

**REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICY
FOR TENURE-TRACK PROFESSORS**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND
HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT**

**Final Passage by EAHR Faculty: 9/12/07 Faculty Meeting
Approved by Dean of Faculties effective August 2007**

PROLOGUE

The EAHR Department tenure and promotion policy and 3rd year review policy are designed to promote excellence in faculty research, teaching, and service. In addition, the purpose of these policies is to provide clear guidance to the tenure and promotion process and the 3rd year review process within the Department. Furthermore, these policies and processes are based on the Texas A&M University's policies presented under 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

University level policies and procedures for promotion and tenure are set forth in the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Approved June 20, 2007, Revised July 27, 2001), which supplements System Policy 12.01. The university has also established guidelines for annual and mid-term reviews. These rules and policies are available electronically:

University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion:
<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>

University Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review:
<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/faculty/annual-midtermguidelines.pdf>

System Policy 12.01: <http://tamus.edu/offices/policy/12-01.pdf>

Instructions and timelines for implementing these policies are distributed annually by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND TENURE & PROMOTION

3rd Year Review and Promotion and Tenure Procedure

Step 1: Initiating 3rd year reviews and promotion and tenure reviews

As required by the College of Education and Human Development, in the spring of the third year as an assistant professor, a 3rd year review will be conducted. However, assistant professors can extend their tenure and promotion clock “with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, dean, and the Dean of Faculties.” (12.01.99.M2 4.3.1)

Legitimate reasons for extending the 3rd year review clock are a serious illness lasting several months; special child, spousal/partner, or parent care issues; etc.

Assistant professors hired on a 7-year probationary period must be reviewed for tenure and promotion during the sixth year of service as an assistant professor at the University, though any extensions of the tenure clock are not counted in the six year time period. (All assistant professors must be reviewed during the penultimate year of their probationary period, if they are not reviewed prior to that penultimate year.)

Assistant professors may be reviewed for tenure and promotion earlier than the sixth year if the assistant professor requests this. According to the CEHD Review, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines, “Non-tenured tenure-track faculty members may request consideration for tenure and promotion to associate professor prior to the end of their probationary period. Such requests should be made to the department head, and careful consideration should be given to the strength of the faculty member’s record in relation to department, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service.”

The probationary period for assistant professors “may include appropriate fulltime service at other institutions of higher education. If a faculty member has served a term of probationary service at one or more institutions, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be for fewer than seven years. In such cases, however, the person’s total probationary period in the academic profession may be extended beyond seven years.” (12.01.99.M2 4.3.1) The timing of the promotion and tenure decision in these cases will be negotiated with the Department Head at the time of initial appointment.

Associate professors may initiate consideration for promotion to full professor at any time. As the CEHD Guidelines indicate, “Such request should be made to the department head, and careful consideration should be given to the faculty member’s record in relation to departmental, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service.”

Step 2: Preparing the review materials

The faculty member who is to be reviewed will prepare her or his materials according to the guidelines of the College and within the timeline set by the College for faculty reviews.

The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a list of no more than six external reviewers. Preference will be given to those reviewers who are full professors at peer institutions, though there are legitimate reasons to include appropriate faculty at other institutions. In no case, however, can reviewers be at the same level or below. This list will be provided to the Department Tenure, Promotion, and Review Committee (hereafter the TPR Committee) within the appropriate timeline.

According to the CEHD Guidelines: “Review letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and one nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals ‘tainted’ by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors).”

The review materials will include the candidate's vita, statement, three examples of scholarly work, a record of all student course evaluation scores, and two examples of recent syllabi. New material, such as the publication of a manuscript or election to be an officer in a professional organization, can be added at any point in the process.

Step 3: Setting up 3rd year reviews and tenure and promotion reviews committees, i.e. the Department TPR Committee

The Department Head will appoint the Department TPR Committee of associate and/or full professors, whichever is appropriate to the particular case, in consultation with the Department Executive Committee and with the candidate. If possible and reasonable, this committee will include at least one faculty from the candidate's program area unless the Department Head, in consultation with the Department Executive Committee, considers this inappropriate because of extenuating circumstances. The Department Head will appoint a Chair of this TPR Committee from the three appointees. The Committee will then distribute its responsibilities among its members.

The TPR Committee Chair and/or the Committee will meet with the faculty to be reviewed to ensure that both understand the nature of the process and the timelines.

The TPR Committee will pick at least one name from the external reviewer list provided by the faculty member who is being reviewed. The Committee will then choose enough external reviewers, preferably six external reviewers, to reasonably guarantee that there will be a minimum of three completed reviews by external reviewers. The Committee Chair will work with the Department Head to contact the external reviewers and to obtain their agreement to participate within the appropriate timeline.

