

The CON takes into consideration research/scholarship, teaching, and service in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Candidates for promotion on tenure track lines should demonstrate high, rank-appropriate performance in all three areas.

#### 3.1.1. Research/Scholarly Activity

There are four expected scholarship outcomes for College of Nursing faculty:

- S1: Demonstrates excellence in research and scholarly activities.
- S2: Cultivates a reputation as an independent scholar through thoughtful dissemination of scholarly work.
- S3: Scholarly products contribute to change demonstrating social impact.
- S4: Develops a record of competitive external funding as a Principal Investigator.

Research/scholarly activity is essential to the mission of the CON. The discipline of nursing, by its very nature, crosses disciplines and other health professions; thus, CON scholarship is flexible and broad. In some instances, it intersects greatly with other academic disciplines. Likewise, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within nursing science. Excellence in scholarship often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also nursing practice.

To be considered for tenure and promotion, tenure-track candidates must, at minimum, have achieved peer recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting a high standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of nursing or human health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence and impact in their scholarly accomplishments.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to include standard scholarly metrics and reference the sources if relevant; however, metrics alone are insufficient in determining the overall merit of a candidate's work. Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty, mentors, and administrators within the discipline and beyond, must contextualize their unique contribution and both identify and define the most relevant evidence of excellence. Most candidates will not be equally strong across scholarship, teaching, and service. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate's rank, role, and area of scholarship. Criteria on which the evaluation of scholarly impact will be made include: scholarly outcomes; reputation; social impact, if relevant; and funding.

Scholarly Outcomes. The generation of new knowledge as well as the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is scholarly work. Research generates new knowledge that advances the discipline using scientific methods. There is no absolute number of manuscripts, book chapters, books, reports, review articles or other outcomes that candidates must publish.

Likewise, given the diversity of the field of nursing, there is no specific level of scholarly metrics (such as h-Index score) that can be considered as a required threshold. The question of whether a candidate has achieved a body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field weighs all of the following indicators of excellence:

- Significance and focus of prior research and the research/scholarship trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement, CV, relevant scholarly outcomes (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
- Publication in quality, peer-reviewed journals. Quality is measured by metrics such as impact factor within the discipline, or if applicable, due to the transdisciplinary nature of the work, other indicators as judged by experts in the candidate's area of focus;
- Number and significance of primary-authored published articles, and those co-authored that reflect transdisciplinary and community-based collaborative work, which is highly valued in the CON;
- Patents and other intellectual property that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts may be relevant to the scholar's area of focus;
- Achievement of an overall outstanding level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at CON peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

However, numbers of publications or grant dollars alone are not meritorious for promotion and tenure. The primary criterion for successful promotion and tenure is demonstration of the impact of your work. To evaluate your impact consider the following questions:

- How has your work advanced an area of science, changed policy or practice?
- How does your work make a difference in society?
- Has your work made a difference in health outcomes?
- What is the impact on student success?

Reputation. Reputation as an independent scholar who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The CON will weigh all of the following indicators of excellence:

- National or international reputation is typically measured by the depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from peer scholars in the discipline. Section 4 spells out the procedures for tenure and/or promotion, and provides specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.
- Faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure should, at minimum, be on a trajectory toward a national and international reputation as a scholar in the area of focus.
- Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.

Social Impact. While social impact is not required for candidate tenure and promotion, the impact of a scholar's work in such areas as clinical practice, health care outcomes, and workforce issues, may be

relevant. A tool such as Altmetric™ can offer an objective measure of the concept, and might be used to augment traditional indicators of quality scholarship.

However, a high level of social impact alone is not sufficient as an indicator of scholarly excellence.

*Funding.* The CON does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion or tenure; however, in all fields, research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, competitive external funding serves as an indicator of the candidate's research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are not sufficient for tenure or promotion. The quality of scholarship is the ultimate determinant.

### **3.1.2. Teaching**

In the area of teaching, expected outcomes for College of Nursing faculty are:

- T1: Demonstrates effectiveness in instructional activity.
- T2: Promotes development of others in advising and mentoring of students and colleagues.

Teaching excellence is central to the educational mission of the CON and represents a second criterion for advancement for promotion and/or tenure. Discipline specific teaching roles are broad, including clinical instruction, interprofessional education, integration of patient care and instructional technologies, and active learning via clinical simulation and other modalities. Proficiency in teaching is necessary but not sufficient by itself to achieve tenure.

Faculty members in the CON provide instruction at the undergraduate or graduate level. Evidence of high quality, innovative, and impactful teaching includes quantifiable teaching outcomes that are at minimum provided by students, peers, experts and/or administrators. Teaching effectiveness is measured through the impact of innovative instructional practices and technologies on nursing education, and ultimately on student achievement in practice, clinical simulation, or interprofessional education.

*Instructional Activity:* Student evaluations of formal classroom, clinical, or simulation lab instruction are necessary, but not sufficient, to judge instructional excellence. In addition to the discipline context described in the preceding paragraph, Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) suggests additional indicators of instructional excellence. Note: These are examples, some are contextualized for the CON and this is not a checklist.

