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**Purpose of the Annual Review:** The Department of Biology annually evaluates each faculty member’s teaching, research/scholarship, and professional service. The purpose of the evaluation is to recognize a level of performance and productivity that is appropriate and desirable for the department, and provide guidance when performance and productivity are less than satisfactory. The review process provides an opportunity for effective communication between each faculty member and his or her department leadership. The annual reviews also form the basis of Post-Tenure Review as described in the Department of Biology Post-Tenure Review Policy.

**Period of Evaluation:** The period of evaluation is a calendar year (January – December). The annual review will be performed in the spring semester following the year to be evaluated.

**Mechanism of the Annual Review:** Per University Rule 12.01.99.M1, the Department Head performs an annual evaluation of faculty members. The Annual Review Committee (ARC) serves in an advisory capacity to the Department Head for this purpose. The ARC provides a written report summarizing the yearly performance and productivity of each faculty member for their activities in research, teaching, and service. The ARC provides a rating in each of these three categories and an overall rating for the calendar year. A copy of the ARC report along with the Department Head’s evaluation and recommendation are provided to the faculty member. The Department Head will schedule individual meetings with pre-tenure faculty to discuss their annual review report. Tenured faculty members may request to meet with the Department Head to discuss their review. The Department Head may request meetings with any faculty member to discuss the annual evaluation report.

**Composition and role of the Annual Review Committee:** The Annual Review Committee is composed of the Associate Department Head for Faculty Affairs (Chair and voting member) and faculty members elected by the departmental faculty. These elected members include at least one tenured faculty member for every 9 tenure track faculty members in the department and not less than 60% Professor rank composition (excluding the Associate Department Head for Faculty Affairs). Also, the elected committee will include at least one academic professional track (APT) faculty member for every 9 APT faculty members in the department. Elected members will serve a three-year term and can be re-elected. Assistant rank faculty (*e.g.*, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Instructional Assistant Professor, etc.) are not eligible to serve on the Annual Review Committee. The ARC provides input to the Department Head on promotions for biology faculty based on research, teaching, and service performance. In addition, the ARC reviews the CVs of faculty applying for a joint appointment to the Department of Biology. It makes recommendations to the Department of Biology Executive Committee regarding the suitability of these applicants.

**Performance to be Evaluated:**

Tenure Track Faculty:

Members of the ARC summarize and evaluate annual reports provided by the faculty on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in accordance with a standard weighting of 60% research/scholarship (*e.g.*, grant proposal preparation, manuscript preparation, conference attendance, invited talks, compliance), 30% teaching (*e.g.*, formal courses, graduate and undergraduate research training), and 10% service (*e.g.*, major departmental, college, or university committees, serving on PhD student committees as a member, grant and manuscript reviews and other service to the field). Modified loads are discussed with the Department Head and approved by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. Any approved changes to the standard load for an individual faculty member will be communicated to the ARC by the Department Head. Each tenure-track faculty member also provides an up‑to‑date curriculum vitae, course syllabi, student evaluations and any additional materials they deem relevant for the committee's consideration.

Academic Professional Track Faculty:

Members of the ARC summarize and evaluate annual reports provided by the faculty on their research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities. For Instructional track faculty, a standard weighting of 70% teaching (*e.g.*, formal course instruction, course development) and 30% scholarship / service (as described above for tenure-track faculty) is expected. Per University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (Section 2.4.3.4.2), service amounts for any faculty member should not be less than 10%. For Lecturer-track faculty, a standard weighting of 90% teaching (*e.g.*, formal course instruction, course development) and 10% service (as described above for tenure-track faculty) is expected. For APT faculty, modified loads are discussed with the Department Head and approved by the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences. Any approved changes to the standard load for an individual faculty member will be communicated to the ARC by the Department Head. Each APT faculty member also provides an up-to-date curriculum vitae, course syllabi, student evaluations, and any additional material they deem relevant for the committee’s consideration.

