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Procedure Statement

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University 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 is comprised of annual performance reviews by the department head (or individual responsible for conducting the annual evaluation) as well as a review by a committee of peers that occurs not less frequently than once every six years.

This procedure does not supersede the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (12.01.99.M2) that defines tenure policies and the process under which dismissal for cause proceedings may be initiated.

Official Procedure/ Responsibilities/ Process

1. UNIVERSITY EXPECTATIONS
   1.1 Tenured faculty are expected to perform satisfactorily at teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e.g. patient care, extension, administration…) throughout their career.

   1.2 Modifications to these assignments may be expected as a career changes but should not go to zero in any category. A decrease in expectation in one category should be
matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another category. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.

1.3 Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more categories in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

2. ANNUAL REVIEW BY DEPARTMENT HEAD

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, *University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*.

2.1 In each department or college, stated criteria for rating faculty performance in an annual review will be established by departmental or college faculty and approved by the department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties. These criteria will be published and disseminated in advance of the academic year in which they are to be used. At a minimum, rating categories for annual reviews shall be “Unsatisfactory”, “Needs Improvement”, and “Satisfactory”, each defined according to departmental standards, but additional meritorious categories are normally expected in the annual review process.

*College Expectations*

The Head of the Department, in consultation with the faculty member, should develop a Position Description that accurately defines the relative load in the areas of teaching; research/scholarship/creative work; and service; no load can go to 0. Appendix I gives a sample format.

College evaluation criteria for rating faculty performance in teaching; research, scholarship or creative activities; and service can be found in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Promotion and Tenure Recommendations. The evaluation criteria appear in Appendix II.

Departments may utilize the College evaluation criteria (Appendix II), or may develop their own evaluation criteria for rating faculty performance. Departments should define the departmental standards in each evaluation criteria to achieve a rating of satisfactory in teaching; research, scholarship or creative activities, and service. A satisfactory level of productivity should be higher in the primary area(s) of load than for the secondary or tertiary area(s).

2.2 An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as being “Unsatisfactory” in any single category: teaching; research, scholarship, or creative work; service; and other assigned responsibilities (e. g. patient care, extension, administration…), or a rating of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories.
2.3 An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance shall state the basis for the rating in accordance with the criteria. Each unsatisfactory review shall be reported to the dean.

2.4 The report to the dean of each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation should be accompanied by a written plan, developed by the faculty member and department head, for near-term improvement. If deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a “Periodic Peer Review” (section 3) of the faculty member.

2.5 If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single category, he or she must work with his or her department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take 1 year or less to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g. research, scholarship, and creative work), this plan may take up to 3 years to complete successfully. The rating of “Needs Improvement” can stay as “Needs Improvement” as long as pre-determined milestones in the improvement plan are being met, otherwise the rating will be changed to “Unsatisfactory”.

2.6 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, department heads or program directors of the appropriate units will collaborate to develop accurate annual reports (12.01.99.M2).

3. PERIODIC PEER REVIEW

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

3.1 The purpose of the Periodic Peer Review is to:

3.1.1 Assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member;

3.1.2 Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;

3.1.3 Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals; and

3.1.4 Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

3.2 Departments and/or colleges must have post-tenure review guidelines which will
3.2.1 How peer evaluation of performance is incorporated in the Periodic Peer Review process. For example, departments may use peer committees that advise the department head for annual reviews, post-tenure review committees, or promotion and tenure committees;

Each department will determine which evaluation of performance model best fits their structure/culture.

3.2.2 Criteria for rating of faculty performance, which must be in agreement with those established for annual review and clearly describe performance expectations for tenured faculty;

Each department will develop and publish their criteria for rating faculty performance.

3.2.3 Review procedures and timelines;

Each department will determine their procedures and timelines.

