



**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences  
Texas A&M University**

**PROMOTION AND TENURE  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Revised: August 2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS**

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	Guidelines for Departmental Recommendations on Promotion and Tenure	
A.	Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	1
B.	Evaluation Process / Voting Procedures	
1.	Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	2
2.	Departmental Faculty.....	2
3.	Recommendation of the Department Head.....	2
III.	Faculty Promotion / Tenure Recommendation Package	
A.	Signed Affidavit.....	3
B.	Faculty Achievement Report / Curriculum Vitae .....	3
C.	Summary of Annual Faculty Evaluations .....	4
D.	Outside Letters of Evaluation .....	4
IV.	College Review by Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee.....	5
V.	College Interdisciplinary Committee (optional) .....	6
VI.	Recommendation / Approval Process of Faculty Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Package .....	6

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATION OF MERIT REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

I.	The Teaching Evaluation .....	8
II.	The Service Evaluation .....	10
III.	The Research Evaluation .....	11
IV.	The Extension Evaluation.....	14

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN  
INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH  
TENURE-GRANTING DEPARTMENT**

I. Criteria . . . . .17

II. Guidelines for Recommendations on Promotion and Tenure

A. Composition of Interdisciplinary Promotion and Tenure Committee .....17

B. Evaluation Process

    1. Traditional faculty.....17

    2. Nontraditional faculty .....18

# PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

## College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

### Texas A&M University

August 2009

(Previous Revisions: July 2008, June 2002, August 1998, original October, 1991)

## I. Introduction

Academic faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (COALS) at Texas A&M University perform a variety of unique activities in the triad of academic functions--teaching, research and extension. Collectively, these activities form the basis of the agricultural component of a land-grant university system.

The following guidelines governing promotion and tenure recommendations will be utilized in the consideration of promotion and/or tenure appointments for faculty with academic appointments within the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. These principles are derived from the Texas A&M Tenure and Promotion Packages: Submission Guidelines as published by the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

## II. Guidelines for Departmental Recommendations on Promotion and Tenure

### A. Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

Each department will be responsible for determining the nature of its Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each department will establish written guidelines to govern departmental tenure and promotion recommendations, and a copy of this information will be available for distribution to the faculty. Promotion and Tenure Committees may be constituted in several different manners as shown below with each committee electing its chair:

- 1) It may be comprised of tenured representatives elected entirely by the faculty (faculty members may consider promotion and tenure issues to their professorial rank only);
- 2) It may be comprised of tenured representatives of the department including those individuals who are elected and those who are appointed by the Head of the Department;
- 3) It may be comprised of all tenured faculty for consideration of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and all tenured Full Professors for promotion and tenure to all ranks, or
- 4) It may be comprised of all tenured Full Professors for consideration of promotion and tenure to all ranks.

B. Evaluation Process / Voting Procedures

1) Promotion and Tenure Committee

Following a confidential committee-wide discussion, the departmental ..... the vote and the overall perspective of the Committee relative to each faculty member under consideration should be explained by the Chair of the Committee in a memorandum to the Head of the Department. This document will form a part of the faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package that will be forwarded through the Dean's Office to the University administration.

2) Departmental Faculty

The department may choose to have the entire tenured departmental faculty provide an additional anonymous vote for the record, as appropriate for rank, on each faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package. That vote should be taken following an oral or written presentation from the promotion and Tenure Committee. The results of this vote will become a part of the faculty member's promotion/tenure recommendation package that will be forwarded through the Dean's Office to the University administration.

3) Recommendation of the Department Head

The head of the department shall make a clear recommendation on each promotion and tenure decision. The department head should summarize the achievements of the faculty member under consideration and explain the perspective of the department-at-large in a memorandum to the Dean. This memorandum should be limited to three pages in length and should include the following information:

- a. A summary of the strong and weak points of each faculty member under consideration for promotion/tenure.
- b. A concise statement of the candidate's position description and terms of appointment (% appointment in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Texas AgriLife Research, Texas AgriLife Extension Service, and other organizations) as well as an explanation of any changes in assignment during the faculty member's tenure.
- c. An evaluation of the responsibilities and expectations of joint appointments between the College and the agricultural agencies. (Additional information should be included in the faculty member's achievement report/curriculum vitae and supporting material.)

