INTRODUCTION

The Department of Soil and Crop Sciences at Texas A&M University seeks to retain and reward faculty members who develop distinguished teaching programs at the graduate and/or undergraduate levels, develop exceptional research or extension programs, and share their time and professional expertise in service both within and outside the University community.

This document describes the Departmental policy and procedures for promotion and/or tenure of its faculty members. The general procedures for evaluation at the College, University and System levels following Departmental evaluation are also described. Modifications of the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Policy requires approval by the Faculty of the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, the College and the Dean of Faculties (DOF).

The policies and procedures for promotion described in this document apply to both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, except that the stated teaching criteria do not apply to non-tenure track faculty whose positions do not require them to teach organized college courses. The annual program review and recommendation for promotion to higher rank for AgriLife Research faculty located at Research and Extension Centers will be the responsibility of the Department Head and the appropriate Center/Resident Director. The annual program review and recommendation for promotion to higher rank for AgriLife Extension faculty located at Research and Extension Centers will be the responsibility of the Department Head and Associate Head, with input from cognizant Regional Program Leaders and District Directors.

Faculty programs are based on the Position Description and the Annual Plan of Work, with documentation of achievement in the Lifetime Achievement Report. Instructions for the preparation of these documents may be found on the website of the College of Agriculture & Life Sciences (http://aglifesciences.tamu.edu/faculty-staff/promotion-tenure/ (link verified 2014 June 19)) or are available from the Department Head or Center/Resident Director.

PROMOTION AND TENURE RESPONSIBILITIES

Individual

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to be aware of the criteria for promotion within the Department, College, University, and System and to meet or exceed these criteria to be promoted and/or be granted tenure. These institutional entities provide a number of helpful documents, workshops and other resources to candidates, departments and administrators that describe the criteria and itemize the components required in the promotion documents. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of each candidate that their required documentation is current and complete and adheres to prescribed organization and formats. The faculty documentation file will include:

1. A current Position Description prepared and signed by the faculty member and the Department Head and Center/Resident Director, as appropriate. Duties and responsibilities of the position with regard to extension, instruction, and/or research programs should be...
clearly stated. The Position Description will be reviewed annually with the faculty member by the Department Head and Center/Resident Director, as appropriate.

2. **An Annual Plan of Work** consistent with the Position Description, which reflects in detail the objectives and tasks to be accomplished during the coming fiscal year. This document is prepared by the faculty member for consultation with the Department Head and Center/Resident Director, as appropriate. The Annual Plan of Work for the previous year is to be utilized as a point of reference in the evaluation process.

3. **A cumulative, comprehensive Achievement Report** of extension, instruction, research and public service for the faculty member’s professional lifetime, including copies of no more than five publications selected by the candidate. Activities should be listed in reverse chronological order. If the faculty member is the principal investigator of the paper and not listed as the first author, then this should be indicated by an asterisk. This report will be used in support of recommendations for promotion and tenure.

4. **Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service.** See Submission Guidelines from DOF. (Dossier Item 1)

5. **Candidate’s CV,** up-to-date, with items in reverse chronological order. Asterisk publications for which the candidate was the principle investigator. See the COALS "Dossier Preparation Guidelines" suggestions for CV content in "Suggested Curriculum Vitae Outline". The candidate's name on the CV should be identical to how it appears on the faculty biography table. Exclude personal contact information. A signed statement stating that the CV is accurate and up-to-date is required, either as part of the CV or appended to it. (Dossier Item 2)

6. **Grants Summary Chart.** See Submission Guidelines from DOF.

7. **Verification of Contents Statement.** See Submission Guidelines from DOF. Note, this is different than CV-specific assurance statement above. (Dossier Item 3)

8. **Faculty Biography Table.** See Submission Guidelines from DOF.

9. **Faculty Summary Data Table.** See Submission Guidelines from DOF.

10. **Other Materials and Documentation** (Dossier Item 13, optional). See Submission Guidelines from DOF.

11. **Faculty members with joint appointments (if funded)** must be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the secondary unit as well as the ADLOC department. This should be done in accordance with the guidelines from both departments/units. Whether mandatory or "early", faculty initiating the promotion (tenure) process should inform the Department Head of the secondary unit(s) of this activity and need for review.