Indicators of Instructional Excellence may include:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award.
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum.

- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students.
- Exceptional service as a peer evaluator.

Indicators of Instructional Effectiveness may include:

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Selection for a CON outstanding teacher award.
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation.
- Evidence of high quality class/clinical/simulation preparation, interaction, and accomplishments.
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- Effective service as a peer evaluator.

*Mentorship*. Although candidates for tenure are often protected from heavy undergraduate student mentoring at the assistant level, there should be some evidence of the capacity to successfully mentor students, when applicable. Mentoring can be demonstrated by quantifiable outcomes (e.g., publications with students, documenting the student contribution, independent student publications, and student accomplishments). As with scholarship, quality matters more than quantity. All faculty are expected to mentor less experienced faculty on their teaching team. Candidates for professor are expected to have measurable outcomes that show successful student mentoring in other dimensions. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and junior faculty members in their academic role. Again, the quality of mentorship is vital and mentorship in name only is insufficient. Indicators of mentorship include but are not limited to criteria suggested in [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Appendix I, and contextualized for the discipline of nursing below.

Indicators of Mentoring Excellence may include:

- Outstanding direction of undergraduate and interprofessional student research or creative activity that is validated by peers and communicated.
- Placement of mentored undergraduate student into significant academic or professional positions.
- Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g. working with the Honors program).

- Outstanding performance as an undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

Indicators of Effectiveness may include:

- Effective direction of undergraduate research or creative activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction (involving appropriate comparisons to department norms) and student outcomes.
- Meaningful participation in a TAMU or external graduate student thesis, scholarly project, or dissertation research.
- Member of graduate student advisory committees within TAMU or as an external invitation due to expertise.
- Service as undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate).

Evidence of exceptional teaching (demonstrated by student or peer recognition of creativity and commitment to teaching) is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional teaching provide the grounds for promotion on the tenure track.

**3.1.3. Service to the CON, University, and the Discipline**

College of Nursing faculty are expected to demonstrate the following service outcomes:

- C1: Provides service/leadership to advance the mission of the University, Health Science Center, and College of Nursing.
- C2: Demonstrates leadership to promote professional nursing.

Evidence of excellent service to the CON, University, or discipline of nursing is also considered in all promotion and tenure decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly impact or stature within the field.

At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in planning major conferences and serving on task forces. Service that advances the mission of the CON, the Health Science Center, and TAMU is expected. Contributing significantly to accreditation of the CON or TAMU, when possible, is an indicator of excellence. Service to the discipline and/or profession is intentionally planned in such a way to advance from state/local to regional engagement with highly regarded professional organizations.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of top-tier journals in the field of nursing or the candidate's sub-specialty, chairing significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, and serving on or chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, CDC, HRSA, NIOSH, etc.). Service within the CON,

the Health Science Center, and TAMU, is recognized for excellence in leading initiatives that advance the mission of each.

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for tenure and/or promotion for faculty on tenured or tenure track lines. Evidence of exceptional service is not sufficient by itself for tenure. Only in extraordinary circumstances can exceptional service, defined as “sustained service to the University [that] is unselfish, distinctive, and outstanding,” provide the grounds for promotion to professor. Clearing such a high bar would be exceptionally rare. Per [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), “exceptional” performance in one dimension cannot compensate for “inadequate” performance in another.

#### **3.1.4. Mid-Term Review**

The CON P&T Committee conducts a Mid-term Review of each tenure-track faculty member traditionally in the third year of their tenure-track role per the Dean of Faculties guidelines. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review is to assess the faculty member’s progress toward tenure expectations in the CON. The review also familiarizes the faculty member with the tenure and promotion process and ensures that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure and promotion decision.

The Mid-Term Review mimics the tenure and promotion review process as closely as possible. The review does not include external review letters. The review includes dossier items contributed by the candidate and is reviewed by the Assistant/Associate Dean, followed by the CON P&T Committee, and the Dean. The Mid-Term Review serves as the faculty member’s annual evaluation for that calendar year. The procedure mimics the tenure review and follows those procedures as described in this document. The review process stops at the Dean, who returns the dossier to the Assistant/Associate Dean for review with the faculty member.

A final summary report is prepared that includes an in-depth analysis of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, inclusive of an initial narrative review by the Assistant/Associate Dean, the CON P&T committee review and recommendation report, and the Dean’s review letter. Within 60 days of receipt of the candidate’s dossier for review, the Assistant/Associate Dean meets with the faculty member to discuss the review and the recommendation of the committee and the Dean.

#### **3.1.5. Post-Tenure Review**

A faculty member’s career and professional development continue to evolve after tenure is awarded. Some individuals may concentrate more of their effort in selected areas. The configuration of professional activities should reflect the interests and abilities of the faculty member and the needs of the CON. A faculty member’s decision to concentrate his/her professional contributions in particular areas should involve consultation with the Assistant/Associate Dean, both of whom must agree with the configuration of responsibilities. These agreements should be reflected in the faculty member’s post-tenure review, which follows separate CON guidelines. The aim is not to require faculty to clear the tenure bar repeatedly. Tenure is awarded based on actual accomplishments, but it also carries the expectation that faculty continue on a satisfactory professional trajectory.

