



PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

The following guidelines will be used by the Department of Computer Science for promotion and tenure reviews.

- In mid November of the year prior to consideration, the chair of the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) committee shall distribute a memo inviting faculty to request that they be considered for promotion and/or tenure and notifying those in their mandatory year of consideration that they should begin the process. The deadline for submitting intent for consideration will be on or around mid December.
- The P&T committee chair and department head shall meet with the candidates individually to review guidelines in January. Candidates will be given the departmental guidelines.
- The P&T committee chair will send a letter to the candidates directing them to prepare the materials for their review. The departmental P&T guidelines will be attached and additional guidelines for the college and university will be conveyed immediately upon receipt. Material preparation will be done in two phases to allow the committee to move ahead with reviewer selection. It is preferred that the candidate submit all materials (Phase I & II) electronically on CD-rom (staff assistance will be available if necessary). Phase I materials will be due on or around early February, and Phase II materials will be due on or around mid June. Materials to include in each phase are as follows:

Phase I

- Up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV) with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature.
- A concise candidate's statement (three pages, single spaced, maximum) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphasis on carrying out professional responsibilities in teaching, research and service.
- List of between 6 and 8 names of potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. According to University policy, the reviewers should be from peer institutions or better. Other constraints on reviewers will be conveyed through the Dean of Faculties.
- A "do not ask" list of potential reviewers that you do not want the committee to contact.
- List of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address interdisciplinary activities, if pertinent.
- Copies of selected publications (five to eight papers) with a signed cover page listing the paper titles and verifying that the choices are for the external reviewers.

Note: According to System Policy 12.01.99.M2 – 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for review materials may sometimes be warranted (see policy for examples). This would require a unique set of materials that would be determined by the department head and chair of the P&T committee.

Note: Updates that occur between Phase I and Phase II should be conveyed immediately in writing to the P&T committee chair. This information will then be immediately conveyed to the appropriate individuals.

Phase II

- Up-to-date annual faculty progress report.
- Copies of refereed publications during the last five years. This is a minimum requirement. Copies of important previous publications may be included if desired.
- A teaching portfolio consisting of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods for peer teaching review by the committee.
- Other material as may be requested by the P&T committee.

Note: According to System Policy 12.01.99.M2 – 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for review materials may sometimes be warranted (see policy for examples). This would require a unique set of materials that would be determined by the department head and P&T committee.

- Both phases of materials collected will be reviewed separately by the P&T committee.
 - The P&T committee will use the materials from Phase I (excluding the list of potential reviewers) to develop a list of 8 names of potential reviewers.
 - The P&T committee will make a complete format and content review of the Phase I packet. A memorandum will be sent to each candidate detailing in writing any missing information or changes that should be made on or around mid February. Corrections must be returned on or around early March. (Note: this is not a substantive review of the packet at this time.)
 - The P&T committee will make a complete format and content review of the Phase II packet. A memorandum shall be sent to each candidate detailing in writing any missing information or changes that should be made on or around early July. Corrections must be returned on or around mid July.
 - The candidate must sign an acknowledgment of receipt of this information.
 - This entire packet, memo to the candidate and the signed acknowledgment will become part of the department records on the P&T evaluation.
- The candidate's packet (Phase I items only, excluding reviewer listings and signed statements) shall be sent to at least 8 external reviewers for review on or around mid March. No one on the "do not ask" list will be considered.
 - The committee shall use at least 4 names supplied by the candidate. The committee, with approval of the department head, shall determine the remaining reviewers, in accordance with the University policy.
 - After the committee has selected a set of recommended reviewers (this list should consist of the 8 reviewers and a few alternates), the chair of the P&T committee shall meet with the department head, who may modify the list.
 - After the reviewer list has been formed, the candidate shall be shown the list and may object to recommended reviewers on the list. The Promotion and Tenure committee and department head shall review the objection/s and the department head shall decide whether or not the objections are valid and the individual/s replaced. The P&T committee shall be given the final list of reviewers before the request letters are distributed.
- All P&T materials shall be maintained in the shared directory for access by the P&T committee, the senior administrative coordinator, and department head only.
- Members of the P&T committee may not write letters of recommendation for the candidate.
- Conflict of interest: Members of the P&T committee should excuse themselves from situations (e.g. served as candidate's research advisor or a family member) that may be construed as a conflict of interest between committee member and candidate (System Policy 33.03.4.1). If such a case exists and the committee cannot come to an agreement, the department head will make a ruling.
- The P&T committee chair will assign committee members the task of writing the peer review letters for each candidate on teaching, research and service (three separate letters for each candidate). These letters must be completed at least one week before the meeting at which the P&T committee begins their deliberations, for the purpose of being distributed in advance to committee members for review. These signed letters are required for the dossier.
- The chair of the P&T committee and department head shall ensure that external reviewers who do not respond promptly are reminded (e.g., by e-mail or phone call) of the request for reviews, or replaced.
- In late July, each candidate should personally review their packet.

