

# GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING TENURE AND PROMOTION

## COLLEGE OF GEOSCIENCES

Revised 15 February 2008

The guidelines for tenure and promotion in the College of Geosciences are based on several Texas A&M University and System policies:

- (1) System Policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (<http://tamus.edu/offices/policy/12-01.pdf>);
- (2) University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>), which supplements (1);
- (3) Appendix I to University Rule 12.01.99.M2<sup>1</sup>;
- (4) System Policy 12.02, Institutional Procedures for Implementing Tenure, (<http://tamus.edu/offices/policy/12-02.pdf>), and
- (5) Dean of Faculties annual guidelines for tenure and promotion packages ([http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/tenure\\_guide.doc](http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/tenure_guide.doc)).

In this document, the College of Geosciences augments and clarifies the procedures in University Rule 12.01.99.M2 from the perspective of the College.

The process of review begins when a prospective faculty member is being considered for employment. At that time, faculty seeking tenure and promotion should be given clear expectations regarding the process and requirements. This document should be provided to new faculty members upon arrival.

### **1.0 Goals and Expectations**

To warrant recommendation for promotion, candidates must have shown superior accomplishment in one aspect of teaching, scholarship or service and a high level of ability in the other two. Persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement.

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor differ in degree and emphasis as described in Appendix I of University Rule 12.01.99.M2, University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion. The criteria for the College of Geosciences are as articulated below.

#### **1.1 Associate Professor**

- Holds a Ph. D.;
- Has demonstrated an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field, where those accomplishments are evidenced by

---

<sup>1</sup>A link to the Appendix is found at the end of the University Rule 12.01.99.M2.

outcomes such as publications, grants, and, where applicable, the development of patents and the commercialization of research;

- Has displayed professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;
- Has expertise in an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University;
- Has shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision; and
- Has demonstrated a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

## **1.2 Professor**

- Has continued superior accomplishment in at least one of three domains - teaching, scholarship or service - and a high level of ability in the other two;
- Has shown evidence of successful graduate student supervision, and
- Has achieved substantial international recognition in research or another form of creative activity.

How these goals are measured, and examples of exemplary activities are described more fully in the Appendix A of this document.

## **2.0 Procedures**

### **2.1 Types of Reviews and General Guidelines**

Tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually, in the mid-term of appointment [typically the third year; see <http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/faculty/annual-midtermguidelines.pdf>] and finally in the penultimate year of the probationary period when the decision for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is made. Such reviews may be made earlier, and are in fact encouraged whenever it appears appropriate. Associate Professors are reviewed during the year in which they are put forward for promotion to Full Professor. These reviews are in addition to other procedures that departments may undertake to assess suitability for salary increases and other University requirements.

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 recommendations.

A candidate will only be evaluated by tenured faculty of equal or greater rank than that sought by the candidate.

## 2.2 Committees

The committees discussed in this document are defined below.

### *Departmental Tenure and Promotion (T&P) Committee*

The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee is a standing committee of tenured associate and full professors appointed by the Department Head. Terms of appointment are determined by the Department, with rotations within the committee to preserve the continuity and high standards of the committee. Associate Professors can be T&P Committee members, but only for evaluation of Assistant Professors.

The committee's function is to conduct annual reviews of all faculty members below the rank of Full Professor to assess progress towards the next rank, to conduct Mid-term and Tenure reviews, and to evaluate faculty members seeking promotion to the next rank.

The following apply to the T&P Committee:

- It is strongly suggested that the Department Head seek advice from the faculty as a whole when considering appointments to the T&P Committee;
- It is the responsibility of the T&P Committee to coordinate the preparation of the candidate's dossier independent of the Department Head. This includes soliciting external review letters, collecting relevant documentation concerning teaching, and checking the dossier for completeness. Further details are explained below under each type of review. It is in the candidate's interest to consult early either with the Chair or the full Committee;
- Transparent governance requires that the results of the T&P Committee be presented to all eligible faculty in the Department for discussion and providing the faculty the opportunity to express their opinions;
- Committee and faculty deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence;
- T&P committee votes are reported directly to the Department Head; and
- Committee procedures are based on this document, as reviewed and updated periodically.