The recommendations of the CON Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee and, if required, an ad hoc review committee, are used to make determinations about satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance at the time of post-tenure review. Guidelines for this process are provided in a separate document for the CON. Broadly, the post-tenure review recommendations are based on consideration of the following criteria:

- Active pursuit of a program of scholarship (e.g., publication, participation at professional meetings, etc.).
- Teaching performance (e.g., achieving appropriate teaching workload, providing academically sound course or instructional content, use of methods that promote achievement of student learning outcomes and diverse and inclusive learning environments, and accessibility to students).
- Mentoring of students.
- Mentoring of junior faculty members.
- Responsible participation in CON and University activities and discipline-specific service opportunities.
- Adherence to the policies and procedures outlined in the Texas A&M University System policy and regulations, Texas A&M University rules, Standard Administrative Procedures (SAPs) and guidelines, and CON guidelines.

### 3.2. Criteria for Promotion for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty in the CON (e.g., clinical, research, or lecturer) who are candidates for promotion on non-tenure-accruing track lines should demonstrate excellence in one area, in addition to service. Expectations are not, however, necessarily limited to only two areas, as described below. Per University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.4.2, APT faculty “should have significant responsibilities beyond solely teaching (or research for research faculty).”

Offer letters for APT positions should clearly state whether faculty members are responsible for excellence in teaching (and the number of courses to be taught) or research (and any expectations for external grant support) and the nature of their responsibilities.

Per [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#), Section 4.4.4, consideration for promotion normally occurs after five years in a given rank, though faculty may seek promotion earlier.

Faculty in the CON report to an Assistant or Associate Dean who oversees their work assignments. There are no department heads in the College of Nursing.

#### 3.2.1. Clinical Track Faculty (or Lecturer) with Teaching as a Primary Expectation

Clinical track (or lecturer) faculty with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate excellence in instruction/teaching and render service contributions related to CON academic needs. Assessment of both performance dimensions, with teaching performance carrying the heaviest weight, is the source of a decision to promote an individual.

### 3.2.1.1. *Teaching.*

Teaching excellence is central to the educational mission of the CON and represents a major criterion for APT faculty promotion. Proficiency in teaching is essential to achieve promotion for clinical track and lecturer track faculty. Discipline specific teaching roles are broad, including clinical instruction, interprofessional education, integration of patient care and instructional technologies, and active learning via clinical simulation and other modalities. An APT faculty member with teaching as a primary role will demonstrate exceptional teaching and instructional excellence.

Faculty members in the CON provide instruction at the undergraduate or graduate level. Measurable evidence of high quality, innovative, and impactful teaching includes teaching outcomes that are at minimum provided by students, peers, experts and administrators.

Measurable impact of integrating innovative instructional or patient care technologies (e.g., for program and course delivery or for teaching students via practice, clinical simulation, or interprofessional education), is an outcome indicator of excellence.

Instructional Activity. Student evaluations of formal classroom, clinical, or simulation lab instruction are necessary, but not sufficient, to judge instructional excellence. In addition to the discipline context described in the preceding paragraph, Appendix I of [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) suggests additional indicators of instructional excellence. Note: These are examples, some are contextualized for the CON and this is not a checklist.

#### Indicators of Instructional Excellence may include:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials
- Developing a new course or course sequence that fills an identified need in the curriculum
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Invitation to teach at domestic or international institution of recognized excellence
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students
- Exceptional service as a peer evaluator

#### Indicators of Instructional Effectiveness may include:

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Selection for a CON outstanding teacher award

- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation
- Evidence of high quality class/clinical/simulation preparation, interaction, and accomplishments
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching
- Participation in University Honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students
- Effective service as a peer evaluator

Mentorship. Candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor in the APT track should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students effectively. APT candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship:

- *Student mentorship:* Candidates with teaching as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for professional, academic or research positions.
- *Faculty mentorship:* Candidates for any promotion with teaching as a primary responsibility must also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the instructional and, if appropriate, clinical practice or research. Faculty could meet this criterion by serving as an outstanding peer evaluator.

#### 3.2.1.2. *Scholarly Activities*

While scholarship is not a major requirement, promotion to associate professor requires some demonstration that the candidate is emerging or has emerged as a thought leader in the discipline of nursing within the context of the role. This requirement is essential for promotion to professor on APT lines. Evidence would include publications (related to pedagogy or assessment or, in some cases, peer-reviewed research unrelated to pedagogy), grants for teaching innovation, and presentations related to teaching and innovation at conferences. As is true of other faculty, faculty with primary responsibility for teaching should establish a regional, national, or international reputation for teaching, service, and related scholarly accomplishments.

