

TENURE AND PROMOTION PACKAGES

Submission Guidelines
2009-2010

Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCHEDULE & TIMELINES (I)	3
DEFINITIONS (II)	4
COLLEGE CHART PREPARATION (III)	5
Examples of College Charts.....	6
FILE SETS—ORGANIZATION & SUBMISSION (IV)	7
DOSSIER ITEMS - ORGANIZATION AND PREPARATION (V)	10
General Instructions for Colleges	10
<i>Item 1: Candidate’s Statement(s) on Teaching Research and Service</i>	10
<i>Item 2: The Candidate’s CV</i>	11
<i>Item 3: Verification of Contents Letter</i>	11
<i>Items 4-7: Department Evaluations of Teaching, Research, Service, and OtherActivities</i> ..	12
<i>Item 8: Outside Reviewers’ Letters</i>	14
<i>Item 9: Departmental (T&P) Committee Report and Recommendation</i>	15
<i>Item 10: Department Head’s Recommendation</i>	17
<i>Item 11: College Committee’s Report and Recommendation</i>	17
<i>Item 12: Dean’s Recommendation and Summary</i>	17
<i>Item 13: Other Materials and Documentation (optional)</i>	18
PHOTO SUBMISSION (January) (VI)	19
PROCESS INFORMATION (VII)	20
A. <i>Committee Proceedings (Department and College)</i>	20
B. <i>Notifying Candidates of Tenure/Promotion Recommendations</i>	21
C. <i>Candidate’s Right to Withdraw</i>	22
D. <i>Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Probationary Period</i>	22
Mandatory Review (Penultimate Year)	22
Non Reappointment	22
The “Tenure Clock” (Timing of Reviews)	23
Extensions to the Probationary Period.....	23
Reconsideration in the Terminal Year	24
E. <i>Departments’ and Colleges’ Written Guidelines for Tenure & Promotion</i>	24
F. <i>Early Promotion and Tenure</i>	25
G. <i>Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments</i>	25
H. <i>Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotions</i>	26
I. <i>Faculty Members Hired Before Terminal Degree Has Been Issued</i>	26
RESOURCES (VIII)	27

SCHEDULE & TIMELINES (I)

March/April 2009	Through the Dean of Faculties, the Provost requests Deans to initiate tenure and promotion proceedings.
December 4, 2009	Deans submit recommendations to the Provost by sending complete files to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost Office. Files must be received by this date. *
January 2010	Deans meet and review recommendations with the Provost and Dean of Faculties. The Provost forwards recommendations to the President. Photos of candidates due by January 29. (See Sec. VI.)
February 2010	The President forwards recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University System.
March 2010	Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions. Tenure and Promotion Recognition Book goes to the printer.
May 2010	Reception for those Tenured and/or Promoted
September 1, 2010	Tenure and Promotion decisions become effective.

***! All T&P candidate dossier materials are expected to arrive in the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost Office before or on the due date. If unusual circumstances necessitate submission of any materials after the due date, the Dean of the College must first obtain approval to submit late materials from the Dean of Faculties, at 845-4274.**

DEFINITIONS (II)

College chart - a form listing candidates' names, departments, ranks, and other information. There are **three** college charts: one is for listing tenure-only candidates, one is for listing promotion-only candidates, and one is for listing candidates being considered for a combination of promotion and tenure. Samples of completed forms can be found in Sec. III: College Chart Preparation.

Dossier - A file for a single candidate that includes documents submitted by the candidate, outside peer-review letters, reports prepared by the various voting bodies (departmental T&P committee, Department Head, college T&P committee, Dean) and other supporting materials. Departments initiate the preparation of the dossiers and send them to their colleges for further processing and completion.

Eligibility to Vote – There are two criteria for voting eligibility:

- 1) Only tenured TAMU faculty are eligible to vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion.
- 2) To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must *also* hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate.

Example: For Assistant Professors seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, only tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor with tenure or above are eligible to vote. For Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor, only Full (and Distinguished) Professors are eligible to vote.

File set - A complete set of materials on all candidates from a college. A file set consists of the *College Charts* (lists of candidates in specified promotion categories), and the *Dossiers* for each of the candidates listed on the charts. Departments will be responsible for compiling and organizing the candidates' dossiers and then sending the dossiers to the college. Colleges will complete the dossiers by including the reports and votes of the College T&P Committee and the Dean. Any documents produced by or generated after a dossier leaves its department should be sent to the college through the department head. Colleges will send the completed file sets to the Dean of Faculties.

Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee – A single faculty committee which is charged with reviewing candidates who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and whose members are voting on those candidates.

- **The department head cannot be a member of the T&P committee and cannot participate during T&P committee evaluations of the candidates.**
- **The “T&P committee” is defined as “the group whose vote is forwarded as the *faculty vote on the candidate.*”**
- **There cannot be different T&P committees for different candidates within the same department.**
 - Different members or subsets of members of the T&P Committee can be assigned with the task of **leading** the evaluation and discussion of different candidates and/or evaluation areas (teaching, research, service). However, **the organization and**

assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates.

All members of the T&P Committee who are eligible to evaluate and vote on any given candidate should be active participants of the evaluation process of that candidate. Members of the T&P Committee who do not read a candidate's dossier should abstain from voting. Some members of the T&P committee might be ineligible to evaluate and vote on some candidates (e.g., an associate professor cannot evaluate a promotion to full; see "Eligibility to Vote," above.)