12. **Candidates involved with one or more Interdisciplinary Programs, Centers, or Institutes** should inform the Department Head of the involvement, so that the Head can solicit appropriate input from them.

13. **A list of nine prospective referees** who are external to the System and who the candidate believes are capable of critically evaluating the candidate’s merit for promotion and/or tenure, and are free of significant conflicts of interest with the candidate. **NOTE -- the candidate should not contact the prospective referee.** The Department Head will solicit external evaluations from a subset of the candidate’s nominated referees and several independently selected referees. To enhance effectiveness of the Department Head's choices among the nominated referees, the candidate will provide a table that categorically lists conflicts with the nominated referees. Content and format of the Table is suggested in an
appendix. The candidate may wish to provide additional information to the Department Head, in addition to the Table. More detailed guidelines on references are provided on the final page of this document.

When called upon for written evaluations, each referee will be provided with the departmental criteria used for promotion and tenure, an up-to-date curriculum vitae of the candidate, and the candidate’s statement of teaching, research, extension, and service as appropriate.

**Departmental**

During the first year of employment in the Soil & Crop Sciences Department, each Assistant and Associate Professor will be assigned a minimum of two mentors from faculty in the Department. All members of the faculty will be reviewed annually by the Department Head. All Associate and Assistant Professors are expected to meet annually with their mentors who will forward any recommendations to the Department Head. All Associate Professors will be reviewed by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee at the completion of the third year in rank, and Assistant Professors will be evaluated mid-term (normally the third year). A written assessment of the progress of each based on Promotion and Tenure Committee deliberations will be prepared by the respective mentoring committees and forwarded to the Department Head through the chairperson of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Reviewed faculty members will receive a written evaluation from the Department Head or Dean that takes into account all evaluative inputs provided at departmental and college levels.

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all Departmental faculty with the rank of Professor and Associate Professor and who hold a majority appointment with TAMU, AgriLife Research or AgriLife Extension. Associate Professors will consider and vote exclusively on candidates for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and shall be excused from the Committee during deliberations on candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Only faculty with higher rank will consider and vote on such promotions. In tenure considerations, votes of tenured members will be reported separately, and only those will be forwarded above the College level to the University. Although votes of non-tenure-track professors are not used outside of the College or AgriLife, the Department makes it a policy to request and examine but not forward opinions and votes of non-tenured faculty on tenure-track promotions, too.

The Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be elected annually by the faculty of the Department. A Vice-Chairperson shall be elected annually by the faculty of the Department. In situations where neither officer has been elected and is available, the Associate Head for Academic Programs will be responsible for conducting all Committee meetings and for completion and submission of the summary recommendations and evaluations of the Committee.

Associate and Assistant Professors should meet annually with and be evaluated by their mentoring committees and should be kept informed in writing on their progress toward promotion and/or tenure by the Department Head or the Center/Resident Director, as appropriate. The role of mentors is to provide assistance and counsel, as needed or requested, to Associate and Assistant Professors and to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The role of the mentors is advisory only. Faculty can seek counsel from the mentors as well as from the Department Head or Center/Resident Director, as appropriate.

The role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is advisory; however, all votes of the Committee are recorded, and the summary departmental recommendations of the Promotion and
Tenure Committee will become part of the promotion and tenure documentation that is reported to the Department Head. The Department Head makes promotion and tenure recommendations for the Department to the Dean and/or Center/Resident Director. The Resident Director also includes a letter for AgriLife Research ADLOCs.

ELIGIBILITY AND PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Development of an outstanding department depends upon quality academic, extension, and research programs resulting from the professional contributions of its faculty. Promotion to higher rank and the granting of tenure to tenure-track faculty are crucial steps for a faculty member because they indicate professional development and reflect the desire of the Department to retain this individual.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure may be identified by any of the following:

- Recommendation by the Department Head or Center/Resident Director
- Recommendation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee
- Request by the individual faculty member.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure or tenure-track status is restricted to faculty having a minimum of a 25 percent appointment on a 12-month basis or a 33.3 percent appointment on a 9-month basis with the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Texas A&M University.

