

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND REVIEWS**  
**MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL**  
**TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY**  
 December 2004

CONTENTS:	Page
Purposes of this Document	1
Dimensions and Indicators of Performance	1
Faculty Ranks and performance expectations	5
Annual Review Process	7
Third Year Review Process	9
Promotion and Tenure EXPECTATIONS AND TIME FRAMES	10
Promotion and Tenure Process	11
Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process	15
Post Tenure Review Process	18
Faculty Workload Guidelines	21
ABD Faculty Appointment Process	23
Appendix 1: Promotion Dossier	24
APPENDIX 2: APPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURE-ACCRUING FACULTY	28

### **Purposes of this Document**

This document provides guidelines for faculty appointments, annual reviews, promotion, tenure, and other pertinent elements of the professional employment relationship in Mays Business School. These guidelines follow from and support the vision, missions, and core values of Mays Business School. In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University or Texas A&M System policies, rules, and procedures, the University or System statements take precedence.

The missions and goals of the University and Mays are not static. It is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. It is, however, necessary, desirable, and feasible to establish a general set of guidelines and criteria for different faculty positions that are congruent with the missions, goals, and core values of both Mays and the University.

This document is also designed to serve as the basis for discussions between faculty members and their Department Heads regarding the setting of individual annual and long-term goals that best meet Mays and University missions and goals. The formal communication regarding a faculty member's progress is typically the direct responsibility of the Department Head and is to include written documentation for the faculty's personnel file.

### **Dimensions and Indicators of Performance**

The three major dimensions of faculty performance are (1) creation and dissemination of new knowledge via research and publication, (2) instruction/teaching, and (3) service to the institution, the profession, and

external constituencies. The accumulation of activities alone does not constitute desirable performance. Rather, it is the quality of accomplishments that is crucial. Mays Business School defines and recognizes three levels of performance in each area.

- *Excellent performance*: a high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations and which is reflected by substantive indicators of performance excellence as described in the next section
- *Effective Performance*: acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations and which is reflected by substantive indicators of performance effectiveness as described in the next section
- *Unsatisfactory Performance*: unacceptable performance that fails to meet norms and expectations and which is reflected by an absence of indicators of performance excellence or effectiveness

Mays Business School also recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance, that performance indicators will vary over time for any individual, and that they will vary over time for individuals at different career stages.

The sections that follow provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each of the three dimensions of performance. By definition, a complete absence of any indicators of excellence and effectiveness for a performance dimension implies unsatisfactory performance along that dimension. Further, some indicators do not clearly fall into a single area. For instance, successfully working with doctoral students has both research and teaching connotations, while involvement in executive development programs has both teaching and service connotations. These activities are classified into a single area, but their relation to other areas should be recognized as appropriate.

## **Research and Publication**

Indicators of *excellence* in research and publication include the following examples:

- Publication in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of acclaimed scholarly book(s).
- Publication of acclaimed practitioner book(s).
- Frequent citation of publications.
- Editorship of a major journal(s).
- Editorship of highly-regarded scholarly book.
- Associate editorship or section editorship of major journal(s).
- Receipt of major fellowship, research, or publication award(s).
- Membership on editorial board of a major journal(s).
- Receipt of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research. (See section note )
- Membership on review panel(s) for national or international research organization(s).
- Invitation to present showcase or keynote paper or address at important international and national conferences.
- Invitation to present research at peer and/or aspirational schools.
- Chair of doctoral student committees.

- Placement of doctoral students or postdoctoral students into significant academic, scholarly, and/or professional positions.
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to doctoral student development.

Indicators of *effectiveness* in research and publication include the following examples:

- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines.
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are widely recognized.
- Publication of a respected professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at national or international conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
- Consistent membership on doctoral student committees.
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings.
- Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
- Significant self-development activities such as a faculty development leave. (See section note)

Recognizing that collaboration in research and publication is both normal and desirable, Mays Business School also encourages the demonstration of research leadership. Such leadership may be evidenced by such things as occasional single-authored works and/or a balance of authoring order on publications in disciplines where the order of authorship conveys information regarding relative contribution.

Section Note: External funding of research may be an indicator of excellence when such funding results in the publication of high-quality research. Likewise, while receiving a faculty development leave can be an indicator of effectiveness, it is the product of the leave that will carry the greatest weight. That is, receiving external funding and/or a leave per se are not direct performance indicators, but will be positively considered if they result in research publications.

### **Instruction/Teaching**

Indicators of *excellence* in instruction/teaching include the following examples:

- Selection for peer reviewed University, Mays, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards (such as the Association of Former Students award).
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period of time as evidenced by outstanding student ratings, interviews with students and student leaders, and outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction). Such evaluations need to be considered in relation to course expectations (documented through course syllabi), grading practices in relation to comparable course levels/sections or other factors, and the like.
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high quality online (distance learning) courses.

- High-quality contributions to flagship Mays instructional programs.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Major contributions to the development of new instructional programs.
- Publications with teaching/instruction focus in refereed journals.
- Receiving significant peer-reviewed external funding for teaching/instruction.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Development and/or coordination of successful new executive development programs.

In combination with assessments of quality from department heads, students, faculty peer reviews, and other sources, indicators of *effectiveness* in instruction/teaching include the following examples:

- Selection of student awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.
- Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, and student interaction.
- Supervision of independent student projects.
- Coordination of multi-section courses.
- Significant contributions to student development through student advising and mentoring, including service as a departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that led to increased teaching effectiveness.
- Participation in the Mays/University Honors Program and/or programs for mentoring the professional development of students.
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching.
- Presentations in executive development programs.

## Service

Indicators of *excellence* in service include the following examples:

- Officer in a national/international professional organization.
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting.
- Administrative leadership role within Mays or the University.
- Officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Chair of a major University committee or task force.
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, Mays, University, or system administrative or service roles.
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, or board.
- Attraction of significant external financial support.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.

Indicators of *effectiveness* in service include the following examples:

- Committee chair of national/international professional organization.
- Officer in regional or state professional organization.
- Program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organization meeting.
- Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on University, Mays, and department committees and task forces.
- Contribution to external development efforts.
- Advisor to student organizations.
- Administrative roles within the department.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

## **Faculty Ranks AND PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS**

In general, Mays faculty positions can be divided into two categories: tenure-accruing/tenured and non-tenure-accruing.