### III. Faculty Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Package

Each faculty member's promotion/tenure recommendation package should be updated immediately prior to submission to the Dean's Office. Promotion/tenure recommendation packages should include the following information:

A. Signed Statement:

The candidate must include a signed statement with the CV acknowledging that the CV being submitted is the most current and is correct as of the date of the signature. (*Note: This is different from the Verification of Contents statement on the Dossier Cover Sheet.*)

B. Faculty Achievement Report / Curriculum Vitae

1. The faculty achievement report/curriculum vitae should represent the faculty member's entire academic career and contain a precise narrative of accomplishments. Publications and other creative contributions should be differentiated into those which are peer-reviewed and those which are not. Publications should list inclusive pages and differentiate abstracts and Proceedings reports from more significant publications. If the faculty member is the principal investigator of the paper and not listed as the first author, then this should be indicated by an asterisk. (In many disciplines, the senior investigator is listed last and postdoctoral or graduate student authors first.) All activities should be listed from the oldest to the most recent in order to permit easier evaluation by reviewers.
2. The teaching, research and extension profiles and relative accomplishments of the faculty member should be clearly displayed. The extent and quality of formal teaching efforts should be defined with a quantitative assessment of student evaluations, qualitative evaluation relative to others in the department (to be completed by department), and identification of any unique aspects of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments. In addition, the faculty member's involvement in non-classroom educational activities, such as chairing graduate student research programs or directing undergraduate honors fellows, should be discussed relative to the matriculation, progress and placement of those students. Involvement in other educational activities, such as advising, curricular development, co-op direction, leadership of special summer programs or other such activities, should be clearly identified.
3. The involvement of the faculty member in international and/or interdisciplinary activities should be clearly defined. The professional significance of international activities of the faculty member should be detailed in a separate section and the importance of these activities explained. The extent of a faculty member's involvement in graduate faculties, research programs, institutes and centers should be clearly described, and the significance of that involvement should be explained.

4. Other extraordinary accomplishments involving service, educational materials development, or faculty development activities should be clearly represented with an indication of the importance of those involvements.

C. Summary of Annual Faculty Evaluations

Annual faculty evaluations by the department head (and directors of centers, if appropriate) are required to provide an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his/her departmental leadership. (This information is not routinely forwarded with the faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package; however, it may be requested during the review process.) If annual evaluations are conducted annually in an honest, judicious manner, then a final promotion/tenure recommendation should be consistent with the cumulative annual evaluations.

Although the department head is not required to consult members of the department's faculty (senior faculty) in conducting annual faculty evaluations, this is a good practice. A faculty committee is required, however, to participate in the mid-term evaluations of faculty, whether they are tenured, tenure track, or non-tenure track, who are expected to be considered for promotion.

D. Outside Letters of Evaluation

In addition and to enhance the effectiveness of the candidate's dossier, the dossier must contain at least three letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and especially knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise. A short biographical statement on the credentials of each external reviewer should be provided in the promotion/tenure package to facilitate an assessment of their credentials.

These external letters are of considerable importance, and the following cautions should be observed. First, the candidate should be asked to provide a slate of names who could serve as reviewers. The candidate may submit a list of names of individuals who they wish not to be contacted. The candidate may also submit a list of names of individuals who they wish not to be contacted. The Department Head and departmental peer review committee should also provide recommendations on reviewers. The Department Head should select at least three individuals from these recommendations who could provide a fair and objective analysis of the candidate. Letters from clientele or former students are considered irrelevant for this purpose; although, they may be useful as indicators of research quality and effectiveness. A preponderance of outside letters should be from peer institutions. Departments should be responsible for determining their departmental peers. Second, reviewers should be asked to provide examples demonstrating the significance of the candidate's professional endeavors. General statements are inadequate. *Copies of all letters sent to solicit outside reviews and all letters received are to be included in the dossier.*

#### IV. College-Review by the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee

The Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences will use the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee to review all requests for promotion/tenure from respective departments and off-campus research units. The committee will review all promotion and tenure recommendations and ensure equitable review and evaluation of on- and off-campus promotion candidates, relative to the position description for each candidate.

The Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee will be comprised of 16 senior faculty members appointed by the Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Dean of the Texas A&M College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Director, Texas AgriLife Research; and Director, Texas AgriLife Extension Service. The makeup of the committee will reflect the composition of the faculty within the College, Texas AgriLife Research and the Texas AgriLife Extension, and will be reviewed every three years to ensure it continues to represent the demographics of the faculty. Committee members shall serve two-year terms, with approximately one-half of the committee rotating each year. As with the departmental peer review committees, all members of the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee may vote on promotion and tenure decisions; however, the vote of the tenured faculty must be kept separate. The results of the committee's anonymous vote and the overall perspective of the committee relative to each faculty member under consideration shall be explained by the Chair of the Committee in a statement to the Vice Chancellor on each candidate.

The Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee shall review all promotion and tenure recommendations in accordance with the following:

1. Review completeness of promotion candidate's file submitted by the Department, requesting additional information, if necessary, particularly if the candidate's department is not represented on the committee.
2. Review recommendations of the departmental peer review committee, Department Head and respective Resident Director, as appropriate. The Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee should focus on nominations of a marginal nature. Specifically:
  - a. If the departmental peer review committee and the administration strongly recommend a decision and the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee does not concur, then the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee may request further input prior to a final recommendation. Detailed comments should accompany all Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee recommendations which are in opposition to the recommendations of the departmental peer review committee or administration.
  - b. If the departmental peer review committee and the Unit Head are in direct conflict, the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee should carefully review the entire file, including external letters, to determine the merits of the file. If necessary, the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee may invite the appropriate Department Head (and respective-Resident Director, as appropriate) and chair of the departmental peer review committee to the meeting to gain further information.