3.2.4 The materials to be reviewed. This may, but need not, include materials beyond those submitted for the annual reviews. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon their assigned duties;

3.2.5 How a peer review that is incorporated into the annual review process will fulfill the requirements of a Periodic Peer Review for Post-Tenure Review purposes (e.g. once every six years the committee will assess whether the individual is making a contribution consistent with that expected of a tenured faculty member; use the average of 3 consecutive annual peer reviews; 3 consecutive unsatisfactory departmental annual peer reviews);

Each department will define their process.

3.2.6 The process by which peer-review committees are selected.

Each department will determine their selection process.

3.3 A finding of “Unsatisfactory” performance in any particular category shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department/college guidelines. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (section 4).

3.4 A finding of “Needs Improvement” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the criteria described in the department/college guidelines. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review.
Development Review (section 4).

3.5 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 and the faculty member.

3.6 For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (ad loc) unless the faculty member requests to be reviewed by both units. If reviewed only by the primary department the department head will share the report with the department head of the secondary department.

3.7 By no later than May 31st, each department will provide to the dean of the college 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.

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

4.1 A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (section 2) or an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (section 3) or upon request of the faculty member (section 7). The department head 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 and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating, circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.

4.1.1 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.

4.1.2 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.

4.1.3 The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by
DRAFT

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.

4.1.4 The department head 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.

4.1.5 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:

4.1.5.1 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,

4.1.5.2 Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean 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.

5. THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

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

5.1.1 Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed;

5.1.2 Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies;

5.1.3 Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes;

5.1.4 Set time lines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes;

5.1.5 Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan;

5.1.6 Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

5.2 Assessment.

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

5.3 Completion of the Plan.

5.3.1 When the objectives of the plan have been met or the agreed timeline exceeded, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the department head shall make a final report to the faculty member and dean. The successful completion of the Professional Development Plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

5.3.2 If, after consulting with the review committee, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Professional Development Plan and that the deficiencies in the completion of the plan separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

6. APPEAL

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

If the faculty member wishes to contest the 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, and the dean, the decision of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost on the committee composition is final.

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.

If the faculty member, department head, and review committee fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

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 (section 3) or a Professional Development Review (section 4), by making a request to the department head.
How to Describe Position Description and Job Expectation
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

There is a difference between a faculty member’s salary source and their job expectation.

**Appointment or Salary Source:** The % of the faculty member’s salary paid by Texas A&M University, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension and/or Texas A&M AgriLife Research.

**Job Expectation:** As per University Rule 12.01.99.M2 and Texas AgriLife Research policy 12.99.99.A1.01 every professorial ranked position has job expectations in teaching, research (scholarship) and service, and Texas AgriLife Extension Professorial Career Ladder System has job expectations in extension, research (scholarship), teaching and service. Therefore, every professorial ranked faculty member has an expectation of accomplishments in teaching, research (scholarship) and service; and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension employees have an additional job expectation in extension.

**Load Expectation:** The Head of the Department, in consultation with the faculty member, will develop a Position Description that accurately defines the relative load in the areas of teaching; research, scholarship or creative activities; and service. Expectation “should not go to zero in any category.”

**Appointment versus Load Expectation:**
% Appointment (salary source) and % Load Expectation are separate categories. For example, a 100% TAMU position may have been hired with the expectation of developing a nationally recognized basic research program, with minimal expectation of classroom teaching. Thus, the salary source is not always proportional to the load and effort defined in the job expectation.

**Position Description**
The position description should address:
• What were you hired to do?
• How much load or effort is allocated to the teaching; research, scholarship or creative activities; and service mission of your position? (plus extension for Extension faculty)
• **Think of it as describing your position description in the form of a plan of work.**
• The reader should be able to read your position description and develop an accurate interpretation of your job expectation.
**Possible Position Description Model**
*Describe Job Expectations in Position Description of your Curriculum Vitae*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current Position</strong></th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2009-present</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Position Description</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching – 40% load expectation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant responsibility will be to teach the department’s introductory undergraduate course every semester, and coordinate all laboratory sections and teaching assistants. Teach one graduate course every year in the area of hydrology. Advise undergraduate and graduate students on independent research projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Research, Scholarship or Creative Works – 50% load expectation** |  |
| Primary responsibility will be to develop a competitive and extramurally funded, translational research program in the area of water quality and conservation as it effects the production of crops in arid environments. |

| **Service – 10% load expectation** |  |
| Serve on one or more departmental and college committees. Make periodic presentations to industry stakeholders. Serve as a manuscript reviewer for scientific journals. |
APPENDIX II – Evaluation Criteria