COLLEGE CHART PREPARATION (III)

1. Using the supplied form (Excel doc), prepare up to THREE distinctive College Charts:
 - a) One chart is for information on candidates being considered for *tenure only* (no promotion candidates). These are candidates who hold the rank of Associate or Full Professor without tenure. Most colleges will not use this chart.
 - b) Candidates being considered for *promotion only*, such as those going from Associate Professor to Full Professor, and non-tenure track promotions (such as to Sr. Lecturer), constitute the second chart.
 - c) The third chart is for candidates being considered for *both tenure and promotion*; these are almost always faculty going from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure.
2. Place these charts as the first item in each hardcopy set. (Please do not put a copy in every candidate's folder.)
3. Because of the use of UINs, please use a password protected file of the chart (Excel format) to Erin Schneider at erinschneider@tamu.edu or put a copy of the chart (not password protected) on the CD.

Examples of College Charts

Note: Candidate names & information are fictitious. Blank forms can be found on the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost's website.

Tenure-Only Chart

College of Business (Mays Business School) For Tenure Effective Sept. 1, 2010

Present Rank (no change being sought)	Department	Candidates' Names (alpha within dept.)	Candidate's UIN	Years Teaching*	
				TAMU	Other
Assoc. Prof	Management	Black, Jane	000000000	3	6
Professor	Marketing	Mason, Gregory	000000000	3	5

*Include all years teaching, except as a graduate TA or in other than an institution of higher education

! Count service up through March 2010 (ex. Hired 9/04 = 5.5 years)

Promotion-Only Chart

College of Business (Mays Business School) For Promotions Effective Sept. 1, 2010

Present Rank	Department	Candidates' Names (alpha within dept.)	Candidate's UIN	Years Teaching		New Rank
				TAMU	Other	
Assoc. Prof	Accounting	Barron, Camilla	000000000	12	0	Professor
Assoc. Prof	Accounting	Huang, Zhisheng	000000000	8	5	Professor
Assoc. Prof	Finance	Hill, James	000000000	10	2	Professor
Lecturer	Marketing	Dixon, Derrick	000000000	10	0	Sr. Lecturer

Tenure + Promotion Chart

College of Business (Mays Business School) For Tenure & Promotion Effective Sept. 1, 2010

Present Rank	Department	Candidates' Names (alpha within dept.)	Candidate's UIN	Years Teaching*		New Rank
				!TAMU	Other	
Assoc Prof	Management	Olson, Famke	000000000	4	6	Professor
Asst. Prof	Accounting	Alonzo, Selina	000000000	5	2	Assoc. Prof
Asst. Prof	Accounting	Roget, Peter	000000000	5	1	Assoc. Prof
Asst. Prof	Finance	Munsun, Lyra	000000000	4	3	Assoc. Prof
Asst. Prof	Management	Zemick, Rita	000000000	5	2	Assoc. Prof

*Include all years teaching, except as a graduate TA or in other than an institution of higher education

! Count service up through March 2010 (ex. Hired 9/04 = 5.5 years)

FILE SETS—ORGANIZATION & SUBMISSION (IV)

(Note: Colleges may have additional requirements for their departments.)

Please submit four complete sets (hardcopy, organized as shown below) plus an electronic copy (PDF format) for archival purposes to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, by the deadline.

Organizing the Candidates' Dossiers for Hardcopy Submission

In each set, please group the dossiers into three major categories (omit those that do not apply to your college):

1. Tenure-only candidates
2. Tenure and Promotion candidates
3. Promotion-only candidates

Organize materials as shown below:

1. a) *Tenure-only College Chart*
b) Tenure Candidate Dossiers in individual manila folders.* Order the files just as they have been listed on the college chart (first by rank, then by alphabetical dept., then alphabetically by name within each department).
2. a) *Tenure and Promotion College Chart*
b) Tenure and Promotion Candidate Dossiers in individual manila folders.* Order the files just as they have been listed on the college chart.
3. a) *Promotion-only College Chart*
b) Promotion Candidate Dossiers in individual manila folders.* Order the files just as they have been listed on the college chart.

This above grouping constitutes one complete file set.

**Manila folders should have tabs labeled with the following information:*

-Candidate's Last Name, First Name	-Rank sought (e.g. Tenure w/Promotion)
-Department/College	- Academic year (e.g., 2009-2010)

Electronic Submission (CD-ROM)

An electronic copy of the file sets and the college charts must be submitted at the same time as the four hard copies, along with CVs and biographical paragraphs for all candidates.

As with hardcopies, supporting materials (such as copies of articles) should not be included in the electronic submission.

The CD-ROM should contain five electronic folders labeled:

- Tenure-only candidates
- Tenure and Promotion candidates
- Promotion-only candidates
- Tenure CVs
- !• Bios (please submit these with the dossiers)

The first three folders should contain:

- An **Excel-format** copy of the college chart for the category. (No .pdf charts please—we must cut/paste info from them)
- A **.pdf format** file of each candidate’s dossier (in the appropriate folder). These should be labeled only with the individual’s name [Last Name, First Name] so that they will sort alphabetically.