### **Tenure-Accruing/Tenured Faculty Positions**

**Assistant Professor** Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and Mays academic needs. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

**Associate Professor** Associate Professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate effectiveness in all three performance dimensions. In addition, excellence is expected in instruction/teaching or research and publication. Associate Professors, relative to Assistant Professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service effectiveness and excellence. Promotion to Professor will be based on an assessment of all three-performance dimensions, with research and publication typically carrying the heaviest weight. The requirements for promotion to Professor in Mays Business School recognize and exceed the University's minimum requirements.

**Professor** Professors are expected to demonstrate leadership in the pursuit of excellence and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as: (1) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; (2) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development; (3) leadership in contributing to the body of knowledge; (4) leadership in the development of junior faculty.

While there may be significant diversity in the nature of the contributions by Professors, there is continued expectation of examples of excellence in one or more performance areas. Merit compensation will be the primary extrinsic means of recognizing such excellence. Another potential means of recognition is through consideration for appointment to an endowed position. Endowed positions are discussed later in this

document.

**Distinguished Professor** The rank of Distinguished Professor is not a Mays but a University rank. To be eligible for consideration for promotion to Distinguished Professor, the individual will have made one and possibly more major contributions that have redirected the flow of research or scholarship in the relevant field. Thus, quality and impact are critical criteria for evaluation. Individuals will also normally be recognized, by peer statement, to be among the top 5% of active researchers in their area of research or scholarship on an international basis.

### **Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Positions**

**Lecturer** This is an entry-level position for part- and full-time instructors who will typically have the following profile:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- Contributions to Mays expected to relate primarily to instruction (broadly defined)

Individuals holding this rank will have annual contracts (or less). Only those with exceptional records will be considered for promotion. (See Appendix 2 for additional information.)

**Senior Lecturer** This is a position for individuals who have served a minimum of five years at the rank of Lecturer and are judged to be deserving of promotion. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A graduate degree and/or commensurate experience
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction

Individuals holding this rank will have annual contracts and must be given one-year advance notification if they are not going to be reappointed.

**Clinical Assistant Professor** This is an entry-level position for full time non-tenure track faculty who will typically have the following profile:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- Contributions to Mays expected to relate primarily to instruction (broadly defined); may also be expected to contribute in other areas as relevant (such as advising and/or working with student organizations)

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to three years. Only those with exceptional records will be considered for promotion at an appropriate time. Clinical Assistant Professors will have the same employment protection as Lecturers.

**Clinical Associate Professor** This is a position for individuals who have served a minimum of five years at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor and are judged to be worthy of promotion. It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of Associate Professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction
- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to three years; they must be given one-year advance notification beyond the terminal date of their most current contract if they are not going to be reappointed. Those with exceptional records may be considered for promotion at an appropriate time.

**Clinical Professor** This is a position for individuals who have served a minimum of five years at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor and are judged to be worthy of promotion. It may also be appropriate for individuals who have achieved the rank of Professor at another institution. They will typically have the following profile and qualifications:

- A terminal degree in the area of specialization (i.e., Ph.D. in a business discipline, J.D. for legal instruction, etc.)
- A record of exemplary teaching effectiveness and excellence
- Additional contributions to the educational mission of Mays beyond classroom instruction
- Additional contributions to other areas as relevant

Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one to three years; they must be given one-year advance notification beyond the terminal date of their most current contract if they are not going to be reappointed.

**Executive Professor** The position of Executive Professor is for individuals who have had distinguished careers in the private sector and/or government service. Individuals holding this rank will have contracts ranging in duration from one semester to one year.

**Visiting Positions** Finally, it may periodically be useful and/or necessary to temporarily employ faculty on a visiting basis. In such cases the appropriate title will be their current title preceded by the word "visiting."

### **Annual Review Process**

The performance of all Mays faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis. This annual review will typically occur in the spring of each year so as to coincide with the University deadlines for such activities. There are occasions, however, when an individual's overall record may be assessed at another time, the most obvious situations being third-year reviews and promotion and/or tenure reviews, all of which are normally

performed in the fall. When an individual has been reviewed in this manner, the subsequent annual process can be compressed by referencing the earlier review.

The purposes of the annual performance review include:

- Creating a sound and logical basis for merit compensation recommendations
- Providing evaluative feedback regarding how well the individual is currently performing relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position
- Providing developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved in the future
- Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure as relevant

Each year the Department Head will request information from each faculty member in his/her department pertaining to faculty performance activities and indicators for the preceding year. All tenure-accruing/tenured faculty will use a common reporting mechanism developed and approved by the Mays Executive Committee. Department Heads have the discretion to request additional information for their own internal use. Department Heads also have the discretion to use the same mechanism to request information from faculty in non-tenure-accruing positions or to use an alternative method to request their performance-related information.

At a minimum, all tenured faculty in a department will be given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the performance of Assistant Professors and all Professors will be given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the performance of Associate Professors. The Department Head will provide each faculty member with written assessment (with appropriate department faculty input) of that individual's performance. This document will be discussed by the individual and the Department Head; both individuals will also sign the document and a copy placed in the individual's personnel file. If desired, a faculty member may submit a written response and request that it also be placed in the file.

The review of faculty in non-tenure-accruing faculty positions will be the sole responsibility of the Department Head. The Head will review measures of faculty performance relevant to the contractual expectations of each individual faculty in such positions. An assessment of performance will then be made and discussed with the faculty member. A performance feedback letter will also be prepared, signed by both the faculty member and the Department Head, and a copy placed in the individual's personnel file.

It should also be noted that Assistant Professors have annual contracts until such time as they successfully achieve promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. This employment contract takes precedence over time frames specified in their probationary agreements and other contextual communication. If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to meet the expectations for promotion with tenure, that individual will not be recommended for any further appointment beyond the period for which the University is already committed.

During the merit salary review period, each Department Head will submit salary recommendations to the Office of the Dean. Such recommendations must be accompanied by (1) a copy of the most recent reporting form completed by the faculty member, (2) a current vita for the faculty member, (3) a copy of the feedback

document provided to the faculty member, and (4) a form developed and approved by the Mays Executive Committee on which the Department Head provides his/her own specific assessment of the individual's performance along each of the three dimensions plus an assessment of overall performance.

With appropriate justification, Department Heads can use a compensatory model to assess overall faculty performance (for merit increase purposes only). For instance, all else equal, a faculty member with no indicators of research excellence or effectiveness must by definition receive an unsatisfactory assessment of research performance. However, the same individual may also have multiple indicators of teaching excellence and thus be evaluated as excellent in instruction. If this mix of activities is in the best interest of the department and has the support of the Department Head, she/he may use excellence in instruction to offset unsatisfactory performance in research and evaluate the individual's overall performance as effective or excellent. Note that this compensatory model applies only to annual reviews, however, but not to promotion and/or tenure decisions.