- The candidate may make updates to their packet at any time prior to the meeting at which the P&T committee begins their deliberations.
- Anything that is added to the packet after consideration by the P&T committee (e.g., late external letters, updates to publications or funded research grants) must be noted as such in the dossier. Items received during deliberation will not be noted as such unless the committee chair deems it necessary.
- The P&T committee shall ensure that a short biography on each external reviewer is available **before the committee begins its deliberations**.
- The P&T committee in conjunction with the department head will develop a list of top venues for disseminating research results for each candidate. In addition to the list, the committee shall identify the number of publications in each venue for each calendar year since joining the tenure-track faculty (for the case of assistant professors) or since the tenure and/or promotion decision (for the case of full professors). Further, relevant conference sub-venues/tracks (e.g., full and short papers) will be noted in the listing.
 - After the list has been developed, the candidate shall be shown the list and may provide additions or corrections to the list. The P&T committee and department head shall review the candidate's changes and the department head shall decide if the changes are needed.
 - The publication venue list shall be developed before the committee begins its deliberations and updated as needed.
- The P&T vote shall be done as a blind ballot. For the case of a split vote, any committee member or the department head can request multiple sub-reports. When multiple sub-reports are requested, volunteers will be sought to write each sub-report. All sub-reports developed by the P&T committee must be reviewed by all members prior to submission to the department head. For the case of a request for multiple sub-reports for a split vote, the following sub-reports must be written:
 - One report that contains detailed facts that is common to both votes.
 - One sub-report for each vote; each sub-report should contain substantive information that resulted in the given vote.
 - One full report will be submitted from the full committee.
- The P&T committee's written report should be completed **at least two weeks prior** to the date on which the department head's recommendation must be submitted to the College. Negative comments contained in outside letters are to be addressed by the committee, and department head.
- At the time of submission to the College, each candidate shall sign a statement that their packet is complete. This statement is required for the final dossier.
 - They do not have to see the recommendations letters, but simply certify that factual required information and their CV are complete and correct.
- Candidates shall be informed of the guidelines and status at every step.

Department of Computer Science Promotion & Tenure Time Line

Date	Action
Mid November	Promotion and/or tenure request for consideration memo distributed to all assistant and associate professors. Memo also distributed to those in their mandatory year of consideration (for notification purposes).
Mid December	Deadline to submit intent for consideration for promotion and/or tenure for the upcoming cycle.
Mid December	Memo sent to each candidate directing them to prepare Phase I and Phase II materials.
January	Committee chair and department head meet individually with promotion and/or tenure candidates to review the process.
Early February	Deadline for Phase I materials.
Mid February	Memo sent to each candidate detailing in writing any missing information or changes that should be made to Phase I materials.
Early March	Deadline for corrections to Phase I materials.
Early March	Deadline for determination of external reviewers (by committee with input from department head and candidate).
Mid March	Packets sent to external reviewers.
Mid April	Follow up with reminders to external reviewers and resend packets to new reviewers if necessary.
Mid May	Letters due from external reviewers.
Mid June	Deadline for Phase II materials.
Early July	Memo sent to each candidate detailing in writing any missing information or changes that should be made to Phase II materials. Peer review letter assignments made by committee chair.
Mid July	Deadline for corrections to Phase II materials.
Mid July	Candidate should review their entire packet and make updates, if necessary.
Late July	Peer review letters due to committee chair.
Early August	Approximate date for committee to meet and begin to deliberate on final decisions concerning each candidate.
Mid September	Deadline for committee's written report to department head on each candidate.
Early October	Approximate deadline for dossier packets to go to the College.