3. The Chair of the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee will be responsible for transmitting written results of the committee's deliberations and make recommendations regarding desired changes to the process.

#### **V. College Interdisciplinary Committee (optional)**

This option should be evaluated at the beginning of a tenure-track appointment or the assignment of significant interdisciplinary activities or new research activities in an Institute or Center. Such individual committees would report to the appropriate department head and the departmental faculty of the home department. The committee's report, if established, shall be considered in the departmental and college evaluations.

The objective and appropriate evaluation of faculty members who are significantly involved in interdisciplinary faculties, institutes and centers may require input from a select Interdisciplinary Committee of senior faculty which represents the appropriate disciplinary interests of a particular faculty member. If deemed necessary, the committee will be appointed by the Dean of the College after consultation with the faculty member, head of the administrative department for the center or institute, the head of the academic home department of the faculty member, the director of the center or chair of the faculty, and others who may have unique perspectives for a given faculty member. For more detail see the section "Evaluation Criteria in Consideration of Faculty Members in Interdisciplinary Activities and Their Relationship with Tenure-Granting Departments."

#### **VI. Recommendation / Approval Process of Faculty Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Package**

The faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package (which includes evaluations and recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, select Interdisciplinary Committee (as appropriate), the faculty at large, the head(s) of the faculty member's department) will be forwarded to the office of the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Following receipt and review by the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee, the Dean's Office will forward the faculty member's promotion/tenure package to the Provost's Office with a summary recommendation. Upon transmittal to the Provost's Office, the Dean will report his/her recommendation to the head of the appropriate department(s).

The Provost will evaluate each request for promotion/tenure and transmit the promotion/tenure package with his/her recommendation to the President of the University. Following review, the President shall approve the promotion of all faculty members, pending confirmation of the Chancellor. The President will submit all requests for tenure to the Chancellor for review and submission to the Board of Regents. Upon review and deliberation, the Board of Regents is authorized to award tenure. Upon confirmation of approval, the Dean will notify the head of the department regarding the approval or denial of promotion and/or tenure.

Each faculty member shall be informed, through appropriate university channels, of the recommendations of the faculty committees, department head, college and university administration upon transmittal to the next level. Information regarding each step of the evaluation process should be transmitted in writing.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATION OF MERIT REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

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 depend 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 an ability to present information with logic and conviction. Quality and effectiveness should be represented through clientele evaluation and peer evaluation. Faculty are expected to utilize state-of-the-art communications technology when appropriate.

3. **Quality of Program and organizational support**

Faculty are 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 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. Applied or 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 Agriculture and Life Sciences 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.

# EVALUATION CRITERIA IN CONSIDERATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH TENURE-GRANTING DEPARTMENT

## I. Criteria

If a given faculty member has a significant teaching and/or research relationship with a Center, Institute or interdepartmental Graduate Faculty, it may be necessary to identify a format whereby those interdisciplinary efforts are considered in the promotion and tenure decision process.

## II. Guidelines for Recommendations on Promotion and Tenure

### A. Composition of Interdisciplinary Promotion and Tenure Committee

In addition to the standard procedures on promotion and tenure recommendations, faculty who are specifically employed as a member of a defined interdisciplinary institute, center or program may have an Interdisciplinary Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee will be established upon recommendation of the respective Director of the Institute/Center in consultation with the appropriate Department Head(s) and approved by the Dean.

This Interdisciplinary Promotion and Tenure Committee shall fulfill the responsibilities in addition to the customary departmental promotion and tenure committee. (Neither the administrating department head nor the Director of the Institute/Center shall serve on or direct the deliberations of this committee.) The committee will provide a written evaluation to the director of the institute/center and the disciplinary department head that will be included in the faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package and forwarded to the Dean's Office.

### B. Evaluation Process

#### 1) Traditional faculty

The department head of the lead department and the chair of the institute/center will provide written evaluations and recommendations to the Office of the Dean for inclusion in the faculty promotion/tenure recommendation package.

Upon request by the faculty member, the chair of the interdepartmental graduate faculty may be solicited to provide a letter of evaluation relative to the faculty member's significant academic participation (teaching or administrative) in the activities of the faculty. This letter will be considered by the Interdisciplinary Promotion and Tenure Committee as well as the departmental committee and forwarded with the promotion/tenure recommendation package through the university process.

2) Nontraditional faculty

Evaluation of faculty with nontraditional training and/or responsibilities must be clearly addressed at the initiation of their promotion and tenure-track appointment. In the rare cases in which tenure-track faculty develops an overriding participation in such activities, the development of a specialized evaluation committee should be proposed at the earliest possible consideration.