### **Third Year Review Process**

In addition to the normal annual review, at the end of a tenure-accruing Assistant Professor's third year on the Mays Business School faculty he/she will receive a more detailed and comprehensive review. This review will focus on:

- The individual's instructional performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's research and publication performance during the first three years of employment
- The individual's service performance during the first three years of employment
- An explicit statement of whether the individual is on, above, or below trajectory for a positive tenure decision at the appropriate time
- An explicit statement of what area(s) of performance, if any, is/are of concern

This review will take place during the fall semester following the completion of the individual's third year on the faculty and will follow the same basic timetable as the promotion and tenure process for that academic year. The individual faculty member will be responsible for assembling a dossier of teaching, research, and service contributions for review. To the extent possible this dossier should mirror those required for promotion consideration (with the exception of outside letters).

The tenured department faculty and the Department Head will first review the individual's dossier. Separate feedback memoranda will be prepared by a representative of the tenured department faculty and by the Department Head. These memoranda should directly address the five points identified above.

The Department Head will be responsible for meeting with the individual and reviewing and discussing both feedback memoranda, which will then be added to the dossier. Copies of the dossier will then be transmitted to the Mays Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T). The P&T Committee will conduct its own review and provide written feedback to the faculty member. That feedback letter will also be added to the dossier.

Finally, the dossier will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean. The Dean and Executive Associate Dean

will then meet with each individual. During this meeting, they will provide their own feedback to the individual and answer questions/address concerns or issues raised by the individual. A summary memorandum of this meeting will subsequently be added to the dossier and returned to the individual. Complete copies of the dossier will also be retained by the Department Head and in the Office of the Dean.

## **Promotion and Tenure EXPECTATIONS AND TIME FRAMES**

### **Assistant Professors Being Considered For Promotion To Associate Professor (with tenure)**

Performance Expectations Assistant Professors are expected, at a minimum, to be effective in instruction/teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and college academic needs. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight. The requirements for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Mays recognize and exceed the University's minimum requirements. The minimum requirements for Mays include the following:

- An overall exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field.
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University.
- Pattern over time of some indication of effectiveness in service.
- Pattern over time of effectiveness in instruction/teaching.
- Pattern over time of excellence (and effectiveness) in research and publication.
- High potential for continued excellence.

Time Frame The consideration of promotion to Associate Professor and tenure decisions is normally linked. The probationary period for an Assistant Professor will be addressed in the initial offer of employment. The maximum probationary period for tenure is seven years, with up to three years credit given for tenure track experience at another University.

The University's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure indicates that in "rare cases the probationary period may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the Department Head, Dean, and the Dean of Faculties." However, such extensions are almost never given in the year of mandatory consideration for tenure.

The University guidelines specify the special and unique circumstances for considering an extension of the probationary period.

In general, assistant professors should expect to complete their full probationary period at their entry rank. (The actual review and decision process, of course, begins the preceding year.) An individual who compiles an unusually strong and distinguished record of achievement may request early consideration. Consideration for early promotion must be coupled with consideration for early tenure and vice versa. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration is strongly encouraged to consult with her/his

Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the Office of the Dean before making a formal request for consideration.

### **Associate Professors Being Considered For Promotion To Professor**

Performance Expectations Associate Professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate continued effectiveness on all three performance dimensions. In addition, excellence is expected in research and publication (see note below regarding instruction and teaching). Associate Professors, relative to Assistant Professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in one or more of the areas of service. Promotion to Professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions, with research and publication typically carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for Mays Business School include the following:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in his or her field.
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Mays Business School and Texas A&M University.
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of excellence and effectiveness in research and publication.
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of effectiveness and/or excellence in instruction and teaching.
- Continuing accomplishment and pattern over time of effectiveness and/or excellence in service.

Time Frame Promotion to Professor will be based on cumulative contributions, with special attention given to accomplishments since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. A minimum of five years at the Associate level is generally required to establish eligibility for consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor; typically a faculty member will require a longer period to compile a record sufficient to warrant consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor. At the same time, an individual who compiles an unusually strong and distinguished record of achievement may request early consideration. An individual contemplating asking for early consideration is strongly encouraged to consult with her/his Department Head, senior members of the departmental faculty, and the Office of the Dean before making a formal request for consideration.

Note: In truly exceptional cases, an individual may be recommended for promotion to Professor on the basis of outstanding instruction and teaching and/or service. In such cases, however, thorough and rigorous documentation will be required to justify consideration of an exception to the normal research standards. Further, such an individual should expect to spend substantially more time at the rank of Associate Professor before consideration will be given for promotion to the rank of Professor. It is also important to recognize that any such case must be truly exceptional in nature. For instance, achieving positive student ratings over a period of several years, and in the absence of numerous other indicators, does not by itself constitute an exceptional case on the basis of instruction and teaching. In addition to the normal review process for promotion cases, the Mays Executive Committee will also review the case and make its own recommendation to the Dean.

## **PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Initiating the Process**

Department Heads initiate the process for individuals wishing to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor by soliciting self-nominations. In the case of the mandatory year of consideration for an untenured faculty, no nomination is necessary. A request for consideration for early promotion to Associate Professor also must be accompanied by a request for consideration of early tenure. After discussing the process and clarifying expectations with the Department Head, an individual wishing to exercise their option to be considered will prepare a dossier according to Mays and University requirements. Individuals in their mandatory year for consideration must also prepare a dossier. Current dossier standards are found in Appendix 1. However, the University frequently changes its requirements for dossiers; individuals are responsible for insuring that they follow the most current University guidelines.

**Role of the Candidate** As noted, it is the primary responsibility of the candidate to draft/prepare the basic information/data for the dossier in accordance with Mays and University requirements. As one part of the dossier, the candidate is to supply in concise form (a maximum of three pages, single spaced) a statement of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in teaching, research, and service and other accomplishments relevant to the position.

**Role of Departmental Faculty** Departmental faculty review is the first internal step in the process of evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The departmental tenure and promotion committee(s) is subject to the following parameters:

- All tenured Associate Professors and Professors in a department will comprise the departmental tenure and promotion committee for faculty under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in that department.
- All faculty members at the rank of Professor in a department will comprise the departmental tenure and promotion committee for candidates for promotion to Professor in that department.
- Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence.
- Committee recommendations are advisory in nature.

