DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY
FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

The following recommendations involve the structure of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee and the process of conducting reviews for promotion and tenure in the Department of Entomology, Texas A&M University. These departmental policies and procedures are designed to supplement those presently in effect at Texas A&M University (as issued from the office of the Dean of Faculties), Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension.

In this document, “faculty member” is defined as any person holding the title of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor - TAMU refers to faculty of the Department of Entomology with tenure-track appointments at Texas A&M University. The designations Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension refer to faculty who do not hold tenure-track positions.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

(1) Review faculty administratively assigned to the Department of Entomology and provide recommendations to the Head of the Department on promotion and tenure.

(2) Review Assistant and Associate Professors and provide recommendations to the Head of the Department on their progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

(3) Review Professors every five years following their last peer review, and provide evaluations to the Department Head on whether their activities in teaching, research, service, and overall performance are unsatisfactory or satisfactory.

COMPOSITION, ORGANIZATION, AND VOTING PRIVILEGES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The membership of the P&T Committee shall consist of faculty members with the rank of Professor in the Department of Entomology. Three P&T subcommittees shall function to evaluate faculty having different responsibilities and administrative assignments within the Department of Entomology. These subcommittees are as follows:

(1) TAMU SUBCOMMITTEE: Five TAMU members, tenured Professors in the Department of Entomology.

(2) Texas A&M AgriLife Research SUBCOMMITTEE: Five members with AgriLife Research focus, or if there are too few faculty with AgriLife Research Appointments, AgriLife Extension or tenured faculty may be appointed.
(3) **AgriLife A&M Extension SUBCOMMITTEE:** Five members with Extension appointments, or if there are too few faculty with AgriLife Extension Appointments, AgriLife Research or TAMU tenured faculty may be appointed.

**APPOINTMENT OF PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

All P&T Committee members shall be elected by vote of the faculty. Faculty of all ranks may vote, but only for those units in which they hold appointments. The Head of the Department shall select subcommittee members, and appoint the Chair of the P&T Committee and Chair of the three subcommittees from the roster of elected members. The P&T Committee Chair shall be one of the members of the TAMU Subcommittee and will have all the duties and responsibilities of the other members of that subcommittee.

**TERM OF APPOINTMENT**

The term of appointment for each member shall be for three years. The initial appointees shall serve staggered terms. The terms for Chair of P&T Committee and Chair of P&T subcommittees shall be for one year. All appointments are eligible for re-election and re-appointment for another term.

**PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure shall follow these procedures.

(1) Only tenure-track faculty will be assigned to the TAMU subcommittee, but can serve on the Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Texas A&M AgriLife Extension subcommittee if needed. AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension candidates will be assigned to the appropriate subcommittee (Research or Extension), based on their primary appointment.

(2) The Chair of the P&T subcommittee assigned to conduct the review shall contact the candidate to advise and to assist in obtaining and developing documents necessary for the review process.

a) Narrative Statement (3 page Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service)

b) Curriculum Vitae (paginated, signed, and attested)

c) Reprints of at least 2-3 most significant publications during the review period.

d) Names, Addresses, and Qualifications of Six Outside Reviewers

e) Note: A Teaching Portfolio (containing a summary package of each course taught with student evaluations) is now optional. The information should be condensed, highlighted, and included in the curriculum vitae and narrative statement submitted with the dossier.
(3) Candidates with appointments in an interdisciplinary faculty or center shall be reviewed and evaluated by the appropriate committee of that unit. The additional review should be requested by the Chair of the P&T subcommittee; this review should be sought early enough to allow the recommendation to become part of the dossier considered by the P&T Committee.

(4) The Chair of the appointed subcommittee shall solicit at least six letters of support; three should be from a list provided by the candidate and three from a list assembled from recommendations of the P&T Committee and the Head of the Department or Resident/Center Director, as appropriate. Refer to College guidelines as to institution, conflict of interest and other details when identifying external reviewers.

(5) All candidates being considered for promotion or promotion and tenure shall present a seminar normally in late summer just before the beginning of the fall semester when dossiers are due to the college P&T committee. The seminar should describe their scholarly accomplishments since last promotion or hire. The seminar should be early enough to allow sufficient input from the faculty as a whole to the P&T Committee prior to the P&T Committee vote. The Chair of the P&T Committee is responsible for setting the seminar schedule and coordinating the seminars with calendars of the Department Head and relevant subcommittee chairs.