The Tenure CVs folder should contain:

- **Separate .pdf format** copies of each candidate’s CV for those seeking *Tenure with Promotion* and *Tenure-only* (required by the Regents).
 - **!**Name individual CV files with just the name & first initial, like this: **Smith, J.**
[Last Name, First Initial] in mixed upper/lower case letters (not all caps, please).
 - **!**CVs may not contain personal contact information such as home address, home phone number, social security number, or personal email address. (Please remove before sending.)
 - **!**The System requests that the candidate’s name on the CV appear **exactly** as it appears on the college chart & in the bio for the regents. In other words, if the CV says “Sam Smith,” the college chart and biography must also say “Sam Smith,” *not* “Samuel Smith.” If a middle initial appears on the CV (e.g., Samuel H. Smith), it must appear that way on the other two documents, and so on.

The **Bios folder** should contain a paragraph-long biography of candidate. See below for instructions:

Submission of Biographies

Submit on CD-ROM along with the electronic dossiers.

Biographies will be forwarded to the Chancellor and Board of Regents, and published in the spring recognition booklet featuring newly tenured and promoted faculty. Bios must be limited to 125 words (except in the case of Distinguished Professors, whose bios can be up to approximately 350 words).

By the date noted on the Schedule in Section I, Departments or Colleges must submit to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost a short paragraph (no more than 125 words) on each of the candidates being considered for recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

The paragraph to be forwarded to the Chancellor and Regents (in Microsoft Word format) should include the following six pieces of information (in this order):

- 1) Candidate's name
- 2) Terminal degree, institution where earned, year earned
- 3) Year they joined the Texas A&M faculty
- 4) Area(s) of Specialty
- 5) A brief outline of his/her contribution to the department in the areas of teaching, research and service ("bragging points" that exemplify to the public the quality of our faculty and contributions they are making).
- 6) Any notable awards or honors

Know that we will do our best to include in the booklet all of the information about the candidate that is contained in the submitted paragraph, but paragraphs are subject to editorial changes at the discretion of this office. Remaining within the guidelines for subject matter and length will minimize the need for editing after submission.

Here is a sample paragraph from the 2006 Tenure/Promotion Booklet (it is 113 words). You do not have to follow the template exactly, as long as you are including all of the pertinent information:

Andreas Klappenecker
Computer Science
Associate Professor with Tenure

Andreas Klappenecker received his Ph.D. in 1998 from the University of Karlsruhe, Germany. He joined Texas A&M University in 1999 as a Visiting Assistant Professor of Mathematics, worked shortly as a Research Associate at the University of Karlsruhe, and then joined the Department of Computer Science as an Assistant Professor. His research interests include quantum algorithms, quantum error-correcting codes, and more broadly the design and analysis of algorithms. Dr. Klappenecker received an Undergraduate Teaching Award in 2005, a National Science Foundation CAREER award and a TEES Select Young Faculty award in 2004, was named Fellow-at Large of the Santa Fe Institute in 2000, and received highest distinction for his Ph.D. thesis in 1998.

Photographs may be submitted later in the cycle (see Chart on p. 3 for due date).

DOSSIER ITEMS - ORGANIZATION AND PREPARATION (V)

General Instructions for Colleges

For each candidate's dossier please do the following:

1. **! Download the New, Revised Dossier Cover Sheet Form Available Online – Word format, quick-fill.** Fill out a Dossier Cover Sheet for Promotion and Tenure, to be included at the front of each candidate dossier. [<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/>]
2. Use tabbed divider sheets to separate the sections (Items) of the candidate's dossier. (When creating the .pdf version of the dossier, you will also have to set it up as a multi-document file with "bookmarks.")

Dossier Items

Item 1: Candidate's Statement(s) on Teaching, Research, and Service

Description:

Written by the candidate, this is a concise statement of the candidate's goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in teaching, in research, in service, and in any other activities. Each of the three areas should be individually addressed. Rather than using this statement as a forum to say why the candidate's teaching, research, and service have been significant (or to make an argument for promotion or tenure), this statement should say how they candidate *approaches* these things.

Item 1 is an important document both for the candidate's reflections and for contextualizing the other materials in the dossier. The personal statement should aid reviewers in understanding the candidate's current philosophies in all three areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. It should also provide evidence (by referencing other dossier materials) of how the candidate's philosophies in each of the three areas have been demonstrated and how they illustrate the candidate's professional growth. (Alternatively, the statement might show how the candidate's experiences with teaching, research and service have helped them develop their philosophies.) For example, a statement on teaching might explain the candidate's philosophy of teaching (which should be more in-depth than a simple statement such as, "I believe in good teaching") and explain how they came to hold that philosophy, as well as providing specific illustrations of how that philosophy is applied in the classroom. The statements on teaching, research and service should provide a context for review of the entire case.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ Three typed pages (max), single-spaced; 10 or 12-pt font; 1-inch margins
- ◇ May be formatted as a single document, OR as three individual documents (addressing Teaching, Research, and Service) that total the maximum of 3 single-spaced pages.
- ◇ Regardless of whether a combined document or single-documents format is chosen, these statements should be placed after the section divider tab for Item One (see Dossier Cover Sheet).