**Report:** The ARC provides an advisory rating to the Department Head for each faculty member in each of the relevant categories of research/scholarship, teaching, and service over the previous year as *Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement,* or *Unsatisfactory*. These ratings are based on evaluation criteria (examples listed below) and are determined for each faculty member in accordance with departmental standards. In addition, the ARC provides an advisory overall rating to the Department Head that is based on the individual criteria ratings and a statement on the expectations for the next year in research/scholarship, teaching, and service. The Department Head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the final criteria and overall ratings. The Department Head ratings will be provided in an evaluation report to the faculty member. Faculty members will acknowledge receipt of the report by signing a copy of the document. Each faculty member will have the opportunity, if desired, to meet with the Department Head to discuss the written review and expectations and/or provide written comments to be included in their personnel file. If a faculty member declines to acknowledge receipt of the report, this will be noted in the personnel file.

For faculty members who receive a *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating in any single category, or an overall *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* rating, the Department Head will consult with the faculty member to formulate a timely improvement plan, with milestones, and this plan should take one year or less to complete successfully. Per College of Arts & Sciences annual review guidelines, a rating of *Needs Improvement* in any two areas results in an overall *Unsatisfactory* rating. An overall *Unsatisfactory* rating is reported to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, accompanied by a written plan that is developed by the faculty member and Department Head for near-term improvement. For faculty members that have two consecutive years of an overall *Unsatisfactory* rating, this will trigger a post-tenure review of the faculty member.

**Complaint Procedures:** A faculty member who believes that their annual review process did not comply with the stated guidelines, may file a complaint, in writing, addressed to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, and with a copy to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences will review and decide on the merits of the complaint. The decision of the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences may be appealed to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

**Timeline:**

In January of each calendar year, the Associate Department Head for Faculty Affairs will request the following from each faculty member:

 1. A completed annual report form.

 2. A current curriculum vitae.

 3. Course syllabi and student evaluations.

4. Rationale for any changes to the standard research/scholarship, teaching, and service load that were not granted prior approval.

 5. Copies of any supplemental materials including research, teaching and/or service reports the faculty member choses to submit.

The reports are due on February 1st. The ARC will evaluate the annual reports in February and March, and then provide their recommendations to the Department Head by April 30. The Department Head will review the recommendations of the ARC, determine the ratings in each criteria area and the overall rating, and provide a written report of the evaluation to the faculty member by July 1.

*Pre-tenured faculty:*

Each year, in addition to evaluating the previous year’s performance, the ARC will provide an evaluation and a written summary of overall progress toward tenure and promotion, with particular emphasis on mid-term reviews during the year of a faculty member’s mid-term review. The guidelines for promotion and tenure are provided in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. Research/scholarship, teaching and service will be evaluated, and areas of success and of concern will be identified. The ARC will advise the Department Head whether the candidate is making 1) excellent progress, meaning the candidate is excelling in all aspects of his/her position; 2) satisfactory progress, meaning the candidate is on track toward tenure and promotion; 3) needs improvement, meaning the candidate is very close to an unsatisfactory mark and will need to make improvements in one or more categories to stay on track toward tenure and promotion; 4) unsatisfactory progress, meaning serious deficiencies in one or more categories must be addressed in order to be considered on track to achieving tenure and promotion. The Department Head will consider the advice of the ARC and determine the rating for progress towards tenure and promotion. This information will be included in the evaluation report.

*Tenured faculty:*

For tenured faculty, the annual review takes a broad perspective of progress in research/scholarship, teaching, and service, using standard evaluation criteria (examples listed below). It is expected that the faculty member will maintain an extramurally funded research program or is actively seeking such funds to support their research and scholarship. The annual review package submitted by faculty will provide evidence of having a scholarly impact on their field (*e.g.*, publications, invited seminars, grant proposal and manuscript reviews, editorial positions, education enhancement). The ARC evaluates and provides recommendations to the Department Head for potential promotion of Associate Professor-rank faculty to the Professor rank according to the guidelines in the Department of Biology Policies for Tenure and Promotion document. The Department Head provides a written report to the faculty member of their progress towards promotion. Review of Associate Department Heads is identical to the review of other tenured faculty except that the faculty submit their annual review documents directly to the Department Head for review. The Department Head will provide a written report to the Associate Department Head of their evaluation.