#### 3.2.1.3. *Service*

Evidence of significant service to the CON, University, or field of nursing is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly or nursing impact or stature within the field. The category of

service is understood broadly to include clinical practice (if completed and evaluated as part of the faculty service role), student advising, and pedagogically–related activities outside the classroom. It may in addition, include:

At the level of associate professor, contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on tasks forces, participation in organizing major conferences, leadership on an accreditation committee, providing continuing education to the field, and/or training other academicians or clinicians.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include chairing a significant ad hoc, standing committees (e.g. peer evaluation committees), or tasks forces; serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, or leading an accreditation process at the University or CON level.

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for promotion. Candidates should provide a strong statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the CON, TAMU, and/or the discipline.

### **3.2.2. Clinical Track Faculty with Research as a Primary Expectation**

#### **3.2.2.1. Research/Scholarly Activity**

Research/scholarly activity is essential to the mission of the CON. The discipline of nursing, by its very nature, crosses disciplines and other health professions; thus, CON scholarship is flexible and broad. In some instances, it intersects greatly with other academic disciplines. Likewise, it may represent a unique area that a candidate has carved out within nursing science. Excellence in scholarship often involves shaping not only broad scholarly understandings of or approaches to the field, but also nursing practice.

To be considered promotion, research faculty candidates must, at minimum, have achieved peer recognized excellence in advancing a body of work judged to be substantial, original (pioneering or innovative), and setting a high standard for scholarship (in the application of relevant concepts, theory, and/or methods) in the field of nursing or human health. Candidates are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of intellectual independence and impact in their scholarly accomplishments.

Candidates for promotion are expected to verify standard scholarly metrics if relevant; however, metrics alone are not sufficient in determining the overall merit of a candidate's work. Candidates, in consultation with senior faculty, mentors, and administrators within the discipline and beyond, must contextualize their unique contribution and both identify and define the most relevant evidence of excellence. Ultimate committee and administrative judgements involve qualitative interpretation and decision-making in which performance is evaluated within the context of a candidate's rank, role, and area of scholarship. Criteria on

which the evaluation of scholarly impact will be made include: scholarly outcomes; reputation; social impact, if relevant; and funding.

Scholarly Outcomes. The generation of new knowledge as well as the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is scholarly work. Research generates new knowledge that advances the discipline using scientific methods. There is no absolute number of manuscripts, book chapters, books, reports, review articles or other outcomes that candidates must publish. Likewise, given the diversity of the field of nursing, there is no specific level of scholarly metrics (such as h-Index score) that can be considered as a required threshold. The question of whether a candidate has achieved a body of independent, substantive scholarship that has had an impact on the field weighs all of the following indicators of excellence:

- Significance and focus of prior research and the research/scholarship trajectory as measured by the candidate's career statement, CV, relevant scholarly outcomes (appropriately contextualized), and external letters.
- Publication in quality, peer-reviewed journals. Quality is measured by metrics such as impact factor within the discipline, or if applicable, due to the transdisciplinary nature of the work, other indicators as judged by experts in the candidate's area of focus.
- Number and significance of primary-authored published articles, and those co-authored that reflect transdisciplinary and community-based collaborative work, which is highly valued in the CON.
- Patents and other intellectual property that advance science in the field through new methods, techniques, or concepts may be relevant to the scholar's area of focus.
- Achievement of an overall outstanding level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of leaders in the field, ideally at CON peer institutions, at the rank sought by the candidate.

Reputation. Reputation as an independent scholar who advances the field is a cornerstone for tenure and promotion. The CON will weigh all of the following indicators of excellence:

- Faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure should, at minimum, be on a trajectory toward a national and international reputation as a scholar in the area of focus.
- Faculty being considered for professor should have well-established national and/or international reputations.
- At both the level of associate professor and professor, evidence of the candidate's national or international reputation is typically measured by the depth of recognition demonstrated by knowledge of the candidate's work in letters from peer scholars in the discipline. Section 4 spells out the procedures for tenure and/or promotion, for specific guidance on seeking referee letters and selecting comparison scholars.

Social Impact. While social impact is not required for candidate promotion, the impact of a scholar's work in such areas as clinical practice, health care outcomes, and workforce issues, may be relevant. A tool such as Altmetric™ can offer an objective measure of the concept, and

might be used to augment traditional indicators of quality scholarship. However, a high level of social impact alone is not sufficient as an indicator of scholarly excellence.

**Funding.** The CON does not require specific levels or types of external funding for promotion; however, in all fields, research support as a Principal Investigator demonstrates that a panel of reviewers judged proposed work to be original and significant. Therefore, competitive external funding serves as an indicator of the candidate's research impact and reputation. High levels of funding, however, are not sufficient for promotion. The quality of scholarship is the ultimate determinant.

**Mentorship.** Although not the primary consideration, candidates for promotion to associate professor or professor on research faculty lines should demonstrate some capacity to mentor other faculty and/or students effectively. Faculty members promoted to professor non-tenure accruing lines must demonstrate leadership through high quality mentorship.

- Student mentorship: Candidates with research as a primary responsibility should demonstrate the capacity to mentor students and prepare them for a research role.
- Faculty mentorship: Candidates for promotion with research as a primary responsibility should also demonstrate the capacity to mentor other faculty members in the research track or the tenure-track.