### *College T&P Committee*

The Dean of the College of Geosciences, in consultation with the Department Heads, appoints a College Advisory Committee, consisting of two full professors from each academic department, of whom at least one shall be a member of their Department T&P Committee. After an initial staggered set of terms, each member shall be appointed by the Dean for a two-year term. This committee will elect its own Chair who will report its recommendations in writing directly and solely to the Dean. Committee procedures are based on this document, as reviewed and updated periodically, and Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence. The College T&P Committee reviews dossiers and Departmental recommendations for all faculty members undergoing mid-term review and promotion and/or tenure considerations.

### **2.3 Annual Review**

The focus of the annual review process will vary depending on rank. For non-tenure track faculty of all ranks, the annual review process will serve primarily as an evaluation of performance and potential for appointment. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual review must take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three-to-five year time-frame may be necessary for the accurate evaluation of scholarly progress.

Tenure-track faculty members in probationary periods are carefully evaluated each year so that they know, to the maximum extent possible, their level of progress toward tenure. While it is recognized that College and Department priorities and faculty performance criteria will likely change over time, faculty members should be kept informed of current expectations and their evaluations conducted in a consistent manner. For tenured Associate Professors, the Annual Review should identify progress toward promotion to Full Professor.

If it becomes clear at any time during the probationary period that a person is unlikely to qualify for tenure, the person should be given a notice in writing of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint (for specific instructions on when the notification must be given, see 12.01.99.M2 section 2.3).

Finally, tenure and promotion are linked for persons hired as assistant professors. Thus, recommendation for promotion must be coupled with a recommendation for tenure. New faculty members hired as Visiting Assistant Professors, because they have not yet received a terminal degree, may be promoted to Assistant Professor upon receipt of that degree, on the recommendation of the Department Head with approval from the Dean of Faculties.

The Department T&P Committee and Department Head should provide written and oral reports containing the conclusions and recommendations of their review of Assistant and Associate Professors. According to the Dean of Faculties, the Department Head shall provide a written statement regarding progress and performance and faculty members should acknowledge receipt of the written statement and be allowed to provide written comments for the file. Assistant Professors are urged to discuss thoroughly the results of the committee and Department Head reviews with each.

### **2.4 Mid-term Review (Assistant Professors)**

The goal of the Mid-term Review of Assistant Professors is to assess the faculty member's mid-term progress toward promotion to Associate Professor. To accomplish this goal, faculty candidates compile a dossier that is nearly identical to the Tenure-and-Promotion dossier in terms of content and deadlines. The two exceptions are:

- Departmental review committees do not solicit letters from external referees. Instead, committees are strongly encouraged to obtain one or more letters of recommendation from within the University, and
- The faculty candidate's dossier does not proceed beyond the College except in those cases where termination is recommended.

The Departmental committee and Department Head should provide written and oral reports containing conclusions and recommendations arising from the Mid-term Review. In addition, it is strongly urged that the Mid-term Review results be discussed by the Department's tenured faculty and a vote taken of those faculty who have reviewed the dossier. The purpose of the vote is to communicate to the candidate the faculty's assessment of his/her progress toward promotion and tenure. The results of that vote along with the written reports from the committee and Head are included in the dossier forwarded to the College T&P Committee.

## **2.5 Tenure with Promotion (Assistant Professors)**

The review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must take place by the time frame mandated by University regulations. Specifically, the review will be conducted during the year determined as follows:

Calendar year hired + probationary period - 2 years = Tenure consideration year (which is first semester of academic year)

It is important to note that the probationary review is determined by the calendar year of hire, not the academic year. Thus, if a new faculty member with the maximum 7-year probationary period were to begin employment in November, 2007, that person's tenure consideration year would be  $2007 + 7 - 2 = 2012$ . If the same candidate instead began in January, 2008, the tenure consideration year would be  $2013$  ( $2008 + 7 - 2 = 2013$ ). An early review for tenure can be conducted when requested by the tenure-track faculty. If the early review is not favorable, the review can be repeated again in the mandatory year. While the candidate can choose to withdraw from the review process, doing so during the mandatory review also requires the submission of a written resignation.

The probationary period can also be extended in appropriate circumstances (*e.g.*, serious illness, primary care of infant or small child, primary care of seriously ill close relative). It is not appropriate to extend the period when the candidate takes a leave of absence to participate in activities that would improve the T&P review.

### ***Departmental Review***

The candidate's dossier is to be assembled carefully following the Dean of Faculties guidelines, more fully outlined in section 4.0. The review process begins with the Departmental T&P Committee.