The timing for Mid-term and Mandatory Promotion (Tenure) reviews is described in the "Submission Guidelines" issued by the Office of the Dean of Faculties, and depends on several factors. The timing is related to the calendar year hired and the duration of the "probationary period", which is stated in the faculty member's original letter of hire. Under extenuating circumstances, the duration may be extended. Normally new faculty members who only recently have earned terminal degrees or have only postdoctoral experiences are accorded a maximum probationary period within which they must demonstrate competence for tenure.

The probationary period for a faculty member will not exceed seven (7) years of full-time service, beginning with appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. Persons with prior experience may be accorded lesser probationary terms. Persons whose initial appointments are at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor are eligible for tenure upon appointment.

The tenure decision for faculty hired without tenure is made no later than the penultimate year of the probationary period. A candidate may request a review at any time. Exceptional candidates may be reviewed earlier for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure. Such action recognizes the accomplishments of the faculty member in making exceptional progress in the development of extension, teaching, and/or research programs.

Assistant Professors will not be recommended for tenure without also being recommended for promotion to Associate Professor. The probationary period should in no way restrict the awarding of merit salary increases.

Decisions to dismiss a non-tenured faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, to deny the renewal of the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member, or to deny the granting of
tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based upon the individual’s professional performance and will be consistent with University Rule and System Policy.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will be based on the documentation of superior achievement in extension, teaching, research, and professional activities. Consideration may be given to promotion of an individual whenever criteria as set forth in the following section are met. There is no definite maximum period designated for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

Non-tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track TAMU, AgriLife Extension and AgriLife Research faculty will be considered for promotion only. The eligibility requirements and requirements for promotion of non-tenured faculty are the same as those for tenured faculty except that the formal teaching function is not required. For AgriLife Research faculty, the recommendation of the Department Head and Center/Resident Director, as appropriate, will also become a part of the promotion package.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

General Policy

The criteria for promotion or promotion and tenure in the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, as set out below, are identical for both; that is, promotion and/or tenure are/is recommended only if the candidate meets the criteria for promotion to the next higher rank. Each candidate shall be considered for promotion and/or tenure solely on the basis of qualifications, without regard to race, color, religion, gender (including pregnancy), national origin, age (40 or older), disability or genetic information, and any other categories covered in University, System or AgriLife nondiscrimination policies.

Assistant Professor: Normally the rank of Assistant Professor pertains to an initial appointment rather than a promotion. In either case, this rank reflects potential for achievement. It denotes the novitiate of the academic order, a fact emphasized by our tenure policies.

Qualifications for this rank include high expectations of future extension, instruction, and/or research ability and productivity, normally ascertained from written letters of recommendation from outstanding scientists in the candidate’s field, evaluation of service as a teaching assistant and/or instructor, the candidate’s dissertation, coursework, or written evidence of original research.

A maximum probationary period of seven (7) years will be applied to all Assistant Professors in the Department. A mandatory vote on promotion or promotion and tenure, as appropriate, should occur no later than the second year prior to the end of the probationary period regardless of appointment (i.e. AgriLife Research, AgriLife Extension, COALS). The year for mandatory consideration for promotion may be calculated as follows. Calendar year for promotion consideration = calendar year hired + probationary period (not to exceed 7 years) – 2 years.

In addition to a mandatory vote on promotion as described in the preceding paragraph, all Assistant Professor faculty must undergo a formal "Mid-Term Review", typically in their third year of employment. A promotion dossier identical to that prepared for promotion will be used, except that internal letters of recommendation will be substituted for external letters required in the actual promotion dossier.
**Associate Professor:** Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires demonstration and evidence of superior performance in extension, instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. With respect to TAMU, there is no set schedule for consideration of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, but from 5-6 years in grade would be common. Evidence of a substantive research or extension program including peer-reviewed publications relevant to the job description of the candidate, success in grant acquisition, and other evidence of superior extension and/or research activities are required. If appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of instructional competence is also required. Other professional and scientific activities, as well as efforts in international, national, regional, state, and university programs are positive factors. The candidate must have national visibility.