### **3.2.3. Service to the CON, University, and the Discipline**

Evidence of excellent service to the CON, University, or discipline of nursing is also considered in promotion decisions. Activities that demonstrate a candidate's service may overlap, to some extent, with nursing, health, or health care impact. Further, a call to service may reflect recognition of either scholarly impact or stature within the field.

At the level of associate professor, evidence of service may include contributions to highly regarded professional organizations, serving on significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on boards of community-based organizations, journal manuscript review, etc. Likewise, service may entail participation in planning major conferences and serving on task forces. Service that advances the mission of the CON, HSC, and TAMU is expected. Contributing significantly to accreditation of the CON or TAMU, when possible, is an indicator of excellence. Service to the discipline and/or profession is intentionally planned in such a way to advance from state/local to regional engagement with highly regarded professional organizations.

At the level of professor, service should represent high-level leadership. Evidence of service may include such things as serving on editorial boards or as editor of top-tier journals in the field of nursing or the candidate's sub-specialty, chairing significant ad hoc or standing committees (e.g. search committees), serving on or chairing significant national or international committees, and serving on or chairing national review panels (NIH, AHRQ, OSHA, CDC, HRSA, NIOSH, etc.).

Service within the CON and TAMU is recognized for excellence in leading initiatives that advance the mission of each.

Service is a necessary, but not sufficient, criterion for promotion for faculty on APT lines. Candidates should provide a strong statement describing their service and the impact it has had on the CON, University, and/or the discipline.

#### **3.2.4. Mid-Term Review**

Consistent with guidelines for tenure track faculty, the CON P&T Committee conducts a Mid-term Review of each APT faculty member in the third year of their APT role. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward promotion expectations in the CON. The review also familiarizes the faculty member with the promotion process and ensures that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion decision.

The Mid-Term Review mimics the promotion review process as closely as possible. The review does not include external review letters. The review includes dossier items contributed by the candidate and is reviewed by the Assistant/Associate Dean, followed by the CON P&T Committee, and the Dean. The Mid-Term Review serves as the faculty member's annual evaluation for that calendar year. The review process stops at the Dean, who returns the dossier to the Assistant/Associate Dean for review with the faculty member.

A final summary report is prepared that includes an in-depth analysis of the candidate's progress, inclusive of an initial narrative review by the Assistant/Associate Dean, the CON P&T committee review and recommendation report, and the Dean's review letter. Within 60 days of receipt of the candidate's dossier for review, the Assistant/Associate Dean meets with the faculty member to discuss the review and the recommendation of the committee and the Dean.

#### **3.2.5. Professional Development Support for Academic Professional Track Faculty**

The CON provides APT faculty support for professional development that is relevant to their appointment and is consistent with the CON practices. This includes, but is not limited to, support for travel to conferences or workshops that will enhance the individual's effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, or service.

Assistant/Associate Deans may, with approval of the Dean, provide a temporary course load reduction to APT faculty who have achieved promotion (i.e., Senior Lecturers and faculty who have earned the rank of Associate Professor or Professor) for professional development activities that enhance teaching or service capabilities for both the individual and the CON. Such a reduction should not be provided more often than once every five years.

## 4. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty and the CON have responsibilities in the process of tenure and promotion. All tenure and promotion discussions are strictly confidential. Dossiers may be made available to candidates only with an Open Records Request (see [System Policy 61.01.02](#)). For more information on making an Open Records Request see <https://openrecords.tamu.edu/>. Committee members and administrators may not share a dossier with a candidate without an Open Records Request. Note that faculty in the CON report to an Assistant or Associate Dean who oversees their work assignments. There are no department heads in the College of Nursing.

### 4.2. Responsibilities of the Tenure-track/Tenured Faculty Member

Candidates for tenure or promotion must:

#### 4.1.1. Provide an accurate and current CV

Provide an accurate and current CV, which should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.). Candidates should:

- Specify how authorship order is defined in their area of scholarship (e.g., is the primary author listed first or last? is authorship alphabetical?).
- Document contribution for multi-authored papers.
- Clearly indicate student authors.

#### 4.1.2. Provide a candidate impact statement

Provide a candidate impact statement (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship, teaching, and service. The different elements of the statement should provide selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate it. Detailed instructions can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

- 4.1.2.1 *The statement of scholarship* describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory. Scholars both within and outside the candidate's discipline who read this statement should be able to clearly understand scholarly contributions. In other words, this should be a clear, crisp, highly accessible statement of the specific contributions that set the candidate apart, how those contributions have changed the field, and the arc of the candidate's career.

The scholarly statement should identify the candidate's most important papers/books. The candidate should provide two to three exemplary papers that reflect the core argument about scholarly impact. These scholarly contributions will be sent to all referees and will be a part of the dossier up to the Dean's review.