 The Department of Biology recognizes that research productivity and funding can change throughout a career. Faculty members that have not had major scholarly activity for their laboratory for a span of three years will be expected to begin to teach a total of two full courses; increased from a standard 1.5 courses. Faculty that have not had major scholarly activity for more than or equal to six years will be expected to begin to teach 3 courses; increased from a standard 1.5 courses.

**Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation Criteria:**

The criteria below represent established metrics of faculty effectiveness, and while it is expected that faculty will meet some of the metrics for a given performance ranking, the metrics are not intended to serve as a checklist. Furthermore, considering differing career development paths, it is expected that flexibility of performance criteria should accrue with seniority. Taking such flexibility into consideration, the ARC and Department Head will evaluate the strengths of a faculty member’s research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in their totality.

**Research/scholarship:**

The generation of new knowledge through research is the hallmark of a world‑class university and an integral part of the Department of Biology.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in research include, but are not limited to:**

1. Publication (≥ 2) of research as corresponding author in top tier, peer-reviewed, journals in the faculty member’s field.

2. Publication in a top Biological Sciences Journal (*e.g.*, Science, Cell, or Nature).

3. Leadership in obtaining funding for large-scale or multiple‑investigator projects (*e.g.*, NIH Program project grants or similar types of grants from other funding units).

4. Invited plenary speaker at national and international meetings.

5. Receipt of a major fellowship or research award.

6. Major media attention for the laboratory’s scholarship.

7. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding research award during the review year.

8. Licensing patents.

**Indicators of Exceeds Expectations for performance in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Publications (≥ 2) of research as corresponding author in peer reviewed journals.

2. Securing major funding for scholarly work (*e.g.*, NIH R01 funding or NSF / DoD / DoE / USDA, etc., equivalent funding).

4. Having more than 1 major funding for scholarly work.

5. Receiving a U.S. / EU patent for scholarly work.

6. Newly elected to be an Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal

7. Awarded a Departmental research award during the review year.

 **Indicators of Meets Expectations for performance in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Regular publication (1 per year) of research as corresponding author in peer reviewed journals.

2. Maintaining an externally funded laboratory or proactively seeking such funding in the absence of such funding.

3. Presentation of research at national and/or international meetings.

4. Publication of a scholarly book, or a chapter in a scholarly book.

5. Publication in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings.

6. Significant self-development activities, such as faculty development leave.

7. Applying for a U.S. / EU patent for your scholarly work.

**Indicators of needs improvement in research/scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

 1. Lack of publication in peer reviewed journals.

2. Sustained inability to obtain extramural research support, and/or unwillingness to submit applications for extramural support.

3. The absence of other scholarly activities.

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in research/scholarship, include, but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in research/scholarship in the previous Annual Review.

2. Negligible tangible research/scholarship activity over the previous calendar year.

**Teaching:**

 Teaching excellence is a goal of the Department of Biology, and the Annual Review Committee takes a holistic approach in evaluating teaching. According to the College of Arts & Sciences guidelines, the ARC will review teaching performance indicators from the information provided in the faculty member’s annual report. In addition to syllabi and student evaluations, faculty members will complete the teaching summary tables in the annual report form. The information required includes semester, course number, number of students in the course, mean GPA for the sections that the faculty member teaches, and the percent of students who earned an “A”, “B”, or “C” grades in their sections. Unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of public trust. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching by a constituted Teaching Review Committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a Teaching Review Committee consisting of three faculty members. This committee will review the faculty member's syllabi, exams, course notes, student evaluations, mean course GPA, and classroom performance, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member. The faculty member and the teaching review committee will develop a written plan for near-term improvement.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Completed development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.

2. Completed development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials.

3. Obtaining extramural funding for curricular enhancement or support for student academic outcomes.

4. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding teacher award during the review year.