The departmental review process must include a faculty peer review of classroom teaching and instructional materials. For Assistant Professors, this review should occur, at a minimum, during the third year at that rank as part of the third year review; it should be repeated in the fourth year if there are any concerns raised during the third year review. For Associate Professors, the review may occur early in the year of consideration.

A senior faculty member should be selected as secretary. The secretary has the responsibility to record in writing the departmental tenure and promotion committee's recommendation. This recommendation should be based on a secret vote taken of the committee and communicate the actual final vote. The secretary should take appropriate steps to insure that she/he accurately conveys the richness of discussion, including positive and negative points. The authorship of evaluation reports should be clearly indicated. This recommendation is added to the dossier after being submitted to the Department Head.

Role of Department Head The Department Head is responsible for obtaining outside letters and responding to candidates' questions as they initially develop their dossiers. The Head will attend the departmental tenure and promotion committee meeting to fully understand the richness of discussion and the outcomes from the deliberations. The Head will serve as a facilitator and coordinator during the deliberations. The Head is also encouraged to serve as an information resource both proactively and reactively. For example, if inaccurate statements are made, it is expected and assumed that the Head will share information to assist in clarifying or presenting the facts. The Head will not serve in the role of championing any of the faculty members being considered for promotion to associate professor or professor and/or tenure. The Head (and Dean, if relevant) will not vote at the departmental level.

After receiving the departmental faculty recommendation, the Department Head will also provide her/his personal and independent recommendation to the Dean. Both the department recommendation and the Head's recommendation will be added to the dossier and forwarded to the Office of the Dean for review by the Mays P&T committee. If the Head's recommendation is different from the departmental committee, he/she must explain in his/her recommendation the reasons for the difference.

Role of the Promotion and Tenure Review Advisory Committee (P&T) The P&T committee is composed of seven voting members—one elected (full) Professor from each academic department and two at-large members appointed by the Dean—and one ex officio (non-voting) member who is appointed by the Dean and serves as the Chair. Tenured (full) Professors, with the exception of Mays and University administrators (Department Head and above), are eligible for election/appointment to the P&T committee. All tenured faculty members holding academic rank within a particular department are eligible to vote for that department's representative. Members of the P&T will normally serve three year staggered terms. The P&T committee will review all promotion and tenure cases and will transmit in writing its recommendations and vote to the Dean.

Role of the P&T Chair The Chair of the P&T committee serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member who is appointed by the Dean and normally serves a three-year term. The Chair will serve as a facilitator, moderator, and coordinator of the process. The Chair will not be an active participant in the substantive discussions on whether a person should or should not be promoted or tenured. The chair will draft the memos of recommendation for submission to the Dean based on the views of the voting members, including any minority perspectives. Each memo of recommendation to the Dean is to be signed by all voting members.

Role of Executive Associate Dean The Executive Associate Dean will insure that the dossiers for candidates for tenure and/or promotion are provided to the P&T members and that the Mays review process is completed within the required time frame as stipulated by the Provost's Office. The Executive Associate Dean will insure that elections (through the Department Heads) and appointments to the P&T committee are completed on a timely basis.

The Executive Associate Dean and/or Dean will also be available, at the discretion of the department, to attend the departmental review process in order to capture the richness of the discussion of the candidates. This participation may consist of attendance throughout the peer review process or a briefing by the departmental faculty involved in the review process at the conclusion of the departmental evaluations.

Role of the Dean After the P&T committee has completed its deliberations; the candidate's dossier will be submitted to the Dean. The dossier at this point must include the following:

- All materials originally created and/or obtained for inclusion in the dossier.
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by the P&T committee (with its vote).
- Written reports and recommendations prepared by departmental committee (with its vote).
- Written recommendation of the Department Head.

The Dean's summary assessment of a candidate is to be an independent evaluation. If the Dean does not concur with the Department Head's recommendation, he or she will inform the Department Head of the reasons for that recommendation and the Department Head will inform the departmental tenure and promotion committee. The departmental committee will then have an opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have been properly enclosed with the dossier and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. In the event that germane new evidence is introduced or new and different arguments are proposed, the committee may submit a newly organized case for reconsideration at the school level.

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 the candidate of the reasons for the recommendation. The faculty member will then have the opportunity to offer a stronger case for tenure and/or promotion. This case will be reviewed by the Dean and the P&T committee before a final recommendation is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost through the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties.

Time Table On a year-by-year basis, the University timetable will determine the specific dates for promotion and tenure recommendations. The approximate timetable is as follows:

- June—Nominations due
- June-September—Preparation of file, receipt of external reviews
- September-October (first week)—Departmental reviews
- October (end of first week)—Departmental recommendations to the Dean
- October-November (first week)—Mays P&T committee makes assessments
- November (second week)—Mays P&T committee submits recommendations to Dean
- December (second week)—Dean submits recommendations to the Provost by sending complete files to the Dean of Faculties
- January—Dean meets and reviews recommendations with the Provost and Dean of Faculties
- February—Provost forwards recommendations to President. Presidents forwards recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the Texas A&M University
- March—Board of Regents reviews recommendations and make final decisions
- September 1—Tenure and promotion decisions become effective

To meet this time table, departments need to have their review processes and the faculty dossiers completed by the first week of October. There can be considerable lead time involved in obtaining external letters of reference and in compiling the required data. Thus, the departmental review process should request external

letters early in June, at the latest.

### **Faculty Notification During Promotion and Tenure Process**

A faculty member shall 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 requested by the faculty member, a statement of reasons will be provided by the Department Head (or Dean) after the Board of Regents has ruled on the University's tenure and/or promotion recommendation.

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 tenure and/or promotion recommendation.

At any point in the process a candidate may elect to withdraw his/her name from further consideration by submitting a written request. If an Assistant Professor facing mandatory review wishes to withdraw, she or he may do so; however, the request must be accompanied by a letter of resignation. By policy, a faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at each level of review. The University specifies rather formal and (in some cases) complex channels for communicating with faculty candidates. In Mays Business School, either the Department Head or the Dean may communicate with the candidate as each deems appropriate.

### **Tenure Appeals**

Except for the appeal procedure built into the Mays review process, official policy states that persons not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the following pertains:

Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on adequate consideration of the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination. If a faculty member alleges such a violation, he/she should discuss the matter with the Department Head and, if necessary, the Dean.