4.1.2.2. *The statement of teaching* addresses the candidate’s philosophy and impact of methods or approaches relating to student achievement, course content, course development, curriculum development, mentoring, and/or clinical based learning. It must include evidence of performance. For promotion to professor, the statement must provide evidence of “higher-level” efforts or leadership (e.g., course or curriculum conceptualization, innovative teaching methods, mentorship of junior faculty, etc.). While a formal Teaching Portfolio<sup>1</sup> is not required, robust evidence of teaching ability is required. Candidates may submit peer evaluations of classroom teaching methods and innovations but are expected, at a minimum, to reflect on peer evaluations. Candidates are expected to provide at least the following:

- Examples of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods.
- Student teaching evaluations in chronological form with appropriate comparisons to College norms (the Office of Academic Affairs will provide a teaching evaluation report).

4.1.2.3. *The service statement* addresses the impact of contributions to the CON, TAMU, the discipline, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

4.1.3. **Submit and verify other required documentation** as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at <http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>.

4.1.4. **Submit names of appropriate potential reviewers.** Submit the names of at least seven (7) appropriate scholars to serve as potential external letter writers. Dossiers must include five to seven evaluation letters. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. When identifying external referees, the candidate should consider the following:

- Referee letters will normally be tenured professors (and will, at a minimum, have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring) preferably at CON peer institutions or those belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least institutions with a Carnegie “R1” classification. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.
- Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Assistant/Associate Dean or Dean explains the relationship.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Matthew Kaplan, *The Teaching Portfolio*, CRLT Occasional Papers, The Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, The University of Michigan, No. 11.

Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a referee in the past 5 to 10 years.

- Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers directly to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

## 4.2. Responsibilities of the APT Track Faculty Member with a Primary Responsibility for Research.

The APT faculty member with a research focus must:

**4.2.1. Provide an accurate and current CV**, which should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.). Candidates should:

- Specify how authorship order is defined in their area of scholarship (e.g., is the primary author listed first or last? is authorship alphabetical?).
- Document contribution for multi-authored papers.
- Clearly indicate student authors.

**4.2.2. Provide a candidate impact statement** (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship, teaching, and service. The different elements of the statement should provide selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate it. Detailed instructions can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

4.2.2.1. *The statement of scholarship* describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory. Scholars both within and outside your discipline who read this statement should be able to clearly understand scholarly focus and impact. In other words, this should be a clear, crisp, highly accessible statement of the arc of your career and major contributions that set you apart.

4.2.2.2. *The educational contributions statement* addresses the candidate's contributions to education with an emphasis on mentorship. For promotion to professor, the statement must provide evidence of "higher-level" efforts or leadership (e.g., mentorship of junior faculty instructors, etc.). For those who have taught, candidates are expected to provide at least the following:

- Examples of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods.
- Student teaching evaluations in chronological form with appropriate comparisons to Department norms.

4.2.2.3. *The service statement* addresses the impact of contributions to the CON, University, discipline, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

**4.2.3. *Submit and verify other required documentation*** as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at <http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-andTenure>.

In addition to the CV and Candidate Impact Statement, these documents generally include:

- Grants Summary Chart
- Verification of Contents Statement
- Faculty Bibliography
- Faculty Summary Data Table

**4.2.4. *Submit the names of appropriate potential reviewers***. Dossiers must include at least four and no more than six external or internal review letters (CON or University) with an option to request review letters from others associated with an external organization in which the candidate has been active. Because some potential reviewers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential reviewers well in advance of deadlines. Reviewers should have achieved, at a minimum, the same rank the candidate is seeking.

Reviewers should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Reviewers who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm's length evaluators provided the Assistant/Associate Dean or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a reviewer in the past 5 years.

At least two review letters must come from outside the CON. Such reviews should speak to research/scholarship, teaching and service accomplishments with the most weight to the primary role (research).

External referee letters will requested from individuals at CON peer institutions, specifically those belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least institutions with a Carnegie "R1" classification. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.

Any internal review should come from peers who have some substantive basis for evaluation (e.g., direct observation of teaching). Any peer who provides a letter must review the full dossier (except for other referee letters).

Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

### 4.3. Responsibilities of the APT Track Faculty Member with a primary responsibility for teaching.

The APT faculty member with primary responsibility for teaching must:

4.3.1. **Provide an accurate and current CV.** Provide an accurate and current CV, which should not contain any personal information (e.g., date of birth, marital status, address, etc.). Candidates should:

- Specify how authorship order is defined in their area of scholarship (e.g., is the primary author listed first or last? is authorship alphabetical?).
- Document contribution for multi-authored papers.
- Clearly indicate student authors.

4.3.2. **Provide a candidate impact statement.** Provide a candidate impact statement (adherent to Dean of Faculties formatting guidelines) that addresses scholarship (as relevant), teaching, and service. The different elements of the statement should provide selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate it. Detailed instructions can be found in Dean of Faculties Guidelines, Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines. In brief, required elements of the statement include the following:

4.3.2.1. *The statement of scholarship* describes the quality of work, productivity over time, scholarly impact, and scholarly trajectory, as assigned. Scholarship is not a major component of the APT review for faculty whose primary role is teaching; however, there are scholarly components of every role in the College of Nursing.