5. Publishing, as an author or editor, of textbooks or other instructional materials.

6. Trainees securing extramural funding for their work.

**Indicators of Exceeds Expectations performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Use of high-impact teaching practices in the classroom (as defined by the American Association of Colleges and Universities) including but not limited to Writing-Intensive Courses or Capstone Experiences.

2. Providing multiple outlets (more than standard office hours) for students to get individualized help outside of class.

3. Undergraduate research students presenting their work at local meetings or Department of Biology events.

4. Attending, and completing, the Mobile Summer Institute or other National teaching workshops.

5. Awarded a Departmental teaching award during the review year.

6. Assisted in the development or re-design of a new course.

7. Received internally funded grant funding to support teaching / learning projects.

8. General instruction, organization of the course, management of students, and overall performance of teaching duties is highly noteworthy and highly recognized by peers and students.

**Indicators of Meets Expectations performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. The presentation of accurate, up‑to‑date, well-organized information and concepts.

2. Satisfactory resolution of student complaints.

3. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research.

4. Satisfactory progress to degree of graduate students.

5. Chair of graduate student advisory committees.

6. Coordination of multi-section courses.

7. Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness.

8. Feedback on student work is appropriate and provided in a timely manner.

9. Follows University procedures for syllabus content and posting and meets all teaching-related deadlines set by the Department and University.

 **Indicators of Needs Improvement in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Consistently negative teaching evaluations from students across two years consecutive of performance.

2. Consistently unresolved student complaints.

3. Consistent presentation of out‑of‑date or incorrect information.

4. Not meeting deadlines for graduate student committee meetings and preliminary exams.

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in teaching in the previous Annual Review.

2. Less than 30% teaching load over a calendar year (without approval from the Department Head).

3. Neglecting to meet formal teaching responsibilities.

**Service:**

Service to the department, college, university, and the scientific community at large is recognized as an essential component of good academic citizenship. The ARC recognizes that service opportunities often increase as faculty ranks also increase. The ARC takes this into account for the Annual Review.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

 1. Officer in a national professional organization.

 2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board.

 3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal.

 4. Chair of a review panel for a national / international research organization.

 5. Program chair, or lead organizer, for a national or international meeting.

 6. Committee chair of a national professional organization.

 7. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee.

8. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding service award during the review year.

 **Indicators of Exceeds Expectations performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Officer in Faculty Senate, CPI, or another elected university-level committee.

 2. Member of >10 graduate thesis committees.

 3. Member of review panel for a national or international research agency or organization.

 4. Member of a scientific advisory board for a company or other research organization.

 5. Awarded a Departmental service award during the review year.

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Participation in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks.

2. Service on departmental, college, or university committees

3. Officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organization

4. Program or committee chair for regional or state meeting

5. Reviewer for peer-reviewed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations

 6. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies

 7. Advisor to student organizations

 8. Directing consulting, continuing education, and/or outreach activities

 9. Contributions to diversity and/or internationalization/globalization

 10. Member of graduate thesis committees

 **Indicators of needs improvement in service include but are not limited to:**

1. Failure to regularly participate in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty chalk talks

2. Repeated refusal to serve, or to be nominated to serve, on departmental, college, or university committees despite having an otherwise low service load.

3. Unwillingness or inability to contribute to the mission of committees the faculty member serves on

**Indicators of unsatisfactory performance in service include but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a *Needs Improvement* rating in service in the previous Annual Review

2. Less than10% service load over a calendar year

**Academic Professional Track Faculty Evaluation Criteria:**

The criteria below represent established metrics of faculty effectiveness, and while it is expected that faculty will meet some of the metrics for a given performance ranking, the metrics are not intended to serve as a checklist. Furthermore, considering differing career development paths, it is expected that flexibility of performance criteria should accrue with seniority. Taking such flexibility into consideration, the ARC and Department Head will evaluate the strengths of a faculty member’s research/scholarship, teaching, and service activities in their totality.

For APT faculty, the ARC annually evaluates the quality of the faculty member’s performance, which is primarily based on teaching and related activities, and provides a recommendation to the Department Head, who will determine the overall performance rating.