Item 2: The Candidate's CV

Description:

The curriculum vitae will reflect experiences and development in the candidate's career as a teacher and scholar. It provides an overview of the candidate's academic accomplishments.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ The curriculum vitae should be concise, and padding should be avoided.
- ◇ List refereed publications (or other types of creative works) separately from those that were not refereed, and caption the lists accordingly. Provide complete documentation for each citation, including the date of publication and inclusive page numbers.
- ◇ Items that have been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled. (Most departments ask to see an acceptance letter.) Items that have been submitted but not yet accepted should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list.
- ◇ It is strongly encouraged that if any coauthors are the candidate's graduate students (past or present) they are delineated in a manner so that this relationship is discernable.

! 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. This statement and signature may be appended onto the end of the CV document. (*Note: This is different from the Verification of Contents statement—Item 3, below— requested on the Dossier Cover Sheet.*)

Item 3: Verification of Contents Letter

Description:

This is a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he/she has submitted for departmental review for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion consideration. The list of materials might include such things as: Philosophy Statement(s), Curriculum Vitae, Articles, Books, Portfolios, Student Evaluations, and other materials submitted by the candidate.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ A dated statement, signed by the candidate
- ◇ In the statement, the candidate should list *all materials* he or she is submitting to the departmental review committee

This list should not include departmental reports, outside letters, or other materials not submitted by the candidate.

Items 4-7: Department Evaluations of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other Activities

Description:

These are summary reports on the candidate's teaching, research, service, and other activities. They should reflect the views of the voting committee's members.

Note: The drafting of the summary reports may be assigned to an individual faculty member or subset of faculty members of the department's T&P Committee, but the summary reports must be reviewed and edited until they can be accepted as accurate by the entire voting committee. A typed statement at the end of each report such as, "*The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee*" will suffice. The purpose of this is to avoid situations in which a report indicates one conclusion about the candidate, but the vote does not support the evaluation.

These reports should allow subsequent reviewers to find documented evidence for statements made in the reports. However, they should not repeat information that can be found elsewhere in the dossier. They may refer to the outside letters and other materials without directly quoting them.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ Three or four separate reports that are indexed under separate section divider tabs in the electronic and hardcopy dossier files.
- ◇ Written by faculty T&P committee(s), **not by the Department Head or the candidate**. (Authorship of each report should be made clear—see sample statement in "Description," above.)
- ◇ A statement at the end of each report reading: "The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee."
- ◇ Thorough analysis should be given to all three areas (Teaching, Research, and Service).

Additional information and guidelines specific to each report can be found below:

Teaching Report

The category of "teaching" includes, among other things:

- classroom and laboratory instruction
- development of new courses, laboratories and teaching methods
- publication of instructional materials including textbooks
- supervision of graduate students

In the report on evaluation of teaching, the following must be included for each candidate:

- a) *Peer Evaluation* of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods, as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate's course offerings.

Note: Peer reports of structured classroom observations are helpful, but are not required. If such a report is provided, it should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department has engaged in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, these evaluations would be a natural addition to this section of the dossier.

- b) *Student Ratings of Teaching*, with comments on these evaluations by peers: Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological, and in tabular form) of the student ratings must be presented, with numerical data set in the context of departmental standards and norms. (A department that does not utilize numerical ratings should provide a careful summary and analysis of the verbal responses over a multi-year period.)
- c) *Peer Evaluation of Other Teaching Contributions* of value to the department, such as the direction of graduate students and undergraduate researchers, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses, pedagogical publications, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching-related activities.

Do not include letters of testimonial from colleagues or students (these may be placed with Dossier Item 13: "Other Materials").

Research and Creative Activities Report

For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publications. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activity, such as architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, and sculpture.

Within the report, describe authorship protocols within your discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.

Service Report

This report might include service to the institution, to students, colleagues, the department, college, and the University. It may also include service beyond the campus, such as service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

Other Activities Report

This report is for any activities that do not obviously fit into any of the other three. It may be omitted if it is not relevant to the candidate.

Item 8: Outside Reviewers' Letters

Description:

Outside reviewers' letters allow an opportunity for authorities in the candidate's field to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and potential. External letters may reflect more than just scholarship. Reviewers may be asked to judge an individual's teaching or other activities, as well as reviewing books or articles. (If a reviewer is asked to judge an individual's teaching ability, it is recommended that they be sent a teaching portfolio or equivalent materials to review.) Be aware that letters from dissertation advisors may not carry the same weight as those from unbiased evaluators, and letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ Letters may be received on official letterhead, or email letters are also acceptable if that is the preference of the reviewer.
- ◇ Most outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better, but letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable.*
- ◇ At least three outside reviewer letters must be included with the dossier.
- ◇ Include a page in this section of the dossier listing the names and contact information for the reviewers, and providing a "biography" showing the qualifications and credentials of the reviewers you solicited. When listing them, please distinguish them under separate headings based upon which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which by the department.
- ◇ Include a copy of the letters requesting outside reviews, as well as all letters received in response. (If a form letter is used for all reviewers, a single copy may be included, with a notation added to this effect.) Letters should be essentially uniform.
- ◇ It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for each candidate.
- ◇ It should be understood that a lack of response from a reviewer who has been asked to send a letter should not be interpreted as a negative statement against the candidate.

Procedures for Requesting Outside Letters:

1. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers. The candidate may also provide a list of those who should not be consulted.
2. The Department Head or T&P Committee provides a list of possible reviewers.
3. From the two lists, a group of at least three are selected and contacted by the Department Head or Committee Chair.
4. Take care to select outside referees...