(6) After the candidate’s dossier has been assembled, including outside letters of support, and the seminar presented, there will be an opportunity for input to the P&T Committee from eligible faculty wishing to do so. Details are provided in the appendix.

(7) The appropriate P&T subcommittee (TAMU, AgriLife Research or AgriLife Extension) will then meet and consider the qualifications of the candidate based on the assembled documents and faculty input. An anonymous vote by the members of the subcommittee will be taken on the qualifications of the candidate.

(8) Upon completion of the process, the subcommittee Chair shall write a summary of the evaluation of the candidate, including a tally of positive, negative and abstention votes and any recused members, and submit it as a recommendation to the Chair of the P&T Committee, who will forward the evaluation to the Head of the Department.

(9) The summary evaluation of the P&T vote distribution on each candidate being reviewed shall be sent forward to the next administrative level by the Head of the Department as part of the departmental recommendation.

INTERNAL REVIEWS OF ENTOMOLOGY FACULTY

All faculty, both tenure and non-tenure track will periodically be reviewed by
the appropriate subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty of
the rank of Assistant Professor will be reviewed annually, including the year of their
mandatory Third Year Review (see below). Faculty with the rank of Associate
Professor will normally be reviewed biennially (every other year) and faculty with
the rank of Professor will normally be reviewed every five years, as required by
University policy. However, any Associate Professor or Professor may request a
review in any year. Such a request should be made in writing (or email) to the
Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The following documents will be made available to the P&T Committee for
internal reviews:

(1) Position Description
(2) Curriculum Vitae (paginated, signed, and attested)
(3) Summary of Teaching Evaluation Forms (TAMU only, to be compiled by
   the teaching administrative staff)
(4) Copies or electronic reprints of selected publications from prior year

Members of the appropriate P&T Subcommittee will report the individual
results of their evaluations to the Chair of the Subcommittee using standard
Department of Entomology review forms (see Appendix). The chair of the P&T
subcommittee will compile the reviews and will provide the Chair of the P&T
Committee with a written summary of evaluation of the person being reviewed
including a tally of all votes, which will be forwarded to the Head of the Department.
The Department Head and/or Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will
communicate the results of the review to the faculty member, including at a
minimum a copy of the Summary Evaluation of the Subcommittee, and will meet
with the faculty member to discuss the review if requested to do so. The Faculty
as a whole shall not review documents or vote in this annual review process.

THIRD YEAR REVIEW OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

Third year review of tenure track Assistant Professors will follow the same
procedures as outlined above for evaluation for promotion and tenure, except that
letters of evaluation are not requested. The purpose for this review is to evaluate
satisfactory progress of the faculty member toward promotion to Associate
Professor. The third year review substitutes for the annual review of Assistant
Professors.

FACULTY INPUT

Faculty holding the same rank or higher for which the faculty member is
being considered are eligible to provide input to the appropriate P&T subcommittee
on faculty being considered for promotion. By university guidelines, only tenured
faculty may vote or provide input on tenure decisions.
PRE-EMPLOYMENT EVALUATION

The P&T Committee shall be involved in the decision-making process when someone is being considered for a tenure-track position of Associate Professor or Professor for tenure on arrival or after a specified period of employment. The TAMU Subcommittee of the P&T Committee shall review the credentials of the candidate, consisting minimally of a CV reporting all relevant research, teaching, and service activities that the candidate wishes to have considered by the P&T Committee. The TAMU Subcommittee will provide a written evaluation and vote to the Chair of the P&T Committee, who will then forward the recommendation to the Head of the Department and/or Selection Committee on the person’s potential for satisfying tenure requirements.

Approved by the Department of Entomology, November 19, 1991.
Revised April 22, 2003 Revised June 17, 2004
Revised July 9, 2007
Revised February 8, 2008
Revised December 9, 2009 (approved at Faculty Meeting)
Revised December 10, 2015, for approval at Faculty meeting in February 2016
Approved by the Faculty, February 11, 2016
APPENDIX