If the matter cannot be resolved, the faculty member may seek a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure by following the procedures outlined in Section 9.1.3. of the University's Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.

### **Endowed Position Appointment and Review Process**

The three principal categories of endowments used in support of faculty scholars in Mays Business School: (1) endowed chairs, (2) endowed professorships, and (3) endowed faculty fellowships. In all instances, the selection criteria for appointments to endowed faculty positions, as well as budgetary approvals, will reflect the stated priorities and restrictions established when the position was created.

### **Descriptions of Endowed Positions**

*Endowed Chair* The holder of an endowed chair should be considered as receiving one of the highest honors that can be bestowed on a faculty member. The highest level of performance, and national and international recognition of that performance, are inherent guidelines for appointment of a chair holder. The institutional expectation of unquestionable excellence in at least one of the three professional performance dimensions (research, teaching, and service) must be met in addition to any specific criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Gift agreements with donors may specify the criteria for a position; however, in the absence of such specification research and publication will be given primary consideration. The appointment to an endowed chair may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruitment of a new faculty member. In all appointments, excellence should be evidenced by several years of outstanding performance based on national and international standards.

*Endowed Professorship* The holder of an endowed professorship should be considered as receiving a high honor as well as recognition of consistently outstanding performance and ability. The institutional expectation of a distinguished record of performance in one of the three professional performance dimensions must be met in addition to any specific selection criteria associated with a particular endowed position. Again, research will generally take precedence. The appointment to an endowed professorship may recognize a current member of the faculty or it may be associated with recruitment of a new faculty member.

*Endowed Faculty Fellowship* The awarding of an endowed faculty fellowship generally is to recognize and encourage a current member of the faculty who has achieved distinction or who has displayed significant promise for future eminence in instruction/teaching and/or research. The institutional expectation of the promise of higher performance must be met as well as any criteria stated in the donor document.

## **Selection and Appointment**

*Selection* The selection process will be initiated by the Mays Research Council with the concurrence of the Dean. An appropriate call for nominations will be distributed; the Research Council will then review nominees and make recommendations to the Dean. If the position has criteria not directly tied to research, the Research Council also has the option of forwarding its recommendations to another appropriate group (such as the Teaching Council) for its own recommendations.

*Appointment* Once a candidate has been selected for appointment, the Dean shall initiate a request for appointment that includes sufficient information and justification for review and evaluation by the administration. Recommendations of the Mays Research Council are to accompany the request for approval at subsequent steps in the approval process. Appointments to endowed chairs and professorships require the approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Appointments to endowed faculty fellowships require the approval of the Dean.

Initial appointments shall be consistent with all applicable University policies. Appointment letters need to include specific reference to the policy on periodic review and reappointment and on the management of endowment related funds. Special conditions may be established by mutual consent and with the approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. However, unusual and extraordinary conditions are

discouraged and shall in no case be in conflict with University policies.

## **Evaluation and Reappointment**

Every five years (or more often if a review cycle of fewer years is established at the time of initial appointment or a reappointment) individuals holding endowed positions will be subject to review for possible reappointment. Individuals will be asked to prepare a summary of how their position has facilitated their work during the term of their appointment and how reappointment will further facilitate their work. This summary will be submitted to their Department Head.

The Department Head will prepare a cover memorandum for the summary recommending one of these three options: (1) reappointment; (2) non-reappointment; or (3) a more detailed review process. These materials will then be forwarded to the Executive Associate Dean for consideration. Reappointment is highly likely when the individual is maintaining high performance standards in his or her work and continues to make positive contributions to the academic mission of the University. In obvious cases of reappointment or non-reappointment, and with the concurrence of the Dean, the Executive Associate Dean will communicate to the Department Head and the endowed position holder of reappointment or non-reappointment. In cases where a more detailed review is required, the Executive Associate Dean will also manage that review process as dictated by the nature of the position and the reasons for additional review.

## **Budgetary Guidelines**

All expenditures of income generated by chair, professorship, and faculty fellowship endowments must be in accordance with the original gift agreement and applicable University policies. A portion of the annual income generated by the position endowments will be available for the discretionary use of the chair/professorship holder. *Subject to the availability of funds*, the following are recommended guidelines regarding the annual financial support that should be made available to holders of endowed faculty positions:

- *Endowed Chairs*: Individuals holding endowed chairs should be able to draw up to two months of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year plus have an annual spending account of \$10,000. If an individual wishes to carry forward unused spending account funds into subsequent periods he/she may request permission to do so. Permission may be granted if there is a thoughtful and justifiable reason to do so (for instance, if the individual plans to apply for a faculty development leave in the near future and anticipates unusually heavy travel expenses during that period; such carry-over funds cannot, however, be used for salary). Otherwise, unused balances may be considered each year when new transfers are being made.
- *Professorship Holders*: Individuals holding endowed professorships should be able to draw up to one month of summer salary not otherwise funded from other sources per year plus have an annual spending account of \$5000. The same considerations as described above apply to unused balances.
- *Fellowship Holders*: Individuals holding Mays Fellowships may elect to draw up to one month of summer salary subject to the annual maximum availability of funds of \$15,000. Remaining funds can be used for appropriate professional expenses. Holders of other fellowships may receive, subject to availability of funds, up to one month of summer salary from their fellowship account.

If individual endowment accounts do not generate earnings sufficient to provide this level of annual support, Department Heads can consider providing supplemental funding from other sources, such as EMBA transfers. If Department Heads want to provide this supplement but do not have sufficient funds, they may request supplemental funding from the Office of the Dean. However, such requests will only be approved in exceptional cases.

### **Post Tenure Review Process**

[Section Note: The following provisions are System procedures and guidelines.]

The Texas A&M University Post Tenure Review Process has been enacted through the following approval process:

- Approved by TAMU Faculty Senate, October 14, 1996
- Approved by University President, November 1, 1996
- Approved by System Chancellor, November 21, 1996
- Approved for Implementation, no later than February 1, 1997 by System Chancellor,

Post-tenure review at Texas A&M University applies to tenured faculty members and is comprised of annual review of performance (PPM2.3.2.5, Section I., E.) and, in case of unsatisfactory performance as delineated in this policy, the construction of, and subsequent review of, performance in a professional development plan.