* In some cases, preeminence of institutions is obvious. Where the stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, include an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer is appropriate. For example, an institution of lower reputation than Texas A&M may have one of the strongest programs in the field of the candidate. Although letters may be requested from outstanding individuals outside the academy, the file should still include three additional letters from individuals in peer programs/universities. Please realize that letters are much more persuasive when the reviewers are chosen from peer institutions.

- a. ..whose objectivity is not open to challenge (i.e. avoid co-authors, longtime personal friends, former students or former mentors unless more than the minimum of three letters are presented).
 - b. ..whose rank at their institution is equivalent to or better than the one for which the candidate is being considered.
 - c. ..who do not appear on the candidate’s “do not contact” list.
5. Ensure that a mix of letters is solicited- some suggested by the candidate, some by the department. Clearly indicate who suggested which reviewers whose letters are included in the dossier.
 6. The solicitation letter should request specific examples of the candidate’s current and potential scholarship and/or impact of teaching and service.
 7. The solicitation letter must contain the following statement:

Your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law. However, under Texas law, your letter could be relinquished through an open records request.

- !8. If a solicitation letter containing the elements of (6) and (7) is sent, and the referee declines to write a letter for the candidate, you must still list this referee’s name among those solicited (and indicate that they declined).

Item 9: Departmental (T&P) Committee Report and Recommendation[†]

Description:

The T&P report is advisory in nature. The main purpose of this report is to convey the meaning of the departmental committee’s recommendation. In part, this report is an explanation of the departmental committee’s vote, centered on the candidate’s performance as it relates to his or her suitability for eventual promotion or tenure. If the vote was unanimous, an explanation will simply state that the committee overwhelmingly believed that the candidate’s teaching, research and service showed that the scholar has evidenced appropriate performance for promotion or tenure. The report should make it clear that adequate consideration was given to teaching, research and service (or relevant categories for the particular faculty member appointment), and that the recommendation was based on a set of written and widely circulated tenure and promotion guidelines promulgated by the college and/or department (which are reviewed and updated regularly). A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities, and the committee’s concerns.

[†] Only one report should be submitted, and submitting minority reports is discouraged. However, if this is impossible and a committee must submit minority reports, they will only be accepted if the reports indicate the name(s) of those submitting the minority report(s). Unattributed minority reports will not be accepted.

The report should reflect the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate's case, and the committee's recommended action. For example, "the majority thought the quantity of publications was good, but questioned the quality," or "a minority was concerned about the rate of productivity," or "the research and scholarly publications were excellent but a few committee members expressed concerns about the quality of the teaching." Do not include direct quotes of committee members, or minutes of the meeting. Do make sure that the summary correlates with the vote.

Format & Guidelines (of the Departmental T&P Report):

- ◇ Summarize the most relevant issues explaining the outcome of the vote. A record of votes alone does not document the important issues in the deliberations.
- ◇ Avoid direct quotes, minutes, or transcripts of the proceedings.
- ◇ Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents (although other documents, such as the teaching, research and service reports, may be referred to).
- ◇ Make sure that the committee's recommendations are consistent with evidence of performance as documented in the rest of the dossier.
- ◇ While the T&P departmental recommendation should emphasize a case based on the evidence that supports the recommendation, an explanation of contrary statements in the departmental reports, external letters, or members' votes should be explained and given a sense of the weighting on the overall decision.
- ◇ The committee's report should reflect the committee's acceptance of the conclusions in the analyses filed under *Teaching, Research and Service*. If those analyses do not reflect the deliberations of the committee and the committee's recommendation, then the committee report must explain this.

!All committee members are to know the contents of the committee report. Members should indicate their agreement with what is stated in the report, and that the document reflects their discussion and voting outcome. This could be done by having voting committee members sign the report.

DEPARTMENT HEAD'S PRESENCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee discussions and recommendations regarding candidates should be independent of any administrator's recommendation, opinion, or influence. For this reason, it is recommended that the Department Head not attend the meetings during which the committee is processing a case. However, if the committee wishes to have the Department Head present, and if the department's bylaws make it clear that this may occur, the committee may elect to ask the Department Head to attend. (In this case, the Department Head should be present for meetings on all candidates, not selective ones.)

Item 10: Department Head's Recommendation

Description:

This report gives the Department Head an opportunity, after reviewing reports and recommendations generated by the T&P committee, to convey the rationale that ultimately leads to his or her recommendations for/against tenure and/or promotion. This should include a discussion of the T&P committee's evaluations/recommendations, as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the Department Head wishes to make.

Format & Guidelines:

- ◇ Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case.
- ◇ Provide the context of this particular case within the department.
- ◇ Explain special consideration cases (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances).
- ◇ Explain any mixed or negative votes, if not explained in the committee report.
- ◇ Explain the Department Head's vote—especially if it is contrary to the departmental recommendation.

Item 11: College Committee's Report and Recommendation

Description:

Similar to the Departmental Committee Report (See *Item 9*), this document should reflect the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other.

Item 12: Dean's Recommendation and Summary

Description:

Similar to the Department Head's Report (see *Item 10*). As with that report, the Dean's report is an analysis of the case which should provide a general basis for strength or weakness, explain any mixed or negative votes (if not explained in the College Committee Report), and explain the Dean's vote—especially if it is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations.