When reviewing the dossier, the T&P committee will evaluate the candidate following the criteria outlined in the Appendix A of this document, following the goals outlined in the first section. To highlight a point in the Teaching section of Appendix A, incorporation of classroom visits to evaluate teaching performance is strongly encouraged, at least for the case of relatively large classes where such visits will not affect classroom dynamics. This will provide additional support for the evaluation of teaching in borderline cases where other measures such as student reviews are ambiguous.

Prior to the vote by the T&P committee, Department faculty of appropriate rank are asked to meet in executive session to discuss the candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion and express their advisory opinion to the T&P Committee. The T&P Committee will vote and forward its vote to the Department Head. The Department Head will notify the candidate on receipt of the recommendation from the Departmental T&P Committee. The Department Head then prepares and submits a recommendation to the Dean, again notifying the candidate of this step when forwarding the recommendation to the College.

If a person is under final review for tenure (and promotion in the case of an Assistant Professor), that person's dossier must be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost and the President for their review after the College review and action regardless of whether the recommendation is positive or negative.

If a tenured person is considered for promotion, or an untenured person is considered for early tenure and promotion, even if the Department Head and the Departmental T&P Committee do not recommend promotion, that person's dossier must be forwarded to the Dean for further consideration unless the candidate requests in writing to stop the process.

### ***College Review***

The College T&P Committee prepares a recommendation to submit to the Dean, who will then prepare a recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

When the Dean does not concur with the Departmental recommendation, the Dean should inform the Department Head and the appropriate Departmental Committee of the reasons for that decision. The Departmental T&P Committee shall then have the 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, quite different arguments are applied, the Department Committee may submit a newly organized case for reconsideration.

If the Dean again 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 faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The faculty member then shall have the opportunity to offer a stronger case for tenure and/or promotion and that case shall be reviewed by the Dean and the College T&P Committee before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

### ***University Review***

The Dean forwards his/her recommendation to the Executive Vice President and Provost through the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties. All Departmental and College level recommendations should be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost as clearly reasoned recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion. The Executive Vice President and Provost and Associate Provosts review the recommendations, after which the Executive Vice

President and Provost confers with the Dean before making recommendations to the President. The President also reviews the recommendations. The President's recommendations are forwarded, through the Chancellor, to the Board of Regents for final action.

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, candidates for promotion may elect by written request to withdraw their names from further consideration.

## **2.6 Promotion to Full Professor**

The procedures for promotion to Full Professor are exactly the same as for the promotion and tenure review to Associate Professor; they will not be repeated here. However, the review committee composition may be different in the case where the Department T&P Committee includes members who are Associate Professors. Associate Professors may not participate in a review for promotion to Full Professor.

## **2.7 Tenure of Associate and Full Professors**

Faculty may be hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure. Tenure-seeking Associate Professors are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Assistant Professors being reviewed for tenure and promotion as outlined in Section 2.5. Full Professors under review for tenure are evaluated using the same criteria and process as Associate Professors being reviewed for promotion to Full Professor as outlined in section 2.6.

## **3.0 Appeals**

Except for the College appeal procedure discussed above, official policy states that persons reviewed but not recommended for tenure may appeal only if the process is in violation of Rule 12.01.99.M2.5.1 of the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>):

Decisions to deny the granting of tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based on the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

If the 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.

#### **4.0 The Candidate's Dossier**

The most up-to-date information on University requirements for assembling dossiers is contained in the Office of the Dean of Faculties' *Tenure and Promotion Packages Submission Guidelines* (<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/faculty/annual-midtermguidelines.pdf>). The current dossier cover sheet for promotion and tenure (copy attached as Appendix B) specifies certain documents for inclusion. The following provides guidance and comments on some of those documents.

##### **4.1 Candidate's Statement on Teaching, Research and Service (Item 1, Appendix B)**

The candidate is to supply a concise (three pages, single spaced, maximum) statement on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the three categories of performance. The purpose is not for the candidate to make an argument for promotion or tenure; it is to provide a context for the review of the dossier at each level. The candidate must understand that this is an important document. It may be especially important to the outside reviewers who are asked to review the dossier.