### **Annual Review**

As specified in PPM 2.3.2.5, annual reviews of performance are to be conducted for all faculty; must result in a written document of expectations for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority; and provide that evaluations of performance in scholarship, teaching, service, and other assigned responsibilities be made in writing. In order for the annual review to be an integral part of post-tenure review, it will have the additional characteristics:

- In each department, stated criteria for categories of performance to be assessed in annual review will be established by departmental faculty and approved by department head and dean. The categories established would range from a level deemed most meritorious to one deemed unsatisfactory by departmental standards. [Within Mays Business School, the stated criteria and standards of performance for all academic departments are presented previously in this document.]
- In any annual review of tenured faculty the burden of proof is on the university to show that performance is unsatisfactory.
- A report to the dean of unsatisfactory performance as assessed by annual review will be accompanied by a written plan for near-term improvement.

### **Professional Development Plan**

*Professional Review* A professional review may be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three

consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews. A post-tenure review of a faculty member within Mays Business School may be prompted by one or more of the following conditions/outcomes:

- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific instructional/teaching responsibilities/expectations as determined through the annual performance review process during three consecutive years; and/or
- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific research and publication responsibilities/expectations as determined through the annual performance review process during three consecutive years; and/or
- Unsatisfactory performance of the individual's specific service responsibilities/expectations as determined through the annual performance review process during three consecutive years.
- Unsatisfactory overall performance as determined through the annual review process during three consecutive years.

The Department Head will inform the faculty member that he or she is subject to professional review and of the nature and procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the Department Head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g. serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the professional review process.

The purposes of professional review are to: identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance; develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies; and monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

The professional review will be conducted by an ad hoc review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the Department Head. The three member ad hoc faculty review committee will be appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the Department Head and faculty member to be reviewed. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a review dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements he or she deems relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of professional review. All materials submitted by the faculty member are to be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include at minimum a current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, and a statement on current research, scholarship, or creative work.

The department head will add to the dossier any further materials he or she deems necessary or relevant. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time during the review process.

The professional review will be made in a timely fashion (normally less than three months after the faculty member under review submits the initial dossier). The professional review will result in one of three possible outcomes: (1) No deficiencies identified. The faculty member, department head, and dean are so

informed in writing, and the outcome of the prior annual review is suspended by the ad hoc committee report. (2) Some deficiencies are identified but are determined not to be substantial or chronic. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. (3) Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified. The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a professional development plan acceptable to the dean.

*The Professional Development Plan* The professional development plan is an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against stated departmental criteria) will be remedied. The plan will grow out of a collaboration between the faculty member, the review committee, the Department Head and the Dean. It should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the school. The plan will be formulated with the assistance of and in consultation with the faculty member. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the plan adopted.

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will: (1) identify specific deficiencies to be addressed; (2) define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies; (3) outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes; (4) set timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes; (5) indicate the criteria for assessment in annual reviews of progress in the plan; and (6) identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

*Assessment* The faculty member and Department Head will meet annually to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. A progress report will be forwarded to the review committee and to the Dean. Further evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) may draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals set out in the professional development plan.

*Completion of the Plan* When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the Department Head shall make a final report to the faculty member and Dean. The successful completion of the development plan is the positive outcome to which all faculty and administrators involved in the process must be committed. The re-engagement of faculty talents and energies reflects a success for the entire University community.

If after consulting with the review committee the Department Head and Dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the professional development plan, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility. Failure to complete a post-tenure review professional development plan is deemed to occur when (1) the professional development plan's goals were not met by the faculty member, and (2) the deficiencies in the completion of the plan are of sufficient magnitude to separately constitute good cause for dismissal under applicable tenure policies.

## **Appeal**

If at any point during the procedure the faculty member believes the provisions of this rule are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of PPM 2.3.2.6, "Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights."

If the faculty member wishes to contest the professional review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the Dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final. If the faculty member, Department Head, and review committee fail to agree on a professional development plan acceptable to the dean, the plan will be determined through mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee.

### **Voluntary Post-Tenure Review**

A tenured faculty member desirous of the counsel of a professional review committee in evaluating his or her career may request such counsel by making a request to the department head. Documentation of the results of such a review, patterned after the details outlined in Section II.B of this Rule, are not to be used in any other University evaluation except by explicit consent of the faculty member.

### **Faculty Workload Guidelines**

Mays Business School faculty are generally expected to be engaged in classroom activities during the academic year. This section addresses teaching loads.

#### **Teaching Loads**

The teaching loads for Mays Business School tenured and tenure-track faculty who do not hold administrative appointments will be based on the following policies and guidelines.

**Three Courses per Year** A three course per year load (with the approval of the Department Head and the Dean or Executive Associate Dean) is appropriate for:

- Untenured faculty for whom a reduced load is a market necessity and who have active on-going research programs
- MBA core faculty who also demonstrate active and on-going excellence in research
- Faculty who hold the rank of Distinguished Professor
- Other faculty who have maintained and continue to maintain an exceptional research record resulting in very high levels of national and international visibility; such a record would include multiple and strong indicators of research excellence over an extended period of time

**Four Courses per Year** A four courses per year load is modal for faculty members who demonstrate on-going excellence in research in combination with on-going effectiveness in teaching.

**Five Courses per Year** A five courses per year load is modal for faculty members who demonstrate on-going effectiveness in research and teaching.

**Six Courses per Year** A six courses per year load is modal for faculty who do not have an on-going research program and who have not exhibited meaningful indicators of research effectiveness for the most recent three-year period.

Adjustments to the above workloads can be made in light of special teaching situations (such as individuals teaching large sections, on-line courses, and/or other especially time-demanding classes) and/or special service situations (such as chairing a major university committee and/or serving on an inordinately large number of committees). Any such adjustment would be applicable for as long as the special circumstances exist.

So long as it does not adversely impact academic programs, a faculty member may request an unbalanced teaching load in order to block time for other professional activities. For instance, an individual with a three-course load may request that those three courses all be taught in one semester, freeing up time in the other semester for research.

If such a request is approved, it is important to remember that the semester in which the faculty member is not in the classroom cannot be construed as a 'leave' in any sense of the word. The faculty member will still be expected to maintain an active presence in the department and to continue to fulfill service commitments during this period. If a faculty member expects to be away from campus for any meaningful period time she or he should obtain approval of the Department Head in advance. The Department Head may approve such a request so long as it is for a defined period of time, is for a defined purpose relevant to Mays, and is not likely to result in adverse perceptions or inferences.