Typically, after six (6) years in grade, but prior to the seventh year, each eligible AgriLife Research and Extension Associate Professor will undergo a formal review by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Following this review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward its recommendation to the Department Head and Center/Resident Director, as appropriate, with a recommendation to promote or that the faculty member be evaluated again in two years. The Department Head and Center/Resident Director in consultation with the faculty member will determine whether the promotion package should be forwarded to the Agriculture Program Review Committee. In cases where the Department Head and Center/Resident Director are in disagreement, the package will be forwarded to the Agriculture Program Review Committee.

If the eligible AgriLife Research or Extension Associate Professor has not been promoted after the six-year review, he/she will typically undergo another comprehensive review after two more years, i.e., at eight (8) years, but prior to nine (9) years. The recommendation after this review will be to recommend promotion, or recommend that the faculty member remain at the rank of Associate Professor until such time that they warrant additional consideration.

**Professor:** Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of superior and sustained performance as a leader in extension, instruction, research, or a combination of these disciplines. Evidence of superior achievement in one or more of these three functions is required of a Full Professor. The relative importance of the three functions is determined by the position description.

Publications that provide evidence of a distinguished extension or research program and, if appropriate, a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of superior instructional competence are required. The candidate should have achieved national and international recognition within the scope of research, extension, and instruction functions in the individual’s job description. Significant service contributions to the Department, College, and University are expected through committee assignments and leadership roles, and by visible participation in professional and scientific societies at the national/international level.

Additional measures that may weigh heavily in evaluation for promotion to Professor include quality of the extension program; quality of instruction; quality of theses and dissertations prepared under the candidate’s supervision; the candidate’s own extension or research productivity; success at grant acquisition; participation in Departmental, College, and University business; and participation in appropriate activities with commodity organizations and state and federal agencies.

**Post-Tenure Annual Review**
System Rule 12.06 "Post-Tenure Review of Faculty and Teaching Effectiveness" requires periodic evaluation of tenured faculty (see STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE 12.06.99.M01 Post-Tenure Review Revised July 14 2014¹).

The Department will coordinate a post-tenure review of tenured faculty every year as part of the annual review process, and shall include peer review of the submitted documentation as part of the annual process. A post-tenure peer-review committee consisting of two Professors with knowledge and experience within the faculty member’s discipline will be commissioned by the Department Head to review the on-going productivity relative to the criteria listed in this document for promotion to respective rank (Associate or Full Professor). A succinct report will be submitted to the Department Head who will include a summary of the post-tenure evaluation in the annual review.

The inclusion of peer reviews in the annual evaluation generally obviates need for periodic Comprehensive Review every 6 years or less (University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01—Post-Tenure Review). However, if deemed necessary, due to an unsatisfactory annual evaluation, the department head may request a Comprehensive Peer Review (Section 2) or Professional Review of the faculty member (Section 3). Three consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews will automatically trigger a comprehensive evaluation equivalent in content to individuals at the time of promotion into the respective rank.

If needed, a Professional Review and Professional Development Plan will be developed according to the STANDARD ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.

Criteria for Evaluation

Based on his/her appointment, each faculty member is expected to develop distinguished extension, instruction, and/or research programs and to serve his/her profession and Department by participating in committee and administrative functions. Programs will be evaluated with respect to the proportion of budgeted time assigned to each activity as indicated by the position description. Major emphasis for evaluation will be on the quality and balance of effort in the individual’s overall academic and professional programs. The criteria for evaluation of Teaching, Service, Research and Extension functions are detailed in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences documents, and some key elements are as follows:

Criteria for the Extension Function

- Evidence of a strong, well-defined, nationally- and internationally-recognized (as appropriate) extension program or a key role in a strong, multi-disciplinary program.
- Publication of peer-reviewed extension bulletins and reports targeted to clientele.
- Publication of extension activities in scholarly and professional journals, especially those involving collaborative efforts.
- Receipt of awards for excellence in extension.
- Significant external funding for extension programs.
- Presentations at user, professional and scientific meetings.
- Presentation of invited papers at professional and scientific meetings.