Procedural Matters

1. Letters from Outside Evaluators

Considerable importance is affixed to letters of outside (external) evaluators; therefore, the faculty member, P&T committee, Head of Department, and Resident/Center Director are advised to put considerable thought into whom they choose to recommend to serve in this capacity. So as to ensure that the letters written by external evaluators on behalf of a given faculty member will have the maximum positive impact possible on the outcome of a faculty member’s review and evaluation, it is recommended that the external evaluators meet the following minimum qualifications: a) Employed by an institution, agency, or other entity completely outside the Texas A&M University System; b) Holds the rank or has the professional status equal, comparable to, or higher than the rank and/or status for which the faculty member being evaluated is being considered in terms of promotion or the awarding of tenure, and; c) Is nationally recognized as a scholar, major contributor and/or leader in the particular areas of expertise and discipline(s) in which the faculty member being evaluated is involved and, in this regard, has an in-depth knowledge about the faculty member’s area of research, extension, and/or teaching expertise. As soon as a given faculty member indicates his/her desire to be considered for promotion, the chair of the appropriate subcommittee should solicit names from subcommittee members and forward at least three names to the chair of the P&T committee, who should then meet with the Head of the Department to discuss the list of potential evaluators. It is essential that this be done in a timely fashion, preferably within a week after notification is received by the Department Head. The candidate and others identifying external reviewers should consult the college guidelines on external reviewers. For example, letters from international colleagues are currently discouraged and if included they should be an extra letter, not one of the mandatory 3 letters of evaluation. Such interpretations change from time to time, thus it is imperative that the candidates, P&T chair and the Department Head stay abreast of such changes.

2. Split Appointments

For candidates with split appointments (e.g., Research and Extension), the relevant subcommittee should be reflective of the split appointment, as far as possible. A standing committee, comprised of the chair of each subcommittee, or a delegate appointed by the chair, will assume responsibility for adjusting the subcommittee structure as needed (from within the committee membership) once a candidate with a split appointment has indicated their intention to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. If the split appointment is across departments, this will also need to be reflected in the revised subcommittee structure.
3. Faculty Input

While the P&T committee is the Department’s designated voting body for promotion and tenure, our guidelines provide for input from other faculty of appropriate rank. Input will be provided as follows: a P&T committee meeting will be held following the seminar given by the faculty member being considered for third year review or promotion. This meeting will be open to all faculty of rank to provide their verbal input. The subcommittee will solicit written input from faculty prior to or following this meeting.

4. The evaluation process

Following input from faculty of appropriate rank immediately following the seminar, each member of the relevant subcommittee of the Department of Entomology’s P&T Committee will be required to prepare summary statements on each faculty member being evaluated by that subcommittee. These statements (covering the areas indicated on the evaluation forms for each agency, attached at the end of this appendix) should summarize the evaluator’s assessment of the faculty member’s quality of performance in each category and should support the evaluator’s final decision as to whether the faculty member being evaluated should be recommended for Tenure and/or Promotion or not. The quality performance statements and final recommendation are to be submitted to the chairperson of the appropriate P&T subcommittee using the form attached to these guidelines. One form needs to be filled out on each faculty member being evaluated as to his or her state of readiness for being recommended for Tenure and/or Promotion.

Upon receipt of all the subcommittee members’ completed evaluation forms for a particular faculty member, the chair of the appropriate subcommittee will then prepare a summary evaluation report for the faculty member being evaluated. This report will summarize the performance statements prepared by each subcommittee member. The subcommittee chair will also tally the votes by the individual subcommittee members as to whether the faculty member is ready to be recommended for promotion. The subcommittee chair is then to submit the summary evaluation report on each faculty member back to the other members of his or her subcommittee for their review and approval. After receiving the approval of the subcommittee members, the chair of the P&T Committee and members of the appropriate Subcommittee should go over the results of the evaluation with the faculty member. The subcommittee chair is then to submit the final approved summary evaluation report for a given faculty member to the chair of the P&T Committee along with the evaluations submitted by the individual subcommittee members.

The chair of the P&T Committee will submit the final summary evaluation report to the Department Head (for TAMU appointments), the Department
Head will provide his/her independent evaluation and both the subcommittee report and the department head letter of evaluation are submitted to the Dean or and Resident/Center Director (for AgriLife Research appointments). For AgriLife Extension appointments the subcommittee summary evaluation will accompany a letter of evaluation that is co-signed by the Associate Department Head for Extension Entomology and the Department Head that goes forward to the Dean and Director of AgriLife Extension. In the case where the Department Head and Associate Department Head are not in agreement, both can submit independent letters of evaluation to the Dean and Director.