### **Additional Considerations**

In addition to performance in the areas of research and teaching, Department Heads are also expected to take into account other considerations such as the nature and scope of service contributions of a faculty member to the profession and/or the institution in determining teaching loads. In exceptional cases an individual may be granted a course reduction based on significant service contributions. Teaching loads of less than three courses or more than six courses per year require approval of the Dean or Executive Associate Dean.

Faculty with research and/or other alternative sources of funding who wish to "buy out" of one or more courses during the academic year can do so with the approval of the Department Head. If the source of funds is a competitively awarded research grant, the rate for buying out of a course will be 33.3% of the individual's semester salary (4.5 months) per course. If the source of funds is an endowment account (such as a chair or fellowship), the rate will be 50% of the individual's semester salary (4.5 months) per course.

### **ABD Faculty Appointment Process**

When an individual is offered a tenure-track position as an Assistant Professor on the faculty of Mays Business School there is a clear expectation that he/she will complete the requirements for the terminal degree prior to September 1 of the year the appointment commences. If the individual has completed the substantive requirements (i.e., successfully defended the dissertation) but not yet completed administrative

requirements (i.e., submission of final dissertation manuscript in order to actually receive the degree), for purposes of these guidelines we consider the degree to have been completed. However, we require a letter from the dissertation advisor or comparable individual certifying this to be the case. Finally, in any event we also require formal certification from the degree-granting institution when the actual degree is conferred. Copies of these documents will be retained in the Department Office.

In the event the individual has not completed the degree (as defined above) by September 1 of the year the appointment commences, the following options are available:

- The individual may remain in residence at his/her current institution and complete the degree. We will hold the individual's position until January 15 of the following year. Assuming the degree is completed by that time the individual may then join our faculty under the terms of the original offer, including summer support. We strongly encourage individuals to select this option.
- If the individual elects to join our faculty on the date originally specified, the rank will be Visiting Assistant Professor; this will be a non-tenure-accruing position. There is a one-year limit on this type of appointment for individuals originally offered tenure-track positions. During this year, the individual will have a minimum teaching load of six hours per semester.
- Assuming the individual completes the requirements for the terminal degree before December 31 of that calendar year, she/he will be reappointed to tenure-track status at the rank of Assistant Professor in January of the next calendar year. If the requirements are completed after December 31 but before August 31 of the next calendar year, the reappointment will be effective on September 1. In either case, tenure accrual begins on September 1 of the second year of employment.

So long as an individual has not successfully completed the requirements for the degree, as described above, she/he will not be eligible to receive summer salary for research. If the individual fails to complete the requirement for the terminal degree during the one-year maximum appointment period as a Visiting Assistant Professor, the individual will receive a terminal contract for the second year of employment. During that second year the individual's title will be lecturer; employment-related resources (i.e., travel funds, computer, etc.) will be commensurate with those provided to other lecturers in the same department. Any exceptions to these guidelines must be approved in advance by the Dean of Mays Business School.

### **Appendix 1: Promotion Dossier**

[Section Note: This section is a University document]

Candidates for promotion and/or promotion with tenure must take the lead role in preparing a suitable dossier for review. At various stages in the review process additional materials are added by those responsible for that stage of the review. The University routinely makes alterations in its format and content expectations for dossiers each year and is moving toward a more electronic process. Hence, the dossier description that follows is relatively general in nature. Candidates and reviewers are responsible for being aware of annual University requirements.

The sections of the dossier (separated by tabs) should correspond to the dossier cover sheet distributed annually by the Dean of Faculties. Guidelines on the content after each tab follows.

### Tab 1: Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service

The candidate is to supply in concise form (a maximum of three pages, single spaced) a statement on his or her goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service and other activities, if any, that may be relevant to the position. The purpose of this statement is to provide a context for review of the file at each level, not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or tenure. This is an important document.

The candidate's acknowledgment of the contents of the promotion and tenure dossier as submitted to the departmental review committee (not including outside letters) should also be placed under Tab 1.

### Tab 2: Candidate's Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae should be concise and accompanied by a statement and signed by the candidate that the curriculum vitae being submitted is the most current and correct as of the date of signature.

Refereed publications (or other types of creative works) should be placed separately from publications (or other creative works) that were not refereed, and the lists accurately captioned accordingly. Complete documentation should be provided for each citation, including date of publication and inclusive page numbers.

Items that have been accepted, but not yet published, should be so labeled. Please include the acceptance letter(s) in this section. Items that have been submitted, but not yet accepted, should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list. Where relevant as evidence of research performance, the amount of funded research should be specified as well as the role of the candidate in the projects (for example, principal investigator, co-principal investigator, etc.). Where relevant, the average percent of time the candidate was supported by non-teaching (research or other) funds over the previous five years should be indicated.

### Tab 3: Departmental Evaluation of Teaching

This document is typically prepared by a departmental peer review committee. Authorship of the report should be made clear. Subsequent reviewers should be able to find documented evidence for statements made in the report. For evaluation of instruction/ teaching, the following are to be included, as applicable:

- Peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine levels of scope, rigor and quality of the candidate's course offerings.
- Peers should comment on student ratings of teaching. Summaries of the student evaluations are to be included, longitudinal perspective is to be given, and numerical data is to be set in context of departmental standards and norms. This document is to contain a listing by academic year of the courses taught. In brief, a complete chronological summary of student ratings of teaching over a five-year period (as applicable) should be presented in tabular form. However, student ratings should never be the sole basis for the evaluations of teaching.

- Peer evaluation of development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses.
- Peer evaluation of special efforts made by the candidate to improve his/her teaching or to develop new teaching materials.
- Peer evaluation of publications with a teaching focus in refereed journals, including journals dedicated to education in the faculty member's discipline.
- Documentation and evaluation of participation in honors programs and development of honors courses.
- List of awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, with explanation if necessary.
- List of external invited presentations on teaching innovations.
- List of competitive, refereed, externally funded grants for projects with a strong teaching focus.
- Evaluations by former students or exiting students, if gathered in an unbiased way.
- Evaluation of publication of instructional materials, including textbooks.
- Other evidence of teaching quality as deemed important by the department and evaluated by peers.
- Peer evaluation of the candidate's performance in classroom teaching situations. This statement is to indicate the methods and frequency of observation as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department engages in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, these evaluations would be natural additions to the dossier. Faculty engaged in the review of classroom instruction are expected to be familiar with the process of effective observation of instruction. The Center for Teaching Excellence is a resource for information on the effective observation of classroom instruction.