From College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Promotion and Tenure Recommendations

EVALUATION CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATION
OF MERIT REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE
Revised June 2015

The following four components (teaching, service, research and extension) are important indicators in evaluations relative to the merit review and promotion and tenure process and should be considered as appropriate to the academic balance of an individual faculty member.

I. THE TEACHING EVALUATION

A variety of independent indicators are necessary to develop an overall teaching profile which can be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness. The evaluation of colleagues, students and academic clientele should include as appropriate the following documentation:

1. **Surveys of student opinions of teaching**
   The use of student comments and evaluations can provide an immediate response of student's perspectives; student reviews such as exit interviews at a later date would provide another important long-term indicator.

2. **Accomplishments of students**
   The number and caliber of students guided through effective research programs which resulted in refereed publications and recognition of the development of the faculty member's reputation as a scholar and teacher.

3. **Evidence of effective student learning**
   The mastery of material in subsequent courses (numerous forms of student or colleague reactions may be appropriate to include pre-test/post-test comparisons and other performance measures of student mastery of subject material).

4. **Creativity in programmatic development**
   Indication that a faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches in teaching his/her own courses or new programs (new texts, teaching material used by other educational groups, new teaching technology development, utilization of distance education, etc.).

5. **Professional peer evaluation**
   A peer analysis of prepared materials can be utilized to evaluate the quality of preparation, clarity and appropriateness of educational goals and methods of testing. Professional peer evaluation may involve site visits, departmental exit interviews, or performance in subsequent courses.

6. **Formal teaching recognition**
   The receipt of awards for outstanding teaching or other formal recognition of teaching excellence by student clubs, the department, college, university or recognition of contributions to the educational programs of a professional society.

7. **Self-evaluation of teaching**
   The instructor's self-evaluation can present a unique insight into the teaching philosophy and professional efforts in teaching activities.

8. **Flexibility in teaching abilities**
   When appropriate, the teaching flexibility demonstrated by each instructor should be considered with attention to the ability of the instructor to properly gauge student understanding and distinguish between introductory and advanced presentations.

9. **Student advising and mentoring**
   Involvement in student advising programs or honors fellows programs provide an important component of student development. Faculty participation in internship management,
the Masters of Agriculture program, co-op programs and student placement are also important components of the teaching evaluation. Significant variable credit programs should be identified and their uniqueness defined.

10. **Continuing education**

Continuing education provides an important aspect of the academic activities of some faculty members involved in adult education, K-12 teacher education, professional leadership, specialized training, etc. Significant ongoing participation and development of continuing education programs may be an important component of a faculty member’s activities.

The quality and level of participation of a faculty member in each of these indicators should be examined at the department and college level. Prepared materials that could be specifically evaluated include course syllabi, goal statements, examinations, and the instructor's personal narrative. Qualitative judgments by a committee of peers could include an assessment of the care with which instructional materials such as texts and problem sets have been selected. This could include the appropriate use of instructional aids such as handouts, films, demonstrations and field trips, and the creative development of the course format (for example, the integration of lectures with laboratory sessions or the use of student panel discussions for controversial issues). The focus of the evaluation should not be limited to the materials themselves, but rather on the quality of thought and synthesis encouraged. In addition to the traditional indicators, the development of techniques or new modes of instruction, substantial revision of existing courses or the development of new courses should be considered.

Authorship of textbooks may sometimes be considered a creative extension of prepared materials which reflect upon a candidate's contribution to academic programs in a larger context than their individual teaching. The committee should carefully evaluate the quality of the literary work and to reflect benchmarking against peer institutions. An award/grant for curriculum development, student development or academic programming may also be considered as an example in which an activity extends into a larger sphere than the teaching program of the select individual.