5. To assist the P&T Committee, the following definitions and examples of criteria that may be employed are provided as guidelines (see guidelines from College and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost):

For all faculty, we expect evidence of national recognition for Tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. Similarly, for promotion to Professor, we expect evidence of an international reputation.

TEACHING (TAMU SUBCOMMITTEE)

Indicators of Excellence:
1. Selection for a University, College, or Professional Society outstanding teacher award;
2. Evidence of courses being taught at a rigorous and challenging level as ascertained by student and peer review, class syllabi, other teaching materials, etc.;
3. Publication of widely-adopted or acclaimed instructional materials;
4. Outstanding teaching performance evaluations;
5. Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials;
6. Chair of doctoral graduate student research advisory committees;
7. Publications in refereed education journals.

Indicators of Effectiveness:
1. Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses;
2. Member of graduate student advisory committees;
3. Evidence of high quality in-class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments;
4. Coordination of multi-section courses;
5. Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor;
6. Significant self-development (improvement) activities promoting enhanced teaching effectiveness.

RESEARCH (TAMU and AgriLife Research)

Note that the evaluator must provide support for any assertions he or she makes in regard to the quality of the faculty member’s research and/or publications.
Indicators of Excellence:

1. Publications in leading refereed journals;
2. Receipt of major fellowship or other awards in recognition of research accomplishments;
3. Frequency of a faculty member’s publications being cited by others in their articles (impact factors of journals are becoming increasingly important);
4. Receipt of significant external funding for research (when used as a quality indicator, the extent of peer review in the competitive process should be noted);
5. Publication of scholarly books;
6. Receipt of nationally-approved patents;
7. Member of a review panel for a national research organization;
8. Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings;
9. Editor or member of the editorial board of a major journal;

Indicators of Effectiveness:

1. Publications in refereed journals;
2. Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations;
3. Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
4. Presentation of papers at national meetings of appropriate disciplines (and/or societies);
5. Publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
6. Publications in non-refereed, but widely-recognized journals or magazines;
7. Significant self-development activities, such as Faculty Development Leave or the participation in other activities that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.

Additions for Texas AgriLife Research:

1. Publication of research in journals targeted for industry and user groups;
2. Evidence of a well-planned and developed program of research that has contributed to the advancement of knowledge or has produced a tangible benefit to society (e.g. an insect-resistant crop variety, software utilization);
3. Evidence of sustained accomplishment of research project objectives;
4. Evidence of an effective relationship with research-user groups;
5. Inclusion of graduate students in research efforts and serving as co-advisor, co-chair and/or member of their advisory committees;
6. Participation in interdisciplinary research activities.

SERVICE

Indicators of Excellence:

1. Officer in a national professional organization;
2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
3. Program chair or similar chair at a national meeting;
TAMU only:
1. Administrative leadership role at TAMU;
2. Officer in Faculty Senate;
3. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee;

Indicators of Effectiveness:
1. Committee chair of national professional organization;
2. Officer in regional or state professional organization;
3. Program or local arrangements committee chair for regional or state professional organization meeting;
4. Service on University, college, departmental, and/or TAES unit committee and task forces;
5. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies;
6. Administrative roles within the department/TAES unit;
7. Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
TAMU only:
1. Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate;
2. Advisor to student organizations;

AgriLife Extension only:

Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Educational program development, implementation and assessment. One of the core programming responsibilities of an extension specialist is to support statewide, district and county programs. By the end of the fifth year, the faculty member should have a record of use by other specialists and by county extension agents in support of field days, tours, and educational programs. Extension specialists should also demonstrate the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the local level. By the fifth year they should have developed effective programming at the district or regional levels, at a minimum and served as a statewide resource within the extension entomology project group. Examples of broader programming would include, but are not limited to, symposia, seminars, web-based programming, or workshops.

A second core responsibility of an extension specialist assigned to a district is agent training. Although a specialist's face to face time with agents is often limited, by the fifth year a faculty member should show a record of providing information and training to agents in their assigned districts through formal training meetings and webinars, newsletters, email correspondence, and collaborations via demonstration efforts or other vehicles.

A third core responsibility is documenting impact of the faculty member’s extension program. The impact of at least one major program area should be formally evaluated to show adoption by clientele of new technology or change in behavior resulting from the program efforts. The evaluation should define the problem or educational need; document its importance to clientele, detail the educational and applied research programs and/or demonstrations conducted to address the issue, and formally document the outcome and impact, including economic impact when appropriate.