Materials to be prepared and submitted by the candidate include:

- Summary of teaching assignments over last five years.
- Summary of teaching evaluations over last five years.
- Summary of graduate student committees and chairperson roles over last five years.
- Materials documenting instructional innovation.
- Teaching awards.
- Any other materials relevant to the examples presented in the section on indicators of excellence and effectiveness in instruction/teaching.

#### Tab 4: Departmental Evaluation of Research

The indicators of effectiveness and excellence in research should serve as the basis for the departmental committee, PTC, Department Head, and Dean. For the evaluation of research, the external reviewers' letters are extremely important. Support for assertions of "quality" of publications and research must be given. If grant activity is to be used as a quality indicator, the extent of peer review in the competitive process must be indicated. Materials to be prepared and submitted by the candidate include:

- List of publications with complete citations (including data of publications and inclusive page numbers) organized as:
  - Refereed journal articles.
  - Books or chapters of books.
  - Proceedings and presentations.

- Other, including non-refereed journals.
- Work in progress
- Items that have been accepted, but not yet published, should be so labeled. Acceptance letters are to be submitted.
- Items that have been submitted, but not yet accepted, should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list.
- Summary of reviewing and/or editorial activities.
- List of research grant(s) and contract(s) funded and report(s) to sponsor(s).
- Other materials relevant to the examples presented in the sections on indicators of excellence and effectiveness in research and publication.
- Reprints (copies) of three of the most significant publications. Per instructions from the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties, supportive materials such as copies of articles are not to be included in the dossiers forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost through the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties. These items are to be retained in the college in case they are requested during the Provost's review.

#### Tab 5: Departmental Evaluation of Quality of Service

Peer evaluation of the quality of service to the department, college, University, or other relevant constituencies is to be included. Activities of the candidate relevant to the mission of Texas A&M University will typically be manifested in the teaching, research, or service activities of the candidate. Special mention may be made of exemplary activities that have influenced the teaching, research, or service mission of the University.

#### Tab 6: Departmental Evaluation of Other Activities

This section is to include the departmental evaluation of the quality of other activities, if any, that are relevant to the missions of the University, college, and department. If there are no such activities to report and review, this tab should be followed with a sheet that states:

No other activities to report and comment on relevant to the missions of the University, Mays Business School, or department.

#### Tab 7: Outside Reviewers and Reviews

This section is to include a statement on the qualifications of the outside reviewers, along with the outside reviewers' letters evaluating the candidate's performance. The Department Head is responsible for soliciting these review letters. In letters to external reviewers, the following statement is to be included:

*Your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law. However, under Texas law the person made the subject of your letter may obtain a copy of the document upon request.*

In determining who are selected as reviewers, the candidate is to supply the Department Head with the names of at least three external reviewers from recognized peer institutions. The Department Head will

solicit at least two letters from the names supplied by the candidate and a minimum of two letters from individuals at recognized peer institutions, but not suggested by the candidate. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to insure that external review letters are obtained from appropriate and respected scholars. From these two lists, a group of at least four will be selected for contact in a fair and objective manner. In cases where the stature of a program is not obvious, the reason for soliciting a particular reference needs to be stated in the dossier under Tab 7: Outside Reviewers and Reviews.

Care should be taken in selecting outside referees to ensure that:

- They are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge – that is, not co-authors, longtime personal friends, former students, or former mentors (unless more than the minimum three letters are presented);
- They hold at least the rank for which the candidate is being considered;
- Guidelines regarding the method of selection are followed (at least two from the candidate's list, at least two not from the candidate's list);
- None are from anyone designated by the candidate as being not to be contacted.

Negative comments contained in outside letters are to be addressed by the departmental committee, the Department Head and the Dean. In addition, positive comments that are received where the ultimate recommendation is negative should also be addressed. This simply means that issues raised in the course of the review should not be ignored. All the evidence should be taken into account when drawing conclusions and making the case.

Dossiers must contain at least three letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's research accomplishments. Comments on other performance dimensions may be requested if the outside reviewer has specific knowledge of them.

Information is to be provided on the external reviewers to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. They should be leading scholars in their disciplines and especially knowledgeable about the candidate's research areas of expertise. A short paragraph on each reviewer will be sufficient.

#### Tab 8: Departmental Committee Report and Recommendation

\*This section is to include the complete departmental report and recommendation. According to instructions from the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties, this section may refer to reports in tabs 3, 4, 5, and 6 for statements of evaluation and provide only a summary here, including discussions of the outside letters and the committee's recommendation.

#### Tab 9: Recommendation of Department Head

This section is to include the Department Head's independent assessment of the candidate. The Department Head is to include in this section a discussion of the peer review committee's evaluations and recommendations as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the Head wishes to make. See section entitled Role of Department Head.

### Tab 10: College-Level Committee Report and Recommendation

This section is to include the complete report and recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Review Advisory Committee.

### Tab 11: Recommendation of Dean

This section is to include the independent recommendation of the Dean.

### Tab 12: Other Materials and Documentation

This section is to include other materials and documentation deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriately placed elsewhere. These might include, for example, letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process. However, supportive materials such as the teaching portfolio and copies of books or articles are to be retained in the college, not included in the dossier sent to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

## **APPENDIX 2: APPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURE-ACCRUING FACULTY**

Appointments to non-tenure track positions will vary based on the needs and expectations of Mays Business School and the individual. At a minimum, however, each offer and renewal letter should clearly indicate that the appointment is: (1) specific as to time, i.e. for the period from to; (2) specific as to percent time, e.g. 100 percent for full time; (3) specific as to essential duties; and (4) specific as to compensation.

Per System Policy 12.01.91 MI (adopted April 1, 1996), notice of non-reappointment of a Lecturer shall be given in writing in accord with the following standard:

- A Lecturer who has held any faculty appointment for the equivalent of five or more academic years of full-time service within a seven-year period shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the academic department's intent not to renew the appointment.

Any request for an exemption to this provision must be based on a major programmatic revision or budgetary cutback. Such a request, with appropriate documentation, must be submitted by the Dean through the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties, the Provost, and then to the President for approval.

Notice of non-reappointment of a Senior Lecturer shall be given in writing in accord with the following standards (Per System Policy 12.01.91 MI (adopted April 1, 1996):

- A faculty member promoted to or hired at the rank of Senior Lecturer shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the academic department's intent not to renew the appointment.

Any request for an exemption to this provision must be based on a major programmatic revision or budgetary cutback. Such a request with appropriate documentation must be submitted by the Dean through

the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties, the Provost and then to the President for approval.