The teaching report should clearly indicate the type of courses being presented and the nature of the evidence on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been measured. Surveys of student opinion on teaching can be quite valuable; however, evaluation of teaching should be based upon more than one criterion. Individual components of student opinion surveys should be interpreted individually rather than relying on a simple evaluation of the overall scores. For example, a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time may consist of required courses which are unpopular or there may be extenuating circumstances in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion.

### II. THE SERVICE EVALUATION

Faculty members in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Texas A&M University are expected to be involved in activities of service to the people of the State of Texas as well as to their academic, research and extension activities. Most of these service functions are administrative or consultative assignments which extend the mission of the College and University. Extraordinary aspects of service should be clearly defined and displayed in the faculty achievement report/curriculum and supporting documentation.

It is difficult to define the scope of these activities without jeopardizing its many different aspects. The most important component of the service function relative to faculty evaluations is related to the significance and impact of the activity. While many service functions represent essential housekeeping responsibilities, others provide the innovative impetus for new programs and development. In the same manner as teaching and research functions, the quality service functions should have a long-range impact on programs or clientele groups that can be readily documented and explained. Examples of service components include the following:

1. **Departmental service.**

   All faculty are involved in various departmental services; however, the requirements of that service vary significantly. Some faculty members serve as Associate Heads of the Department or provide other major programmatic leadership. Included in these activities are student recruiting, placement services, departmental student club advising, and similar activities which provide nonacademic components of student development.
2. **College or university service.**

   Selected faculty members provide major service on college or university-wide committees or task forces, public relations activities, and the Faculty Senate. Distinguished effort in such activities provides important contributions to the Texas A&M University community.

3. **Community or state-wide resource or leadership activities.**

   Some faculty members provide an irreplaceable resource for community development and continuing education. While these activities may or may not be a direct component of their professional responsibilities, extraordinary service or quality of community enhancement should be considered in a faculty evaluation. Of particular importance is the role that faculty have in youth education and development through both formal and informal programming. Another issue involves adult and continuing education activities which may or may not be a part of the professional responsibilities of a given faculty member.

4. **Contributions to government, industry or commerce.**

   Many faculty members are asked to contribute their professional or scientific expertise to informational needs or to the solution of practical issues in the public and private domain. As appropriate, a statement should be provided relative to the service activities and problem solving aspects of the faculty member.

5. **International Involvement**

   In seeking to achieve a global perspective among students and professors, faculty at Texas A&M University are encouraged to contribute to the worldwide economic and cultural development, and enhance global understanding through their efforts at the international level. This includes assuming responsibility for international research enhancement grants, participation in USAID projects, and forging new collaborative relationships with international institutions.

6. **Contributions to professional disciplines.**

   Many faculty members serve as officers and leaders in the disciplinary activities of their professional societies. The significance of these appointed and elected positions should be clearly explained.

---

**III. THE RESEARCH EVALUATION**

The research evaluation should examine publications and other examples of creative work ("scholarly activity"). An analytical summary of the research record is often a useful tool which can be important in evaluation; however, this type of summary analysis cannot substitute for appropriate qualitative judgment. Quality as well as the number of publications must be considered relative to the importance and creativity of the work.

Emphasis on the quality of work requires attention to the nature of the publication and a consideration of the contribution of each author. It should be determined whether the journal is appropriate for the subject material and the stringency of the refereed judgments. The total publication record should indicate a directed, ongoing research program whose specific goals are appropriate and clearly defined. It is important to determine if the research program shows promise of continued productivity in publications, support and impact. In keeping with the academic goals of the College, the work should be evaluated for student and/or postdoctoral fellow training and research accomplishments. (Copies of publications or select examples of publications should be on file in the department head's office for evaluation.) Each faculty achievement report /curriculum vitae should contain an evaluation of the quality of the academic press or scientific journals in which the scholarly work appears. (This should be based on the standing of the publication in the discipline. This evaluation does not have to be exhaustive; however, some statement of comparative status should be provided in the evaluation.)