**Teaching:**

Teaching excellence is a goal of the Department of Biology, and the Annual Review Committee takes a holistic approach in evaluating teaching. According to the College of Arts & Sciences guidelines, the ARC will review teaching performance indicators from the information provided in the faculty member’s annual report. In addition to syllabi and student evaluations, faculty members will complete the teaching summary tables in the annual report form. The information required includes semester, course number, number of students in the course, mean course GPA, and the percent of students who earned an “A”, “B”, or “C” grades. Unsatisfactory teaching is contrary to our mission and a serious violation of public trust. An unsatisfactory rating in teaching will necessitate a comprehensive review of teaching by a constituted Teaching Review Committee. The Department Head, in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a Teaching Review Committee consisting of three faculty members. This committee will review the faculty member's syllabi, exams, course notes, student evaluations, mean course GPA, and classroom performance, as well as any additional materials provided by the faculty member. The faculty member and the teaching review committee will develop a written plan for near-term improvement.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Obtaining external funding to support teaching or learning projects (NSF, Foundations etc.)
2. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding teaching award during the review year.
3. Developing workshops, programs, or seminars designed to improve teaching practices of others.
4. Invitation(s) to present at the university or another institution to share their teaching practices.
5. Invitation(s) to teach as a visiting scholar at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
6. Teaching performance serves as a model for others across the university and other institutions.
7. Leading an initiative to create high-quality instructional materials widely adopted or acclaimed in other institutions.

 **Indicators of Exceeds Expectations performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Obtaining internal funding to support teaching or learning projects (College, University etc.).
2. Awarded a Departmental teaching award during the review year.
3. Leading or other significant involvement in national or international workshops, programs, conferences, or seminars that are designed to improve teaching practices.
4. Invitation or accepted proposal to give a talk or presentation at a local or national conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar about effective teaching methodologies or pedagogies.
5. Teaching performance serves as a model for others in the department and the college.
6. Leading an initiative to create high-quality instructional materials widely adopted or acclaimed in the department and the college.
7. Assisted with the creation of high-quality instructional material that were adopted by the Department or University.
8. Assisted with the development of a new course that filled a departmental need.

**Indicators of Meets Expectations performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

* 1. The presentation of accurate, up‑to‑date, well-organized information and concepts.
	2. Satisfactory resolution of student complaints.
	3. Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research.
	4. Satisfactory progress to degree of graduate students.
	5. Chair of graduate student advisory committees.
	6. Coordination of multi-section courses.
1. Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced teaching effectiveness.
2. Feedback on student work is appropriate and provided in a timely manner.
3. Follows University procedures for syllabus content and posting and meets all teaching-related deadlines set by the Department and University.

**Indicators of Needs Improvement in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Significantly negative teaching evaluations from students across two years of performance.
2. Consistently unresolved student complaints.
3. Consistent presentation of out-of-date or incorrect information
4. Not meeting the teaching or the scholar/service load as described in their job description

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any of the problems that led to a Needs Improvement rating in teaching in the previous Annual Review.
2. Less than 70% teaching load over a calendar year (without approval from the Department Head).
3. Neglecting to meet formal teaching responsibilities.

**Scholarship:**

Scholarship is the generation of new knowledge, is critical to the mission of the department, and a defining element of our University as a Research I institution. APT faculty members with research appointments are expected to excel in research. APT faculty with instructional appointments may choose to excel in laboratory research or in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) (which is an investigation into teaching and learning practices within the context of higher education). Instructional track faculty are expected to fill 30% effort using scholarship and/or service (service cannot be below 10% effort per University rules). Faculty involved in SoTL or research should disseminate their findings in academic venues such as conferences and journals.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Obtaining external funding for curricular enhancement or research in an area of a faculty member’s research interest or SoTL (NSF, NIH, Foundations etc.).
2. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding scholarship award during the review year.
3. Publishing, as a lead or corresponding author or editor of textbooks or other instructional materials in top-tier refereed journals.
4. Publishing research or SoTL as a lead or corresponding author in top-tier, peer-reviewed, journals.
5. Publishing with undergraduate or graduate students in peer-reviewed journals.
6. Presenting invited talks at the university or other institutions (based on audience size, prestige of institution) or presenting a keynote address at a major national or international meeting
7. Leading the curriculum development and improvement efforts of the department
8. Development of a highly visible and substantial digital database, archive, or research tools whose creation involves serious intellectual work consistent with best practices in digital scholarship
9. Patent or commercialization of research (with demonstrable impact and use)