! The Dean's report makes an independent determination. The Dean's report should be helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing/quoting other materials in the package. This is especially important for cases that have generated strong differences in recommendation during the evaluation process

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.6.3, "If the dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the department head's recommendation, the dean shall inform the department head and faculty member of the reason for the recommendation."

Reconsideration of a Case

If the Dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the Department Head's recommendation, the Dean shall inform the department head and faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The Department Head may then resubmit the case for further consideration to the Dean. If a case is resubmitted, it shall be re-reviewed by the dean and the college-wide tenure and promotion committee before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics.

Any petition for reconsideration must be based upon either (a) new evidence that is not already contained within the dossier, or (b) substantial and entirely new arguments that were not made in the first presentation.

Item 13: Other Materials and Documentation (optional)

Description:

This section is for any materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process, or letters from TAMU faculty members.

Supportive materials such as the teaching portfolio (if utilized) and copies of books or articles should be retained in the college, and not sent to the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost with the T&P package.

Additions or Changes to the Dossier (if needed)

Additions or changes to the dossier after initial submission may occur at any level of the review and evaluation process. In general, it is advisable to use caution and limit changes to the dossier to additions, updates, or corrections that are substantive in nature. For example, candidates may request to update their CV after learning that a pending grant has been funded, a paper submitted for publication has been accepted, a new contract for a book has been signed, an important recognition has been awarded, etc. In the case of *reconsideration* requests by the department to the dean (see heading, "Reconsideration of a Case", under "*Item 12*" above), the basis for seeking the reconsideration of the case and any supporting materials are considered *additions* to the dossier.

Modifications to the dossier must be clearly marked and documented. For example, a sheet may be inserted into the CV section stating exactly what has changed (such as, "Grant proposal X to NSF, listed as pending, has now been awarded"). The insert should contain a statement that the candidate deems the changes to be accurate as of this date, and should be signed and dated by the candidate.

Changes or additions to the dossier do not trigger nor prohibit re-reviews by evaluation bodies that have already produced a vote based on the older version of the dossier. Therefore, the department or the college (depending where the dossier is at the time the change is introduced) should indicate whether previous evaluation levels re-reviewed the material (e.g., “The department T&P committee reviewed update material on 9/27/09”), along with the results of the re-review (e.g., “The new information did not change the recommendation of the T&P Committee). Re-reviews by previous evaluation levels are rare occurrences, except in cases where the dean is asked to reconsider his/her vote. It is advisable to consult with the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost before requesting or conducting any re-review.

Note: If the report of the previous level is specific in naming a change or addition that would alter their vote from negative to positive, and that change or addition happens, it may not be necessary for that level to re-review. For example, if a Departmental T&P Committee indicated (in the report) that those who voted negatively would--if the candidate had a signed book contract, for example--be persuaded to change to a positive vote, and if that contract came through while the file was at the Dean’s level, the Dean could simply include that in his or her report.

PHOTO SUBMISSION (January) (VI)

Every year, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost cooperate to create a booklet honoring those who receive tenure and/or promotion, including those who have earned the distinction of Distinguished Professor during the current year of consideration.

Photographs of successful candidates must be received by the due date (see chart in Section I) to be included in the booklet.

Colleges may direct their departments to send the booklet bios and photos directly to our office, OR they may request that their departments send all submissions to the college for forwarding as a group. Please make sure that the guidelines below are followed:

Photographs

For best results, the photograph should be a head or upper-body shot in which the head is 1” high. Electronic (digital) photos are preferred, but should be a minimum of 300 dpi.

!Please do not copy and send website photographs (their quality in the printed booklet will be poor).

Email photographs as separate .jpg files. You are encouraged to refer to the previous year’s booklet for examples of biographies and photographs. Contact the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost (see Section VIII: Resources) if you would like for us to send you a copy.

Send electronic photographs and biographies for the booklet to Erin Schneider, Program Coordinator, erinschneider@tamu.edu

Photos sent for the recognition booklet are not part of the dossier and will not be included with any materials forwarded for tenure or promotion consideration.

PROCESS INFORMATION (VII)

- A. *Committee Proceedings (Department and College)*
- B. *Notifying Candidates of Tenure/Promotion Recommendations*
- C. *Candidate's Right to Withdraw*
- D. *Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review & the Probationary Period*
 - Mandatory Review (Penultimate Year)
 - Non Reappointment
 - The "Tenure Clock" (Probationary Period)
 - Extensions to the Probationary Period
 - Reconsideration in the Terminal Year
- E. *Departments' and Colleges' Written Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion*
- F. *Early Promotion and Tenure*
- G. *Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments*
- H. *Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotions*
- I. *Faculty Members Hired Before Terminal Degree Was Issued*

A. *Committee Proceedings (Department and College)*

- Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence.
- In presenting cases for tenure and/or promotion, departments should make clear any distinctive expectations that have existed with respect to particular candidates, which therefore should be brought to bear in the review. If a case is to be reviewed according to atypical criteria, that fact must be made clear in the presentation of the file. (See paragraph 4.5.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2—Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.) In cases for promotion to full professor, please make the basis for the argument for excellence clear.
- Promotion and tenure are matters of central concern to many faculty members and to the university. Failure to provide and adhere to criteria for the granting of tenure and promotion can do long-term damage to a department and college, and certainly a negative decision can do long-term damage to an individual's career. The process must uphold high standards and at the same time observe scrupulous standards of fairness.
- Department Heads, Deans and committees should take care to consult the University's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion to be thoroughly familiar with criteria for tenure and/or promotion by rank, and with procedures.