In the evaluation of research and other creative accomplishments, interpretations by qualified members of each discipline in the College as well as outside referees of national reputation, are extremely valuable. Invited reviews, citations, and appraisals in the publications of others constitute a particularly significant
testimony of importance. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships both submitted and awarded should be examined and interpreted. These components should demonstrate a positive pattern of professional development of the faculty member as a creative scholar. Original work typically should be considered as evidence of this productivity only after acceptance for publication or presentation.

While faculty are expected to publish research in peer-reviewed journals, it must be recognized that some faculty members were recruited to provide leadership in areas of research that are less amenable to publication. Furthermore, the publication of some types of observations may be more appropriate in publications or presentations other than reviewed journals. In these cases, it may be more difficult to evaluate the quality of the research effort by external standards. However, it is important to provide some comparative standards and expectations for these faculty. Furthermore, it is essential that the nature of these evaluations is clearly communicated to the faculty members. The research leadership on multidisciplinary teams with specific targeted applications should be highlighted as appropriate.

In addition, there are numerous creative productions that develop from different goals than refereed publications (i.e., patented technology or germplasm release). These should be evaluated from the perspective of the impact of the material on the targeted program or clientele use. Some of the specific activities which could contribute to faculty research or other creative activities might include several of the following:

1. **Original peer-reviewed scientific publications.**
   The most traditional sense of original basic and applied research is the presentation of that material in formally reviewed literature publications.

2. **Invited review publications.**
   One of the more important components of developing national and international recognition for research capabilities is the publication of significant reviews in leading disciplinary journals or review publications.

3. **Book chapters and book editing.**
   Ongoing research activity may be published in books or specialized monographs of scientific meetings. While these may have varying value and occasionally be of major importance in chronicling or providing direction to a research area, they should not be interchanged with the invited reviews mentioned above.

4. **Popular press articles and research application bulletins.**
   Publication opportunities exist which are targeted toward specific components of the lay audience in the popular press or applied agricultural service bulletins. This type of publication provides an important component of scientific education and application.

5. **Textbooks, educational software and teaching materials.**
   There is an ever increasing demand for educational materials for use in laboratories, lecture courses, workshops, and continuing education. Some of these materials find access to large interdisciplinary markets and some are used entirely within the local domain. The importance of these materials depends on the quality and extended impact of the materials on a wide community.

6. **Products of research experiences.**
   As a result of research investigations, many products are developed which provide valuable end-products in themselves and traditionally represent a variety of integrated research and production-oriented activities. The utility of the research product should be examined in the performance criteria assessment. Included in this forum are the development of patented and non-patented products and/or techniques encompassing the formulation of germplasm/varieties, software, equipment, models, etc. (i.e., the development of the cotton module builder and the electro-stimulation of carcasses.)

7. **Technology transfer.**
   Invention disclosures, patents, copyrights, trademarks, consulting and participation in extension educational programs are important indicators of research performance.

8. **Development of extramural funding activities.**
   Successful research programs in many areas are able to attract extramural research
support from competitive state, federal and industrial sources. The development of competitive funding should be evaluated for the provision of a consistent, directed research program. In addition, it is becoming increasingly possible to develop extramural teaching/research funding relative to the national concerns regarding the future status of scientific education and research.

9. **Participation in scientific meetings, invited seminars and related activities.**
   An indication of research activity can be demonstrated by participation in scientific meetings, particularly as invited speakers at major symposia. In addition, however, published abstracts and short published research reports associated with meetings can contribute to the evaluation of research quality.

10. **Peer recognition, awards, and commendations.**
    The recognition of research accomplishments and their impact on clientele groups provides a valuable indicator of the external impact and significance of the research program.

11. **Solicitation of scientific expertise.**
    Requests to serve on decision-making panels (i.e. program reviews, consultation with government or industry, select scientific panels, publication editorial work, and peer grant review) represent measures of the potential importance of scientific effort.