##### **4.2 Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (Item 2, Appendix B)**

The candidate should provide a concise document focusing on essential information. "Padding" is immediately apparent and does not count in the candidate's favor. The Departmental Committee should receive an early copy of this document to check formatting and content. Be certain to include the following, among other information. Please consult Appendix A for other types of information that may be appropriate:

- A list of courses taught by semester and year including enrollment. Clearly describe new courses designed or significantly revised, development of new teaching methodologies and other innovations in teaching;
- A list of graduate students supervised, level (MS or PhD) and dates of graduation;
- Refereed and non-refereed publications listed under separate headings. Complete, standard, journal citations are absolutely necessary. It is helpful but not required to separate abstracts from longer publications. Unpublished reports and references to citations in the popular press are not useful;
- Where relevant as evidence of research performance, specify amounts of funded research and the role of the candidate in the project; e.g., principal investigator, co-principal investigator. Include in the list of funded research projects supporting agency, contract number, total funding, and start and finish dates;
- List Department, College and University service (e.g., committees, administrative duties, activities with student organizations, minority recruiting activities, etc.);
- List outside service (e.g., professional societies, committees and panels, consulting, reviewing proposals and papers, lecturing, editorships, etc.), and
- Indicate the number of semesters that teaching release was granted and the percent teaching release (one course, two, all etc.) in each case.

### **4.3 Department evaluation of Quality of Teaching, Research, Service or Other Activities (Items 4 through 7, Appendix B).**

These will be supplied by the Department T&P Committee and the Department Head. In making these determinations, the committee and Head will assemble and/or assess the measures enumerated in Appendix A. The College of Geosciences requires the following, at minimum, be included in the dossier:

- Evaluation by colleagues of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine levels of scope, rigor and quality. This may be assembled by either the Departmental Committee or Head;
- Faculty evaluation of teaching included as a narrative. This statement should indicate the methods and frequency of observation as well as criteria for assessment of performance. Departments are urged to begin classroom visits early in the candidate's career for both assessment and mentoring;
- The numerical summaries of the student evaluations, broken down by course number, enrollment and semester/year taught. To make these data useful, the candidate's scores should be placed in the context of Departmental scores, and
- Evaluation of contributions to the Department and University through non-classroom teaching situations (e.g., graduate student research direction, University Undergraduate Fellows, Minority Scholars Program and the like).

It is in the interest of the candidate to review the measures of teaching quality in Appendix A and to include as many as appropriate in his/her dossier. Most of this information should be included in the curriculum vitae. However, separate items should be listed under Item 3 on the cover sheet of Appendix A and may be included directly after the curriculum vitae.

### **4.4 Outside Reviewers (Item 8, Appendix B)**

Dossiers must contain at least three letters (five to seven are strongly preferred) from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate a candidate's research accomplishments and potential. The Department must provide information on the reviewers to facilitate an assessment of their credentials. To be most effective, such evaluators must be leading scholars in their disciplines and especially knowledgeable about the candidate's research areas of expertise. Because these external letters are of considerable importance, the following should be observed:

- The candidate will be asked to provide a slate of names and the Departmental T&P Committee should also provide names. Candidates are advised not to submit an extensive list of the experts in the field as this limits the options of the Departmental Committee. From each of these two lists the Departmental Committee should select at least two reviewers in a fair and objective manner. Letters from co-authors, longtime personal friends, and former students and mentors must be avoided unless more than the minimum of three letters are presented. In such a case, the relationship to the candidate should be plainly stated in the reviewers' information. Letters from former students are irrelevant for this purpose, but may be used as indicators of teaching quality. The candidate should

be offered the option of providing a "do not ask" list of reviewers, and under no circumstance should anyone on the "do not ask" list be asked to provide a review.

- Reviewers should be asked to provide examples demonstrating the significance of the candidate's research; general statements are inadequate.

As a point of information, the solicitation letter must contain the following statement:

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

## **5.0 Time Schedule**

Consult the Office of the Dean of Faculties for the most up-to-date review calendar. As of this draft, the dates are the following:

- **May 31** – Deadline by which the Departmental T&P Committee reviews annually the curriculum vitae of all tenure track faculty and provides advice and counsel to the Department Head concerning readiness for promotion and tenure;
- **October 14** – Deadline by which the Department Heads is responsible for conveying the Departmental recommendation to the Dean;
- **November 11** – Deadline by which the College T&P Committee reports its recommendations to the Dean, and
- **December 9** – Deadline by which the Dean must submit recommendations to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

## APPENDIX A: Tenure and Promotion Measures and Information Sources

The criteria for promotion and tenure were stated at the outset of the College of Geosciences Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. To clarify these criteria, we offer the following guidance.

