

**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**

**Revised December, 2008**

**Revised October, 2010**

**Revised November 2010**

**Approved by EAHR Faculty September 5, 2012**

**PROLOGUE**

The EAHR Department tenure and promotion policy and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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/sites/default/files/pdfs/Annual%20%26%20Mid-Term%20Review%20Guidelines.pdf>

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

University guidelines for Tenure and Promotion <http://policies.tamus.edu/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**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review and Promotion and Tenure Procedure**

**Step 1: Initiating 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 or associate professor on tenure track, a 3<sup>rd</sup> year review will be conducted. However, since tenure track faculty 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) 2, the time of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review will be determined by the new mandatory year.

Legitimate reasons for extending the tenure clock are a serious illness lasting several months; special child, spousal/partner, or parent care issues; etc. Assistant or associate 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 or associate on tenure track at the University, though any extensions of the tenure clock are not counted in the six year time period. (All tenure track faculty must be reviewed during

the penultimate year of their probationary period, if they are not reviewed prior to that penultimate year.) Assistant and associate professors on tenure track may be reviewed for tenure and promotion earlier than the sixth year if the tenure track faculty requests this. According to the CEHD Review, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines, “Non-tenured tenure- track faculty members may request consideration for tenure 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 tenure track faculty 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 if there are legitimate reasons to include appropriate faculty from other institutions, a justification must be included. In no case, however, can reviewers be at the same rank or below. This list will be provided to the Department Tenure, Promotion, and Review Sub-Committee (hereafter the TPR Sub-Committee) within the appropriate timeline.

According to the CEHD Guidelines: “External reviewers’ 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).” However, for EAHR Department, the external reviewers’ letters should include at least two external reviewers nominated by the candidate.

The review materials will include the candidate’s vita, statement, three examples of scholarly work, a record of all student course evaluation scores, teaching peer evaluation reports, 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 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews and tenure and promotion reviews committees, i.e. the Department TPR Sub-Committee

The Department Head will appoint the Department TPR Sub-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. The composition of the TPR Sub-committee for each individual’s 3<sup>rd</sup> year review may not be the same. If possible and reasonable, this TRP Sub-

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 Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee will be composed of three faculty members. The Sub-Committee will then distribute its responsibilities among its members (teaching, research and service). The TPR Sub-Committee Chair will meet with the faculty to be reviewed to ensure that both understand the nature of the process and the timelines.

The TPR Sub-Committee will select at least three names from the external reviewer list provided by the faculty member who is being reviewed. The Sub-Committee will then choose enough external reviewers, preferably seven external reviewers, to reasonably guarantee that there will be a minimum of five completed reviews by external reviewers. The Sub-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: Tenure and Promotion Review Sub-Committee

The TPR Sub-Committee will review the faculty member's materials and the external reviewers' letters and prepare summary reports on Teaching, Research and Service activities to be distributed to the Departmental T&P Committee. In particular, each report will state whether the record in that area is appropriate to a successful review for promotion to associate professor with tenure (in the case of assistant or associate professors going up for promotion and tenure or tenure, respectively). These reports must address any negative issues in the record under consideration.

#### Step 5: Convening the appropriate department professors and voting on the review by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

After drafting of the reports by the TPR Sub-Committee has been completed, the Department Head will convene a meeting of all appropriate tenured Department professors, which will be called the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, to discuss and vote on the review. For 3<sup>rd</sup> year reviews and for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate, the T& P Committee includes all tenured associate and full professors. For promotion from associate to full professor, the T&P Committee includes all tenured full professors. The meeting will be led by the Chair of the TPR Sub-Committee. Only those on the Departmental T&P Committee with the appropriate rank may be in the room for the discussion of the candidates. 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, and each member has to sign the following: "I have reviewed the entire dossier." Those who are thus qualified will be the only faculty allowed to vote.