**Indicators of Exceeds Expectations performance in scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Obtaining internal funding for curricular enhancement or for research in area of faculty interest or SoTL (College, University, Publishers etc.).
2. Awarded a Departmental scholarship award during the review year.
3. Publishing, as an author or editor of textbooks or other instructional materials on online platforms such as CourseHero, OER Commons, etc.
4. Publishing research as an author in peer-reviewed journals or other online platforms.
5. Publishing with undergraduate or graduate students in online platforms.
6. Accepted proposal to give a talk or presentation at a major conference, meeting, workshop, or seminar about effective teaching methodologies/pedagogies or research.
7. Active participation in the curriculum development and improvement efforts of the department.

**Indicators of Meets Expectations performance in scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Presentation(s) of creative work (e.g., performance work, etc.) appropriate for the discipline) on any platform.
2. Proposal(s) submitted for a competitive internal or external grant.
3. Participatory role(s) in a collaborative research project(s).
4. Competitive Internal or External grant(s) under review.

**Indicators of Needs Improvement performance in scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. Minimal evidence of progress on original research project.
2. Minimal contributions to collaborative research projects.
3. Minimal evidence that substantial progress is underway on new research or creative projects.

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory in scholarship include, but are not limited to:**

1. No evidence that progress is underway on new research or creative projects.

**Service:**

Service to the department, college, university, and the scientific community at large is recognized as an essential component of good academic citizenship. Instructional track faculty are expected to fill 30% effort using scholarship and/or service (service cannot be below 10% effort per University rules). The ARC recognizes that service opportunities often increase as faculty ranks also increase. The ARC considers this for the Annual Review.

**Indicators of Outstanding performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Officer in a national professional organization.
2. Service on a major governmental commission, task force or board.
3. Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal.
4. Chair of a review panel for a national research or teaching organization.
5. Program chair, or similar chair, for a national or international meeting.
6. Committee chair of a national professional organization.
7. Chair of major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee.
8. Awarded a College, University, or professional society outstanding service award during the review year.

**Indicators of Exceeds Expectations performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Officer in Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate EC (Executive Committee), CPI (Council of Principal Investigators), or other elected university committee.
2. Member of >10 graduate thesis committees.
3. Member of review panel for a national research or teaching organization.
4. Member of a scientific advisory board for a company or other research organization.
5. Awarded a Departmental service award during the review year.

**Indicators of Meets Expectations performance in service include, but are not limited to:**

1. Regular attendance and participation in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty research and teaching chalk talks.
2. Service on departmental, college, or university committees.
3. Officer in regional, state, and/or national professional organization.
4. Program or committee chair for regional or state meeting.
5. Reviewer for peer-reviewed journals, and/or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations.
6. Service as a consultant to business or governmental agencies.
7. Advisor to student organizations.
8. Leading consulting, continuing education, and/or outreach activities
9. Contributions to the goals set by the University for service.
10. Member of graduate thesis committees.

**Indicators of Needs Improvement in service include but are not limited to:**

1. Failure to regularly participate in faculty meetings, departmental seminars, and faculty research and teaching chalk talks.
2. Repeated refusal to serve, or to be nominated to serve, on departmental, college, or university committees despite having an otherwise low service load.
3. Unwillingness or inability to contribute to the mission of committees on which the faculty member serves.

**Indicators of Unsatisfactory performance in service include but are not limited to:**

1. Inability or unwillingness to resolve any problems that led to a Needs Improvement rating in service in the previous Annual Review.
2. Less than 10% service load over a calendar year.