2. Program Support. The acquisition of external support is an integral part of scholarly contributions. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts from various organizations (commodity, state agencies, regional and federal agencies, foundations, industry, etc.) along with donation of materials and volunteerism. A faculty member’s job in the first few years is to create the personal relationships with clientele, county extension agents, extension program specialists, IPM specialists, industry representatives, extension specialists in entomology and other discipline areas, and relevant colleagues in the local area, state, region, or nation, so that an effective extension program can be developed.
By the end of the fifth year, a record of obtaining external support and collaboration should be documented. Partnering or networking with other agencies, universities, campus-based faculty, and agribusinesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an extension specialist in terms of program support.

3. Scholarship through Publication. The expectation for extension specialists is that the record will show multiple extension publications or similar contributions written or revised each year. Examples of extension publications include numbered bulletins, fact sheets, videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, web pages, newsletters, blogs, other relevant social media, and computer software programs. It is expected that applied research will be submitted for publication in appropriate peer reviewed journals. A goal of publishing as senior or junior authors multiple refereed journal articles by the end of the fifth year is a good benchmark, but this level of output will not be the only criterion used to measure for scholarly writing. As such, other writing which may not be anonymously reviewed, but is peer-edited or reviewed should be included. Examples include symposium proceedings, published abstracts (e.g., Arthropod Management Tests), and writing for mass media (e.g., authored or co-authored articles in newspapers, magazines, trade publications, newsletters, web sites, blogs or other relevant social media). All scholarly contributions will be taken into consideration.

An extension specialist applying for promotion to associate professor should have at least a local and state-wide recognition for their extension and academic excellence and show evidence of progress toward a regional (multi-state) reputation. An extension specialist should have demonstrated considerable diversity of topic area expertise; however, there should be some evidence in the publication record that a coherent extension program has been developed by the end of the fifth year as the state-wide expert in the faculty member’s major area of expertise.

4. Professional Service. Such service refers to accepting a variety of opportunities to serve a larger organization such as a department, agency, professional society, and other such venues with the concept of meeting the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of professional service would include, but are not limited to: (a) service on department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving on external agency boards, grant review panels, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and (e) serving as adjunct faculty for other universities.

5. Reputation/Professionalism. A local to statewide reputation with evidence of progress toward building a regional (multi-state) reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to associate professor. This is likely to be exemplified by serving in leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or
teach at professional meetings or conferences, organizing and participating in symposia, guest lecturing and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

Faculty are expected to maintain professional integrity and responsibility. Performance in this area is exemplified by showing respect for colleagues and this respect being reciprocated; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, and university by serving on committees and task forces.

Benchmark Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

1. Educational program development, implementation and assessment. An extension specialist applying for promotion to professor should exhibit a proven track record supporting state, district and county programs. This support may be in the form of educational programs (field days, tours, workshops, seminars, etc.) as well as support of their programming planning activities. Extension specialists should also exhibit the capability of expanding their program efforts beyond the local level. When applying for promotion to professor, an extension specialist should have developed effective programming at the district, regional, and state level with evidence of an emerging national or international reputation. Examples of broader programming would include, but not be limited to, named programs, organizing or being invited to participate in symposia, seminars, web based programming, or workshops.

A second core teaching responsibility of extension specialists assigned to a district is ongoing agent training. Although a specialist’s face to face time with agents can be limited, a faculty member applying for the rank of professor should show a proven record of providing information and training to agents at the state, district, regional and county level through formal training meetings and webinars, newsletters, email correspondence and collaborations via demonstration efforts or other vehicles.

A third core responsibility is documenting impact of the faculty member’s extension programs since last promotion. The impact of at least one major program area should be formally evaluated to show adoption of new technology by clientele or a change in behavior resulting from the program efforts. The evaluation should define the problem or educational need; document its importance to clientele, detail the educational and applied research programs and/or demonstrations conducted to address the issue, and formally document the outcome and impact, including economic impact when appropriate.

2. Program Support. The acquisition of external support is an integral part of an individual's scholarly contribution. External support can be in the form of grants or contracts to various organizations (commodity, state agencies, regional and federal agencies, foundations, industry etc.) along with donation of materials and
volunteerism. A faculty member's expectations are to create the personal relationships with clientele, county agents, extension program specialists, IPM specialists and industry representatives, extension specialists in entomology and other discipline areas, and relevant colleagues in the region or nation, so that an effective extension program can be developed.