At this meeting the TPR Sub-Committee will explain its evaluation for all the three areas of teaching, research and service, and the TPR Sub-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 of the T&P Committee). 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 TPR Sub-Committee Chair will initiate an anonymous ballot of all T&P Committee members in attendance. After the voting, faculty will be provided with papers to provide any justification for the votes (yes, no or abstain) without disclosing their names.

By University policy (12.01.99.M2.4.5.3), "An improper standard [for critiquing the tenure and/or promotion case] is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member." In other words, critiquing the candidate for any reason not related to "professional performance" is

not appropriate.

The vote will be officially recorded by the TPR Sub-Committee Chair. Attendance of tenure and promotion meetings is mandatory and members must be physically present to vote. Absentee ballots by members not present at the meeting will not be counted. The TPR Sub-Committee Chair will then finalize reports for teaching, research and service and the summary report that records the vote and discusses the vote, including any negative issues. The three area reports should include the statement *“The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P Committee.”* The summary report should include the signatures of all voting members. *The report must be reviewed and edited by all Departmental T&P Committee members until it is accepted as being accurate by the entire voting committee.* The Department Head cannot be at this meeting during the deliberations and vote.

#### Step 6: Communicating the T&P Committee’s vote to the Department Head

The TPR Sub-Committee Chair will provide a copy of the approved T&P Committee teaching, research, service and overall reports including the Department T&P Committee’s 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.

#### **Suggested Criteria for a Positive 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 on a 4 point rating scale (4.38 on a 5 point rating scale) or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 4 point rating scale (3.75 on a 5 point rating scale) or above.
- Shows evidence of beginning to work with doctoral students on dissertations or records of study as both chair and committee member
- Shows evidence of using technology in classes by putting classes online or teaching courses in a hybrid format
- 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 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
- Has a record of consistently seeking external /internal funds to support research agenda and students

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 served as reviewer for peer reviewed articles
- Has served on editorial boards
- Has annually met appropriate Department benchmarks in service
- Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department’s community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, serving on program, department, college and university committees etc.)

\*\*\*\*\*

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 University.

**Suggested 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 on a 4.0 scaled instrument (4.38 on a 5.0 scaled instrument) or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 4.0 scaled instrument (3.75 on a 5.0 scaled instrument) or above.
- 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 one student complete proposal
- Has had at least 2 students complete prelims
- Has evidence of working with students to present and publish at national conferences and peer refereed annual meetings.

Research

- Has established a focused, demonstrable line or two of research that is supported in candidate’s statement and publications.
- 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.

- Being a sole author on some of the peer-reviewed journal articles; if many of these peer-reviewed journal articles have multiple authors, should be lead on at least three articles.
- 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 as either sole author or lead as presenter.
- Has reviewed for at least three scholarly, peer-reviewed journals
- Has a record of consistently seeking external /internal funds to support research agenda and students

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 community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, serving on program, department, and college and university committees etc.)

\*\*\*\*\*

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 University.

**Suggested 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 on a 4.0 scaled instrument (4.38 on a 5.0 scaled instrument) or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 4.0 scaled instrument (3.75 on a 5.0 scaled instrument) or above.
- 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 unless there are implications of moving from a less than tier one research institution.
- Can provide evidence of mentoring students, especially mentoring for conference presentations and journal publications
- Has used available technologies for teaching, such as WebCT. Moodle, 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 that supports candidate's statement and their research articles.
- 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 as sole presenter
- 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
- Has served on editorial boards of peer reviewed journals
- Has served as an editor or co-editor of refereed journals in her/his
- Has a record of consistently seeking external /internal funds to support research agenda and students

### Service

- Has served annually on at least two committees at the program, department, college, or university levels. Exceeds departmental criteria on A1  
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. (clarification?)
- 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 community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, reviewing 3<sup>rd</sup> year, tenure and promotion materials and attending T&P meetings, serving on program, department, college and university committees etc.)

\*\*\*\*\*

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 University.

**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.                             |
| May                              | Board of Regents reviews recommendations   |



September following the successful P&T review

and makes final decisions

Tenure and Promotion decisions become effective.