4.3.2.2. *Include a Teaching Portfolio*<sup>2</sup>: that provides selective, representative (not complete or exhaustive) evidence of the quality and scope of teaching performance and solid evidence of effectiveness. For promotion to professor, the dossier must provide evidence of “higher-level” efforts or leadership (e.g., course or curriculum conceptualization, innovative teaching methods, mentorship of junior faculty). The portfolio provides an opportunity for the candidate to tell the story of how their work impacts the CON, University, or field. If there is a major unifying theme, the candidate should punctuate that theme throughout the portfolio. The portfolio should contain three sections:

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Matthew Kaplan, *The Teaching Portfolio*, CRLT Occasional Papers, The Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, The University of Michigan, No. 11.

- Statement of teaching approach and philosophy (which may also include descriptions of course responsibilities, syllabi or syllabi overviews, assignments, case studies or other material prepared for courses).
- Evaluative material from others (which may include material from peer evaluations, student letters, honors or awards including grants, invitations to teach from outside institutions or other evidence of reputation as a teacher).

The portfolio must include:

- Student teaching evaluations in chronological form with appropriate comparisons to CON norms (the Office of Academic Affairs will provide a teaching evaluation).
- Products of good teaching (which may include exemplary student work). Candidates are expected to provide robust evidence that includes at least the following: examples of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods.

4.3.2.3. *Provide a service statement* addressing the impact of contributions to the CON, University, discipline, and society. As specified above in criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion to professor must include evidence not only of service but of leadership.

**4.3.3. *Submit and verify other required documentation*** as specified in DOF guidelines on tenure and promotion, which are issued annually and available at <https://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>. In addition to the CV and candidate impact statement, these documents generally include:

- Grants Summary Chart
- Verification of Contents Statement
- Faculty Biography
- Faculty Summary Data Table

**4.3.4. *Submit the names of appropriate potential reviewers.*** Dossiers must include at least four and no more than six external or internal review letters (CON or University) with an option to request review letters from others associated with an external organization in which the candidate has been active. Because some potential reviewers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential reviewers well in advance of deadlines. Reviewers should have achieved, at a minimum, the same rank the candidate is seeking.

Reviewers should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Reviewers who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm's length evaluators provided the Assistant/Associate Dean or Dean explains the relationship. Ideally, to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, a candidate should not have collaborated with a reviewer in the past 5 years.

At least two review letters must come from outside the CON. Such reviews should speak to teaching and service accomplishments, and research or scholarship contributions where appropriate with the most weight to the primary role (teaching).

External referee letters will requested from individuals at CON peer institutions, specifically those belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least institutions with a Carnegie “R1” classification. There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU, R1, or other peer institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external referee is required.

Any internal review should come from peers who have some substantive basis for evaluation (e.g., direct observation of teaching). Any peer who provides a letter must review the full dossier (except for other referee letters).

Candidates should not contact potential external reviewers to inquire about their willingness to write a letter or to inquire about the status of a letter.

#### 4.4. Dossier Preparation

Responsibilities of the Assistant or Associate Dean to whom the faculty member reports and the Assistant/Associate Dean’s administrative support person. These responsibilities are related to initial preparation of a dossier that includes:

**4.4.1. Management of external review letters (Tenure Accruing Candidates).** For candidates on tenure-accruing lines must include five to seven evaluation letters from external referees.

- Use Candidate External Reviewer Checklist and the Department External Reviewer Checklist provided by the Promotion and Tenure Committee to identify a large pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. The Assistant/Associate Dean may add other reviewer names as needed.
- When finalizing a list of external referees, the Assistant/Associate Dean should consider the following:
  - Referee letters will normally be tenured professors (and will, at a minimum, have achieved the rank to which the candidate is aspiring), preferably at CON peer institutions, institutions belonging to the American Association of Universities (AAU), or at least at Carnegie R1 institutions.
  - There may be instances in which top scholars or top programs are not in public or private AAU or R1 institutions, but when this is the case, a convincing rationale for selection of an external reviewer is required.
  - Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate.
  - Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm’s length evaluators provided the Assistant/Associate Dean or Dean explains the

relationship. Ideally, to avoid a conflict of interest, candidates will not have collaborated with the referee for 5 to 10 years.

- Ideally, no more than one referee from the same institution should be included.
- The Assistant/Associate Dean will use the University Standard External Review template to invite reviews by potential referees via e-mail; documentation of all communication should be retained.
- The Assistant/Associate Dean will receive all review letters and assure that they are uploaded into the candidate's dossier.
- The Assistant/Associate Dean will complete the External Reviewers Chart and upload it to the candidate's dossier file.

#### **4.4.2. Management of external review letters (APT Candidates)**

For APT candidates, at least four and no more than six evaluation letters from referees outside the CON, at the University, national, or professional level that speak to a candidate's research (if relevant), teaching, or service accomplishments and contributions. Because some potential writers will decline, it is critical to identify a larger pool of potential referees well in advance of deadlines. Assistant/Associate Deans should identify at least four appropriate potential referees and consider the following:

- Referees should not have mentored, advised, or otherwise worked closely with the candidate. Referees who have published with candidates as part of large research efforts but who did not interact directly with the candidate can be considered arm's length evaluators provided the Assistant/Associate Dean or Dean explains the relationship.
- The list of potential external letter writers should not overlap with the list provided by the candidate.
- When soliciting letters, Assistant/Associate Deans must draw from both the Assistant/Associate Dean and candidate lists.