- **Teaching.** Essential qualifications for promotion are the ability to teach at a sustained level of excellence, whether at the undergraduate or the graduate level. Some of the elements to be evaluated are knowledge of subject matter, skill in presentation, respect for students, ability to stimulate youthful minds, capacity for cooperation, and enthusiastic devotion to teaching. It also involves initiating and improving educational methods. A candidate for promotion to Full Professor is expected to have demonstrated a sustained level of competence in teaching and mentoring of students.
- **Research.** All tenured faculty must be persons of scholarly ability and accomplishment. Their qualifications are to be evaluated on the quality and impact of their published and other creative work, the range and variety of their intellectual interests, their success in training graduate students, and their participation and leadership in professional groups. While promotion to Associate Professor involves developing a sustained research program post-Ph.D., candidates for Full Professor are expected to be respected and active members of the scholarly community and to have taken an intellectual leadership role at the national or, preferably, international level.
- **Service.** The scope of the College's activities makes it appropriate for faculty members to engage in many activities outside of the fields of teaching and research. These may include participation in committee work and other administrative tasks, counseling, and special training programs. The College also expects many of its faculty members to render extramural services to schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and to the public at large. Candidates for Associate Professor are expected to be good department citizens, executing administrative tasks with competence and thoughtfulness. Full Professors are expected to provide leadership in the Department, College and/or the scholarly community at large.

For evaluating teaching, service, collegiality, and appropriateness, the Department and College are the reference groups. For evaluating scholarship, peer review by nationally and/or internationally recognized outside referees is the benchmark.

### A.1 Teaching Measures

The bases for evaluation of teaching performance are (i) coverage of appropriate material in a rigorous manner, (ii) effective classroom presentation, and (iii) reasonable evaluation of the student's performance. Items (i) and (iii) are generally handled by peer evaluation of appropriate materials, such as class syllabi, notes, and examinations. Some information on these two items may also be obtained from student evaluation. Item (ii) may be evaluated by student evaluations, classroom assessments by senior faculty and alumni surveys.

### ***Indicators of Outstanding Merit***

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student satisfaction, and student outcomes.
- Outstanding direction of graduate research as indicated by performance, placement and subsequent development of graduate students
  - Placement of graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly or professional positions:
  - Chair of successful doctoral research committees
  - Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's students.
- Selection for a University or professional society outstanding teacher award.
- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Developing a new course that fills an identified need in the curriculum.
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects.

### ***Possible Measures/Sources of Information***

- Reflective response to student ratings and comments and to peer review.
- Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course materials and delivery.
- Analysis of student achievement of course objectives.
- Statement of goals for improvement.
- Participation in teaching workshops or other improvement activities.
- Peer critique of course materials.
- Peer critique of classroom teaching. Incorporation of classroom visits to evaluate teaching performance is strongly encouraged, at least for the case of relatively large classes where such visits will not affect classroom dynamics. This will provide additional support for the evaluation of teaching in borderline cases where other measures such as student reviews are ambiguous.
- End-of-semester student ratings of instruction.
- Mid-semester questionnaires.
- Exit interviews.
- Evidence of student growth over the semester.
- Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses.
- Employer reports of student performance.

## **A.2 Scholarly Activities Measures**

Active production of scholarly work is expected and necessary for promotion and tenure. In addition, scholarly work should be appropriate in the context of supporting the mission of the Department. Pursuit of scholarship can be accomplished in teaching, research, or professional activities. A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated work. Scholarly activities are those that result in publications. Publications in highly-ranked refereed

journals carry the greatest weight, publications in proceedings of international or national conferences (refereed) rank second, and presentations and publications in regional conferences rank last. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work.

### *Indicators of Outstanding Merit*

- Publications in leading refereed journals.
- Receiving major fellowship or research award.
- Frequent citation of publications.
- Publication of scholarly book(s) by reputable publisher(s).
- Awards for, or publication of, peer reviewed creative activities.
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings.
- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
- Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields where the faculty member occupies a substantial role in research.

### **A.3 Service Measures**

Service includes service to the Department, the University, and the profession, and must be appropriate in the context of the mission of the Department. Serving as chair of major committees represents a leadership role and contributes to the stature of the Department and College. Typical service activities may include organizing national or international symposia or workshops; serving as a member of boards of international or national symposia, an officer in professional societies, referee or reviewer for funding agencies, professional journals, or text book publishers; and participating in editorial boards of journals or text books and grant review panels.