B. Notifying Candidates of Tenure/Promotion Recommendations

Candidates should be advised of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion *at each level of review*. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If it is requested by the faculty member, the statement of reasons will be provided (usually by the Department Head) after the Board of Regents has ruled on the University's tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

The following chart outlines the notification process. Notification should be made as soon as possible after a recommendation is made at a given level.

<u>Level of Review</u>	<u>Notification Procedure</u>
Department Committee	Department Head notifies candidate upon receipt of committee recommendation
Department Head	Department Head notifies candidate upon submission of recommendation to the Dean
College Committee	Dean notifies Department Head upon receipt of the committee's recommendation; Department Head notifies candidate.
Dean	Dean notifies Department Head upon submission of recommendation to the Provost, by way of the Dean of Faculties. Department Head notifies Candidate.
Provost	Dean of Faculties notifies Dean, who notifies Department Head, who notifies candidate.
President	President notifies Provost. Dean of Faculties notifies Dean, who notifies Department Head, who notifies candidate.
Board of Regents	Dean of Faculties notifies Dean, who notifies Department Head, who notifies candidate.

The official decision by the Board of Regents regarding the granting of tenure and/or promotion of a faculty member will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member as soon as possible after the Board of Regents has officially acted on the President's recommendations.

C. Candidate's Right to Withdraw

At any point in the process, a candidate may elect to withdraw his or her name from further consideration. This must be a written request. In the case of mandatory tenure considerations, this will mean submitting a written resignation.

D. Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Probationary Period

Note: Guidelines on annual and mid-term (3-year) reviews have been relegated to a separate set of guidelines that is available from the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

Mandatory Review (Penultimate Year)

These Tenure and Promotion Guidelines focus primarily on procedures for the Mandatory (penultimate year) review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required; however, conducting the review earlier is often appropriate, and encouraged. (If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for promotion and tenure, a review is conducted again at the mandatory time.)

Although the Department Head should initiate the mandatory review process, if they do not, any faculty member who is in their next-to-last year of probationary service should notify the Department Head that the year for a tenure judgment has been reached. This communication should be made in writing in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the matter by any party.

The timing of penultimate year reviews is illustrated in the table in the next section.

Non Reappointment

Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year contracts, a decision not to reappoint an individual who is on probation can be made any time up to the year of the mandatory review. Non-reappointment should be considered if performance is unsatisfactory to the point that it is clearly unlikely the person will qualify for tenure, as neither party benefits from prolonging an unsatisfactory situation. Such a decision is made, of course, with great care and only in compelling circumstances. Please note that notification of non-renewal may be made in spite of a prior decision to extend the probationary period. However, once notification of non-renewal is made, no probationary period extension may be requested.

Please see University Rule 12.01.99.M2 or the *Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review* (published by the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost) for details regarding required notification procedures for non reappointment.

The “Tenure Clock” (Timing of Reviews)

The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Fall semester of Tenure Consideration Year (e.g., regardless of month, contracted start date is in 2004 + 7 years of probation – 2 years = 2009. The mandatory review will start in Fall 08; if successful, the regents will grant tenure in Spring 2010, and the promotion and tenure will become effective in September, 2009).

Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. The timing of this depends upon the length of the probationary period (see chart below).

For example--For a faculty member **hired in calendar year 2006:**

If probationary period is:	Mid-Term Review will occur between:	Mandatory Tenure Review (at all levels) will occur:
7 years	Mar – Dec 2009 (due 09/10)	2011/12
6 years	Mar – Dec 2009 (due 09/10)	2010/11
5 years	Mar – Dec 2008 (due 08/09)	2009/10
4 years	Mar – Dec 2007 (but usually not done)	2008/09
3 years	N/A	2007/08

NOTES:

- (1) The semester of hire does not determine the start of the “Tenure Clock.”
- (2) The length of the probationary period will be found in the faculty member’s original letter of hire.
- (3) The Board of Regents will review recommendations in the spring semester of the tenure review (academic) year.
- (4) See the separate Guidelines for Annual and Midterm Reviews for more information about midterm review timing.

Extensions to the Probationary Period

Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member, recommendation by the Department Head and Dean, and approval by the Dean of Faculties.

Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances. Any extension greater than one year must be approved by the Provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases:

- The faculty member is taking leave without pay, or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year, provided the leave is not taken solely for the purpose of pursuing activities that will enhance the faculty member's qualifications for tenure and promotion.
- The faculty member has encountered circumstances that may seriously impede progress toward demonstrating qualification for the award of tenure and promotion. Such circumstances might include (but are not limited to):
 - serious illness or injury
 - having responsibility for the primary care of an infant or small child
 - having responsibility for the primary care of a close relative who is disabled elderly or seriously ill
 - any serious disruption of the probationary period for unexpected reasons beyond the faculty member's control

The above guidelines for extension were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President of the University.

Reconsideration in the Terminal Year

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department and with the agreement of the Dean and the Provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration. The Dean of Faculties will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.

E. Departments' and Colleges' Written Guidelines for Tenure & Promotion

University Rule 12.01.99.M2—Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (SAFRT) requires that each college and the Libraries develop written guidelines describing their own evaluation criteria in accordance with those specified for the University. Departments should also have written guidelines. The rule states that **guidelines should be redistributed to faculty at least every three years**, and steps should be taken to ensure that faculty are thoroughly familiar with these guidelines. For the sake of openness of process and the maintenance of an atmosphere of trust, it is also advisable to announce the names of members of college and departmental evaluation committees on an annual basis.