It is recognized that external funding may be more accessible to those working in some subject matter fields as compared to others, thus discrete guidelines are not defined. Partnering or networking with other agencies, universities, campus-based faculty, and agribusinesses is indispensable to an extension specialist when leveraging available resources to produce broad, effective extension programs. Partnering or networking should be considered when evaluating an extension specialist in terms of program support.

3. Scholarship through Publication. Extension specialists applying for promotion to professor should have a significant body of scholarly extension-focused publications. Extension publications are defined, but not limited to, numbered bulletins, fact sheets, videos, instructional manuals, handbooks, newsletters, web sites, blogs and other relevant social media and computer software programs. Similarly, applied research reports and books or book chapters in edited volumes should be considered as peer reviewed or peer edited contributions.

There should be a consistent record of multiple refereed journal articles since last promotion with some of those articles having extension specialist or their graduate students as senior author. Additional scholarly writing is expected, such as symposium proceedings, published abstracts (e.g., Arthropod Management Tests), and articles for mass media, e.g., authored or co-authored articles in newspapers, magazines, trade publications, newsletters, web sites, blogs, and other relevant social media. All scholarly contributions will be taken into consideration.

An extension specialist applying for promotion to professor should be able to demonstrate an emerging national or international reputation in Extension programming and academic excellence, and have a documented, coherent long-term successes in extension programming, recognizing that specialists will be required to address a diversity of topics. Additional attention should be given to the development of techniques or new modes of educational delivery (i.e. interactive video or web design, blogs or relevant social media) and the revision and/or development of new educational approaches, new technology or technology transfer in the base program areas.

4. Professional Service. Such service refers to accepting a variety of opportunities to serve a larger organization such as a department, agency, professional society and other such venue with the concept of meeting the needs of the university and of external constituents. Examples of professional service would include, but are not be limited to: (a) service on department, agency, and university committees, (b) leadership positions in professional societies, (c) serving
on external agency boards, grant review panels, taskforces, and committees, (d) serving on graduate student committees, and, (e) serving in adjunct positions for other universities. It does not include service to the community as a citizen, rather than a professional role. For example, personal (as opposed to professional) involvement with political, commercial, religious, non-profit, and other similar institutions is not relevant to the evaluation of service performance.

5. Reputation/Professionalism. A strong local, district, regional and statewide reputation, with evidence of an emerging national or international reputation in an area of expertise is expected by faculty applying for promotion to professor. This is likely to be exemplified by taking on leadership roles in professional associations, appointments or election to state and federal committees, invitations to speak or teach at professional meetings or conferences, organizing and participating in symposia, and by awards or recognition from external groups or agencies.

Faculty are also expected to maintain professional integrity and responsibility. Performance in this area is exemplified by showing respect for colleagues and this respect being reciprocated; professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment; adhering to expected standards of academic integrity; and being a "good citizen" of the department, college, and university by serving on committees and task forces.

AgriLife Extension “Guidelines for Promotion” were approved by a vote of the faculty in the Department of Entomology on August 1, 2012.

References/Resources:

1. Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, Tenure and Promotion Packages, Submission Guidelines (updated annually)
2. Guidelines for Midterm Performance Review College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
3. General Promotion Calendar (issued annually)
4. Suggested Curriculum Vitae Outline (from COALS)
5. Suggestions to Improve P&T Dossiers College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Department of Entomology
Promotion Evaluation Form – 2015

Committee Evaluation (“Blue FORM”)
Subcommittee Chair will forward to the Chair of Promotion and Tenure Committee

Name of Candidate:          Date:

Candidate’s job expectation:

_____ Teaching (TAMU) ______ (tenure track, yes or no?)

_____ AgriLife Research

_____ AgriLife Extension

_____ Service

Fiscal Appointment:

NOTE: Guidelines for criteria to be used in evaluating faculty with TAMU, AgriLife Research appointments can be found at http://agrilifeas.tamu.edu/documents/129999a003.pdf.

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty promotion guidelines are currently being revised by the agency so the department drafted a document that has been placed in the appendix of the DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. These guidelines should be consulted for specific information on appropriate indicators of performance.