Step 4: Making the TPR Committee's decision and composing the Committee's letters

The TPR Committee will review the faculty member's materials and the external reviewers' letters and will develop any additional information that is reasonable to the review, tenure, and promotion process. Based on the record, the Committee will review the evidence and compose evaluative statements about that evidence in three letters, one each for research, teaching, and service. In particular, each letter will state whether the record in that area is appropriate to a successful review or promotion (and tenure, in the case of assistant professors going up for associate). These letters must address any negative issues in the record under consideration. The Committee will also vote and record that vote in a cover letter that states whether the Committee decides there has been appropriate progress, by 3rd year review faculty, toward tenure and promotion or promotion (and tenure, in the case of assistant professors going up for associate). This letter must also address any "no" votes and the reasons for those, if there are any. The Department Head cannot participate in the TPR Committee's evaluative deliberations.

Step 5: Convening the appropriate department professors and voting on the review

Upon recommendation of the TPR Committee, the Department Head will convene a meeting of appropriate tenured Department professors to discuss and vote on the review. For 3rd year reviews, the appropriate professors are all associate and full professors. For tenure and promotion from assistant to associate, the appropriate professors are all associate and full professors. For promotion from associate to full professor, the appropriate professors are all full professors. However, to participate in this vote, the faculty member has to have examined the candidate's record with the examination logged by a staff member. Those who are thus qualified will be the only faculty allowed to vote.

At this meeting the TPR Committee will explain its evaluation and vote, and the review Committee Chair will lead a discussion on this matter. (A staff member will take thorough notes on this discussion so that there can be an informed report about the vote.) An emphasis will be placed on a professionally oriented vote on the issues in the record and not on personal attitudes or feelings. When there has been sufficient time for discussion, the Committee Chair will initiate an anonymous ballot of all faculty members in attendance. Any faculty member who votes "no" must provide an explanation of his or her vote to the TPR Committee Chair or later to the Department Head, though there will be no connection of the explanation of the "no" vote to a specific faculty member's name in any written record. The vote will be officially recorded by the Committee Chair. The Committee Chair will then compose a letter that records the vote and discusses the vote, including any negative issues. The Department Head cannot be at this meeting during the deliberations and vote.

Step 6: Communicating the TPR Committee's vote and letters and the faculty vote to the Department Head

The TPR Committee Chair will provide a copy of the TPR Committee's letters, including the letter recording the Department faculty vote, to the Department Head, along with all of the materials now in the record.

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Introduction

None of the criteria below are meant to be absolute requirements. Rather, they are meant to provide guidance and to serve as indicators of success. In addition, it is not expected that every faculty member going up for review, tenure, and/or promotion will excel in every category.

Basic Criteria for a Positive 3rd Year Review

Teaching

Has regularly met classes at the scheduled times. If online, responds to students in a timely fashion

Has an average score that for graduate student course evaluations is 3.5 or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 or above (given the current 4.0 scaled instrument)

Shows evidence of beginning to work with doctoral students on dissertations or records of study as both chair and committee member

If relevant to the candidate's program, shows evidence of working with masters students

Has annually met appropriate benchmarks in teaching

Research

Has established a focused research agenda that includes a demonstrable line or two of research

Has a record of publication in peer-reviewed journals, particularly journals that are respected in particular fields of expertise, are valued by the candidate's program area, or are ranked in SCI or SSI

Has a record of other publications, which can include books, chapters, reports, book reviews, proceedings, etc.

Has a record of presenting at appropriate national professional/research conferences for which the presentation proposals are peer-reviewed

Has annually met Department benchmarks in research

Service

Has attended program area and department meetings

Has served annually on at least one committee at the program, department, college, or university levels

Has annually met appropriate Department benchmarks in service

Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department's collegial community

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M.

Basic Criteria for a Positive Review for Moving Successfully from Assistant to Associate Professor

Teaching

Has regularly met classes at the scheduled times. If online, responds to students in a timely fashion

Has an average score that for graduate student course evaluations is 3.5 or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 or above (given the current 4.0 scaled instrument).

Is carrying a reasonable load of master's chairing and master's committee membership, commensurate the master's students in the candidate's program area

Is chairing or co-chairing at least 7 doctoral committees and is a member of at least 7 doctoral committees, unless there are program, department, or other circumstances that would make this an unreasonable possibility

Has had at least 2 students complete prelims

Has evidence of work with students to present and publish

Research

Has established a focused, demonstrable line or two of research

Has a strong and consistent record of publication in peer-reviewed journals, particularly journals that are respected in particular fields of expertise, are valued by the candidate's program area, or are ranked in SCI or SSI.

Some of these peer-reviewed journal articles should be sole authored; if many of these peer-reviewed journal articles have multiple authors, should be lead on several of them.

Has a strong record of other publications, which can include books, chapters, reports, book reviews, proceedings, etc.

Has a strong record of presenting at appropriate national professional/research conferences for which the presentation proposals are peer-reviewed

Has reviewed for at least two scholarly, peer-reviewed journals

Service

Has served annually on at least two committees at the program, department, college, or university levels

Can provide evidence of starting to build a national presence in the candidate's area of expertise or field of study or national professional organization

Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department's collegial community

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M.