**IV. THE EXTENSION EVALUATION**

The evaluation of Extension effectiveness must utilize various diverse activities to represent the overall creative excellence in educational programming and technology delivery. A combination of critical professional endeavors can form the basis for an accurate evaluation of the faculty member:

1. **Program development plans and activities**
   A variety of peer and clientele inputs should be used to determine the content, quality, priority and emphasis of the Extension faculty member's programmatic leadership. This should reflect the assimilation and synthesis of information from county program development committees, clientele organizations, and key industry leaders relative to the strategic plans of the department, college, agency and faculty.

2. **Teaching effectiveness and quality**
   Teaching quality involves command of the subject discipline, progressive assimilation of new knowledge, and ability to present information with logic and conviction. Quality and effectiveness should be represented through clientele evaluation and peer evaluation. Faculty is expected to utilize state-of-the-art communications technology when appropriate.

3. **Quality of Program and organizational support**
   Faculty is expected to participate in disciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary programming efforts as appropriate to adequately address the priority issues of the clientele. Financial and material support should be sought through grants and contracts or innovative linkages with other agencies, industry or organizational groups. The evaluation should include both proposals or solicitations submitted, and these awarded.

4. **Cooperative and coordinative efforts**
   Each faculty member is expected to establish and enhance mutual support among colleagues within and across disciplines at the agency, college and university level. Timely and effective coordination, cooperation, and scheduling of activities with District Extension Directors, county staff, and other agencies/organizations are required for programs and responsibilities with mutual audiences.

5. **Scholarly contributions and professionalism**
   The faculty member should show evidence of contributions to professional and total Extension programs. The development of creative educational programs and/or materials which are widely accepted and used are examples of professional contributions.
adaptive research and comprehensive and intensive program evaluations are important components for Extension faculty. Publication of creative and scholarly work is expected.

For purposes of promotion, all of these indicators of performance should be reviewed by the departmental or the College and Texas AgriLife Peer Review Committees. Specific materials to be included are long- and short-term goal statements, program evaluations, Extension plans of work, and the faculty achievement report. Additional supporting materials provided in the faculty achievement report such as public and institutional service, research, teaching, and other non-extension activities shall be included in the overall assessment. A qualitative assessment performed by a peer committee evaluation at the department and Agriculture Program level will be conducted.

Educational materials which have been developed for Extension bulletins, fact sheets, production videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, and computer software programs will also be included in the evaluation. Similarly, written and visual support materials (including slide sets, video tapes and film) used in educational settings such as field days, seminars, symposia, and interactive video productions should also be evaluated. The overall evaluation should not be limited to traditional materials, but should consider the quality and originality of thought and the integration of educational concepts that will lead to increased awareness and appropriate change and/or adoption. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (e.g., interactive video, satellite broadcasting), and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches in the base program areas of the discipline.

The development and publication of comprehensive handbooks, training manuals, and textbooks may also be considered in evaluating the faculty member’s contributions to the entire educational program. In such cases, the committee should assess the quality of the work in addition to determining the value and acceptance of the work in other states and by other universities. Educational grants for the development of new and creative Extension programs may also be considered as instances in which prepared materials extend beyond the limits of the university or state.

Other evidence of recognition by colleagues, Extension clientele and other professionals include the follow examples:

1. Receipt of awards for outstanding programs or service.
2. Peer recognition by faculty within the discipline, particularly those that have direct evaluative experience, and have attended Extension programs or presentations before professional groups or societies.
3. Comprehensive program evaluations that attest to program effectiveness (awareness, adoption, etc.) through pre- and post-survey evaluations and/or other evidence of productive change or mastery by clientele.
4. Evidence that the faculty member has been a catalyst for the initiation of new programming approaches within and/or across disciplines to include developing interactions with new faculty, scientists and clientele.
5. Contributions to professional societies.
6. Leadership in networking with other faculties, research scientists, societies and professional groups leading to integrated interdisciplinary programming.
7. Solicited evaluations by outside faculty within the discipline of national reputation as to assessment of creative professional accomplishments.