On the basis of this member’s professional performance as summarized in the Quality of Performance Statements given below, he/she SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR PROMOTION:

YES _____

NO _____

Summary recommendation, including tally of subcommittee votes, if applicable:
A. Statement on Quality of Teaching (TAMU) Program (as appropriate):

1. Courses taught and approximate enrollment patterns.

2. Quality of teaching program, including, but not limited to, students evaluations, evidence of innovative teaching methods, development of new courses or course materials, awards or other recognition, external grant support for teaching activities, scholarly accomplishments or publications associated with the teaching program.

3. Training or mentoring of undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs.

B. Statement on Quality of AgriLife Research Program (as appropriate):

1. Scholarly contributions
   a. Scientific publications
   b. Other scholarly contributions

2. Impact of the research

3. Financial support (grants and contracts)

4. Awards and other recognition

C. Statement on Quality of AgriLife Extension Program (as appropriate):

1. Program development activities and planning (demonstrates ability to plan, design and implement an effective extension program)

2. Impact of extension program (achieves measurable impacts on client behavior, promoting positive economic, environmental, or other changes)
3. Effective and innovative teaching methods (demonstrates effective teaching skills and ability to make innovative use of different techniques and technologies for teaching and disseminating information to clientele)

4. Organizational support (provides support for extension and university system programs, e.g., via grantsmanship, support of county programs, agent training, service on committees, etc.)

5. Scholarly contributions and professionalism (demonstrates a record of quality research and scholarly publications, professional society participation and professional improvement)

D. Statement on Service (pertains to all appointments):

E. Activities supporting interagency and multidisciplinary collaboration:

F. Activities enhancing diversity and international climate and experiences:

G. Other activities

H. Evaluations from outside reviewers (if appropriate and if not covered above):

I. Other comments
Department of Entomology

Promotion Evaluation Form – 2015

Committee Evaluation (“PINK FORM”)
Subcommittee Chair will forward to the Chair of Promotion and Tenure Committee

Name of Candidate:       Date:

Candidate’s job expectation:

_____  Teaching (TAMU)   ______ (tenure track, yes or no?)

_____  AgriLife Research

_____  AgriLife Extension

_____  Service

Fiscal Appointment:

NOTE: Guidelines for criteria to be used in evaluating faculty with TAMU, AgriLife Research appointments can be found at http://agrilifeas.tamu.edu/documents/129999a003.pdf.

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension faculty promotion guidelines are currently being revised by the agency so the department drafted a document that has been placed in the appendix of the DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY FACULTY EVALUATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. These guidelines should be consulted for specific information on appropriate indicators of performance.

On the basis of this member’s professional performance as summarized in the Quality of Performance Statements given below, he/she SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR PROMOTION:

YES _____

NO _____

Summary recommendation, including tally of subcommittee votes, if applicable:
A. Statement on Quality of Teaching (TAMU) Program (as appropriate):

1. Courses taught and approximate enrollment patterns.

2. Quality of teaching program, including, but not limited to, students evaluations, evidence of innovative teaching methods, development of new courses or course materials, awards or other recognition, external grant support for teaching activities, scholarly accomplishments or publications associated with the teaching program.

3. Training or mentoring of undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs.

B. Statement on Quality of AgriLife Research Program (as appropriate):

1. Scholarly contributions
   
   a. Scientific publications
   
   b. Other scholarly contributions

2. Impact of the research

3. Financial support (grants and contracts)

4. Training of undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs.

5. Awards and other recognition
C. Statement on Quality of AgriLife Extension Program (as appropriate):

1. Program development activities and planning (demonstrates ability to plan, design and implement an effective extension program)

2. Impact of extension program (achieves measurable impacts on client behavior, promoting positive economic, environmental, or other changes)

3. Effective and innovative teaching methods (demonstrates effective teaching skills and ability to make innovative use of different techniques and technologies for teaching and disseminating information to clientele)

4. Organizational support (provides support for extension and university system programs, e.g., via grantsmanship, support of county programs, agent training, service on committees, etc.)

5. Scholarly contributions and professionalism (demonstrates a record of quality research and scholarly publications, professional society participation and professional improvement)

D. Statement on Service (pertains to all appointments):

E. Activities supporting interagency and multidisciplinary collaboration:

F. Activities enhancing diversity and international climate and experiences:

G. Other activities

H. Evaluations from outside reviewers (if appropriate and if not covered above):

I. Other comments