Basic Criteria for a Positive Review for Moving Successfully from Associate to Full Professor

Teaching

Has regularly met classes at the scheduled times. If online, responds to students in a timely fashion

Has an average score that for graduate student course evaluations is 3.5 or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 or above (given the current 4.0 scaled instrument)

Is carrying a reasonable load of master's chairing and master's committee membership, commensurate the master's students in the candidate's program area

Is chairing or co-chairing at least 7 doctoral committees and is a member of at least 7 doctoral committees, unless there are program, department, or other circumstances that would make this an unreasonable possibility

As chair or co-chair, has had 10 students complete doctoral degree

Can provide evidence of mentoring students, especially mentoring for conference presentations and journal publications

Has used available technologies for teaching, such as WebCT, list serves, etc.

Can provide evidence of development and improvement of teaching skills, e.g., portfolio development, participation in professional development of teaching broadly construed, etc. Teaching is considered to include classroom teaching, student mentoring, student advising, dissertation guidance, etc.

Can provide evidence of the respect of colleagues for high teaching quality, such as persistently being asked to teach for others in the Department, College, and University or for colleagues in other universities or educational sites

Research

Has established a focused, demonstrable line or two of research

Has a strong and consistent record of publication in peer-reviewed journals, particularly journals that are respected in particular fields of expertise, are valued by the candidate's program area, or are ranked in SCI or SSI

Some of these peer-reviewed journal articles should be sole authored; if many of these peer-reviewed journal articles have multiple authors, should be lead on several of them

Has developed national leadership, not just publication, in at least one line of research and thus can provide evidence of a demonstrable national reputation in the candidate's area of expertise

Has a strong record of other publications, which can include books, chapters, reports, book reviews, proceedings, etc.

Has published at least one book, including edited, co-authored, or single-authored ones

Has a strong record of presenting at appropriate national professional/research conferences for which the presentation proposals are peer-reviewed

Can show evidence that the candidate's scholarship has influenced the national discourse in the candidate's area of expertise and that the candidate's scholarship is seen as influential by peer institution professors working in the same general area of scholarship

Has presented with her or his students in peer-reviewed national research conferences

Has published with his or her students in peer-reviewed journals

Has reviewed for at least three scholarly, peer-reviewed journals

Service

Has served annually on at least two committees at the program, department, college, or university levels

Regularly participates in program area and department meetings

Has consistently demonstrated leadership at the program area and departmental levels by chairing committees, by focusing on the development of the department, etc.

Has participated in college and/or university levels, demonstrating a commitment to the well being of the college and university

Has been an editor, associate editor, and or editorial board member of a minimum of one major journal in the candidate's area of expertise, including journals of relevant major professional organizations, highly respected and ranked journals, or practitioner/practice community journals

Can demonstrate significant national leadership in the candidate's area of expertise, national professional organizations, or other relevant national professional organizations

Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department's collegial community

External funding

Has a consistent record of seeking and securing external funding appropriate to the candidate's area of expertise

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M.

IV. A Typical Example of CEHD Promotion and Tenure Estimated Calendar Dates

January of each year	Dean Notifies Department Heads of schedule and procedures for tenure track reviews to occur in the <i>next academic year</i> .
February of year prior to review	In consultation with Department Head (DH), candidate begins preparing dossier.
March	Through the Dean of Faculties, the Provost requests Deans to initiate tenure and promotion proceedings.
March-September	Department solicits external letters and completes departmental review process.
September	Departmental Review Committee (DRC) meets to discuss candidate(s) materials and vote on its recommendation(s). DRC recommendation(s) is forwarded to Department Head.
October	DH reviews candidate(s) material and DRC recommendation. DH recommendation is forwarded to College Review Committee.
November	College Review Committee (CRC) reviews candidate(s) material, DRC and DH recommendations. CRC recommendation is forwarded to Dean.
December	Dean reviews candidate(s) material, DRC, DH and CRC recommendations. Dean's recommendation and candidate(s) tenure and promotion packets are forwarded to the Dean of Faculties.
January of year reviewed	Deans meet and review recommendations with the Provost and Dean of Faculties.
February	Provost forwards recommendations to President. President forwards recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the TAMU System.
March	Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions
September following the successful P&T review	Tenure and Promotion decisions become effective.

V. A Typical Example of CEHD 3rd Year Review Estimated Calendar Dates

January of each year	Dean Notifies Department Heads of schedule and procedures for tenure track mid-year reviews to occur in the <i>next academic year</i> .
September of 3 rd year probation	In consultation with Department Head (DH), candidate begins preparing dossier.
September-February	Department solicits external letters and completes departmental review process.
February	Departmental Review Committee (DRC) meets to discuss candidate(s) materials and vote on its recommendation(s). DRC recommendation(s) is forwarded to Department Head.
March	DH reviews candidate(s) material and DRC recommendation. DH recommendation is forwarded to College Review Committee.
April	College Review Committee (CRC) reviews candidate(s) material, DRC and DH recommendations. CRC recommendation is forwarded to Dean.
May	Dean reviews candidate(s) material, DRC, DH and CRC recommendations. Dean's feedback provided to candidate.