### *Indicators of Outstanding Merit*

- Being an officer in a national or international professional organization;
- Serving on a major governmental commission, task force, or board;
- Serving an administrative leadership role at Texas A&M University;
- Serving as program chair or in a similar position at a national or international meeting;
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal;
- Serving as a member of review panel for national research organization;
- Chairing a major standing or ad hoc Texas A&M University committee;
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large;
- Organizing national or international symposia or workshops;
- Serving as a referee or reviewer for funding agencies, highly ranked professional journals, or text book publishers, and
- Serving on editorial boards of journals or text books and grant review panels.

#### **A.4 Commercialization Measures**

- “The Regents voted to add ‘patents and the commercialization of research, where applicable’ as a sixth criterion to the existing list of five tenure policy criteria that A&M System universities take into account in considering and recommending faculty tenure.” (<http://sago-news.tamu.edu/releases/?p=166>)
- “the tenure policy changes will not affect the administration of the tenure process nor will they create requirements for patents or commercialization, even in the areas in which opportunities for technology commercialization primarily exist—science, medicine, the life sciences, engineering, business and agriculture.” *ibid*

College of Geosciences  
Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

---

**APPENDIX B**

**Name of Candidate:**  
**Current Rank:**

**College:**  
**Dept:**

**Years of Academic Service at Current Rank** (regardless of institution):

**Years at A&M (at any rank above graduate student):**

**Action being considered:**

**Effective Date of Last Promotion (if applicable):**

**If tenure is being considered, list Academic Year for Mandatory Tenure**

**Consideration:** (e.g., 2010-11)

**DOSSIER:** If tab sections in dossier are numbered/labeled as listed below, just check here:

	<i>Dossier Item</i>	<i>Tab (if diff. from left)</i>
1	Candidate's statement on teaching, research and service	
2	Candidate's curriculum vitae (with signed acknowledgement of correct, up-to-date content)	
3	Candidate's list and signed verification of what he/she has submitted to the Departmental T&P Committee	
4	Departmental evaluation of quality of teaching	
5	Departmental evaluation of quality of research	
6	Departmental evaluation of quality of service	
7	Departmental evaluation of quality of other relevant activities	
8	Statement on qualifications of outside reviewers; All letters received (indicate candidate selection or dept. selection); Copy of solicitation letter	
9	Departmental committee summary report and recommendation	
10	Recommendation of Department Head.	
11	College Committee summary report and recommendation	
12	Recommendation of Dean	
13	Other materials and documentation	

**VOTES & RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

*Recommended Action By:*

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>	<i>Abstain/ Recuse</i>	<i>Total Eligible</i>	<i>Date</i>
<b>Dept. Committee</b>						

**Dept. Head:**

*(select from drop-down list)*

**SELECT:**

**Date:**

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Absent</i>	<i>Abstain/ Recuse</i>	<i>Total Eligible</i>	<i>Date</i>
<b>College Committee</b>						

**College Dean:**

**SELECT:**

**Date:**

**Provost:**

**President:**

**Date:**

**Date:**

**Revision History**

- (1) Original basis for revisions: October 3, 2005 'DRAFT'. Author:
- (2) Revision, Sept-Dec., 2006. Final Draft dated: 12/18/2006, Author: GFAC, Wiltschko chair.
- (3) Revision, Sept. 19, 2007 by Vatche Tchakerian, Associate Dean for Academics, Ethan L. Grossman, Acting Executive Associate Dean, based on written comments by Karan Watson, Dean of Faculties and Antonio Cepeda, Associate Dean of Faculties.
- (4) Revision, 16 October 2007, by Björn Kjerfve, Dean.
- (5) Reformatting by Carol Troon, 2 November 2007
- (6) Content editing and revisions by Vatche Tchakerian and Ethan Grossman, 20 November 2007
- (7) Edit and revisions by Björn Kjerfve, 29 December 2007
- (8) Review by Vatche Tchakerian and Ethan Grossman, 2 January 2008
- (9) Review by College of Geosciences GFAC, 25 January 2008
- (10) Review by Ken Bowman, Piers Chapman, Andreas Kronenberg, Douglas Sherman, and Janice Mills, 15 February 2008
- (11) Unanimously approved by College of Geosciences 15 February 2008