#### **4.4.3. Assistant/Associate Dean Responsibilities**

For all candidates, regardless of whether on a tenure-accruing or non-tenure-accruing line, Assistant/Associate Deans are responsible for:

- Facilitating high standards of academic integrity and academic freedom.
- Assuring fairness and equity throughout the processes of promotion, tenure, and post tenure review.
- Providing individual consultation at the request of faculty on matters related to scholarship, teaching, strength of scholarship and teaching, timing of tenure and promotion, and best practices for preparing dossier elements.
- Maintaining or providing data collection and analysis resources for candidates in assessing, understanding, and/or presenting scholarly and teaching contributions.
- Assuring that their administrative staff member supports the faculty member to develop the dossier.
- Reviewing and verifying the dossier to assure that all materials are included and placed accurately.

- Meeting with and advising the candidate about the elements of the dossier and the timing of tenure and/or promotion.
- Conducting a comprehensive and objective review of the dossier after it is completed and prior to submission to College P&T committee. The review should provide a composite evaluation of the candidate's record and include sufficient information to support judgments regarding teaching, research/scholarship (as relevant to the candidate's track), and service. The review should address all negative comments from the external review letters.
- Meeting with candidate's whose application for promotion to professor is unsuccessful and informing the candidate that a minimum of one year is required before resubmission. This only applies for promotions that do not involve tenure.

#### **4.4.4. Administrative Support Responsibilities**

The administrative support person who assists the Assistant/Associate Dean to whom the faculty member reports is responsible for:

- Verifying candidate dossiers in collaboration with the Assistant/Associate Dean.
- If incomplete or inaccurate, returning the dossier to appropriate party for correction.
- Assembling and verifying the dossier in collaboration with the faculty member.

**4.4.5. Reconsideration of a Case.** For all candidates, in the event the CON Dean disagrees with the Assistant/Associate Dean's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the Assistant/Associate Dean follows the Dean of Faculties guidelines.

#### **4.5. Responsibilities of the CON Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The CON P&T Committee is governed by the Bylaws of the CON, which makes clear that its deliberations are confidential. The P&T committee is responsible for communicating with faculty by:

- Disseminating a P&T timeline to candidates and all CON faculty based on current Dean of Faculties deadlines and requirements (which are revised on an annual basis).

When considering candidates for P&T, the committee conducts a searching analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure and or promotion. Reports should:

- Be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any discrepancies between the recommendation of the CON P&T Committee and the Assistant/Associate Dean recommendations.
- Not duplicate the analysis provided by the Assistant/Associate Dean.
- Make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for its assessment.
- Be consistent in its assessment of candidates (e.g., if an h-index is weighed and discussed for any candidate, it should be weighed and discussed for all candidates).
- Be consistent in its judgment of candidates (e.g., if it critiques the quality of external referees for one candidate, it must make clear that it applied the same yardstick to all candidates).
- Address all negative comments from external reviewers.

- Include a robust analysis of the committee deliberations and a final vote, including reasons for negative votes or absenteeism among committee members.

#### 4.6. Responsibilities of the Dean of the CON.

The Dean is responsible for:

- Assuring that the Assistant to the Dean provides technical support for the CON P&T Committee.
- Communicating changes in standards or procedures to faculty, Assistant/Associate Deans, and the CON P&T Committee.
- Conducting an independent analysis that provides a meaningful validation of the case for tenure and/or promotion. The Dean's letter of recommendation to the Provost should be rigorous and thorough, addressing any weaknesses in the case as well as any mixed or negative votes. The Dean should make a clear recommendation in each case and explain the rationale for the Dean's assessment.
- Adhering to all Dean of Faculties Guidelines and [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#).
- Assuring that the Assistant to the Dean is responsible for submission of the dossier to the Dean of Faculties.

## Appendix A

Links to TAMU Documents that Guide Faculty Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Evaluation\*

- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion)  
<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>
- Office of the Dean of Faculties Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review  
[http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/review\\_guidelines/guidelines\\_annual\\_and\\_mid-term\\_review.pdf](http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/review_guidelines/guidelines_annual_and_mid-term_review.pdf)
- Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01 (Post-Tenure Review)  
<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf>
- Office of the Dean of Faculties Faculty Hiring Guidelines for Deans and Department Heads  
<http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/hiring/Hiring-Guidelines.pdf>
- Office of the Dean of Faculties Faculty Hiring Guidelines for Deans and Department Heads, Appendix C: Guidelines to Faculty Titles  
<http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Documents/Guidelines/hiring/Hiring-Guidelines.pdf>
- Office of the Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Package Submission Guidelines (published annually)  
<http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-DOF/Forms/DOF-Tenure%20and%20Promotion/2018-2019-TAMU-T-P-Guidelines.pdf>

\*This list is provided for exemplary purposes. 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 statements take precedence.