A copy of each department's and college's guidelines for tenure and promotion should be forwarded electronically to Erin Schneider, Program Coordinator, on an annual basis. They may be sent to erinschneider@tamu.edu.

Each department must publish its annual review procedure on paper or electronically, and the annual review procedures for the department must be approved by the respective college dean

and the Dean of Faculties, for the sake of consistency. The creation and modification of the annual review document should be a product of joint deliberation by faculty members and the Department Head. If there is no need for department specific guidelines, a college-wide document, developed jointly by faculty and administrators, and reviewed by the Dean of Faculties, is sufficient. The annual review procedure document must include the following information:

- The Period of Evaluation (may be longer than one year—see SAFRT sec. 2.5.2.)
- Aspects of Performance to be evaluated, as appropriate for each job title
- Annual Activity Report Format and Content Expectations. Examples of possible content of the report include:
 - a statement of assigned duties, consistent with the appointment letter or position description
 - a list of activities, accomplishments and awards
 - documentation, including such items as course syllabi, evidence of student learning, published papers or books, evidence of effectiveness in service, teaching portfolio, etc.
 - self-evaluation in the context of the assigned duties of the faculty member and the missions of the department and University
 - a statement of goals
- The Basis for Evaluation. All sources of information to be used for the evaluation must be specified (e.g. annual activity report, personal observation by evaluator, discussions with colleagues, students or others, student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, etc.)
- Timeline and Procedures for Evaluation
- Complaint Procedures

F. Early Promotion and Tenure

Since tenure and promotion are linked for individuals hired as Assistant Professors (or instructors), a recommendation for early promotion must be coupled with a recommendation for early tenure, and vice-versa.

G. Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments

University Rule 12.01.99.M2—Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (SAFRT), sections 4.6.2.1. and 4.6.2.2., indicate that faculty members having joint appointments (if funded) or having appointments with interdisciplinary (intercollegiate) faculties are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the secondary unit as well as the ADLOC department. This should be done in accordance with the guidelines from both departments/units. Each unit must have guidelines governing faculty review, promotion and tenure (and these guidelines must be approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, and reviewed by that office whenever significant changes are made to them).

In the case of joint appointments involving more than one college, both Deans (and both college level promotion and tenure committees) provide recommendations to the Provost. In the case of interdisciplinary faculty, the additional review and evaluation must be sought early enough to allow it to become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental T&P committee. The report by the committee of an interdisciplinary faculty may consist simply of a letter including comments on teaching, research, service, and intercollegiate cooperation.

H. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotions

The review process for non-tenure track faculty (such as Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, or Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor) is very similar to that of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and is on the same timetable (e.g. follow the schedule and timelines in Section I). Non-tenure track promotion packages should not be forwarded outside of the regular tenure and promotion timetable.

The process is unique, however, in the following ways:

- ◇ Outside letters are not required (although they may be included if desired). It is recognized that some of those in non-tenure track appointments do not have external visibility.
- ◇ The weighting of teaching, research and promotion may differ significantly from what is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty. The categories of *Teaching*, *Research* and *Service* may in fact be changed to more appropriately reflect the individual's responsibilities and to reflect the evaluation guidelines developed by the college and/or department (regarding those positions).
- ◇ Non-tenure track packages do not require Board of Regents approval.

Non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion will submit a dossier for review, organized in the way described in Section V of this document (with outside letters being optional). Committee reports and Department Head and/or Dean's reports should make clear the criteria and weighting used for the consideration. Each college may have its own (approved & published) criteria for reviewing non tenure track packages. In most cases, after being forwarded from the department, non-tenure track promotion packages will be submitted for review and a decision from the College Dean. Non-tenure track packages will then go forward to the Associate Provost, Provost, President, and Chancellor.

I. Faculty Members Hired Before Terminal Degree Has Been Issued

New faculty members hired as instructors because they have not yet received a terminal degree may be promoted to Assistant Professor upon receipt of that degree without a tenure decision being made. Instructor titles are tenure accruing. If the unit wishes the tenure clock not to start until the person obtains the terminal degree, the faculty member needs must be given a non-tenure track title.

If hiring paperwork was previously sent to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost Office that indicated the hire would be at the level of Assistant Professor conditional upon receipt of the degree, the Dean of Faculties will only require a memo indicating that this has occurred. If the individual was officially hired at the level of instructor, then all appropriate paperwork for a hire at the level of Assistant Professor must be filled out and submitted to the Dean of Faculties before the promotion may occur.

RESOURCES (VIII)

Questions about the organization, processing, and submission of the dossiers, file sets and T&P Recognition Booklet materials should be directed to:

Erin Schneider
Program Coordinator
Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
Henderson Hall 114
1126 TAMU
(979) 845-4274
erinschneider@tamu.edu

Questions about the tenure and promotion evaluation process may be directed to:

Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
or Associate Dean of Faculties
Henderson Hall 114
1126 TAMU
(979) 845-4274

Note: Colleges may have submission requirements and guidelines that do not contradict but complement these printed guidelines. Please, refer also to your college guidelines and college's T&P coordinator for direction.