¹ http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/(X(1)S{au1ojc2nurix3055jcf1iq55})/PDFs/12.06.99.M0.01.pdf
• Maintenance of effective relationships with clientele.
• Conduct of extension programs with demonstrated impact or outcome for clientele.
• Evidence of strong, collaborative efforts.
• Accomplishment of Program objectives from the Plan of Work.

Criteria for the Instruction Function

• Superior teaching performance in the classroom.
• Development of innovative and effective instructional approaches, materials and techniques.
• Development of nationally recognized teaching or graduate student programs.
• Development of new academic courses.
• Chairperson of graduate advisory committees and participation in graduate student research programs.
• External funding to support instruction programs.
• Publication in refereed educational and/or scientific journals.
• Receipt of awards for teaching from the University and professional organizations.
• Effective student counseling.
• Effective student recruitment.
• Accomplishment of project activities from the Plan of Work.

Criteria for the Research Function

• Evidence of independent, nationally and internationally recognized (as appropriate) research in a well-planned and developed program, or a key role in strong, nationally and internationally recognized multi-disciplinary research.
• Publication of original research in professional refereed journals and scholarly books.
• Publication of research in forms that are targeted to clientele.
• Receipt of awards for excellence in research.
• Significant research funding from external sources.
• Presentation of invited papers at professional and scientific meetings.
• Evidence of collaborative efforts with extension, research, teaching, and/or industry.
• Evidence that research has contributed to the advancement of knowledge or has produced a tangible benefit to society.
• Recipient of nationally approved patents.
• Accomplishment of project objectives from the Plan of Work.

Criteria for the Public Service Function

• Service to the Department, College, and University through committee assignments and
leadership roles.
• Service to professional and scientific societies.
• Maintenance of a strong working relationship with extension, instruction, and research counterparts in the department.
• Service to state, regional, and national levels of government.
• Service to students, student organizations, and charitable organizations.
• Service to clientele organizations and groups.

REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Departmental

The entities responsible for the review of candidates for promotion and tenure in the Soil & Crop Sciences Department are the Department Head and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Candidates with primary appointments with Texas A&M AgriLife Research and who are located at AgriLife Research and Extension Centers will be reviewed by the Center/Resident Director, the Department Head, and the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The lifetime achievement report along with external recommendation letters and other documents prepared by the candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, with the exception of individuals recused by way of conflict of interest.

Faculty will recuse themselves from reading, viewing, or listening to candidate-specific documents and discussions, and from voting on promotion and tenure decisions involving candidates with whom they have a conflict of interest, as defined by any of the relevant superior institutional guidelines (System, University, College, and AgriLife). These include Board of Regents rules on "33.03 Nepotism (http://policies.tamus.edu/33-03.pdf)" (link verified 2014 June 19th). For a candidate with whom there is a conflict of interest, a faculty must not view any part of the official dossier, and must not attend, view or listen to any part of Promotion and Tenure Committee deliberations concerning that candidate, and must not participate in the drafting or approval of Committee-based Evaluation Statements.

The Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet and only members who attend/participate the meeting in an accountable manner will vote on recommendations for promotion and/or tenure. Attendance may be "in person" or by electronic means arranged by the Department. Attendance will be recorded. Individuals having a conflict of interest with a candidate will not participate in any phase of the review of the conflicted candidate and will not attend, participate in, view or listen to the relevant part of the Committee meeting, or vote on the candidate with whom they have a conflict of interest.

All Committee members are expected to read each candidate's dossier; if a Committee member has not read the dossier of a candidate, they are expected to abstain from voting on that candidate. One or more members of the Committee, often one or both a candidate's assigned mentors, will be requested by the Chair of the Committee to summarize factual data from the Dossier and present the data to the Committee as a means to catalyze insightful discussion during the Committee meeting. Presentations and discussions of candidate data by the Committee shall stay focused on professional topics directly pertinent to performance, and avoid unrelated topics (e.g. non-professional matters) and topics protected by anti-discrimination laws, policies and rules.
The vote will be by secret ballot.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, in collaboration with each candidate’s mentoring committee, will prepare the departmental written Evaluation Statements on teaching, research, extension, or service as appropriate, as well as the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee report and recommendation. The Department Head will prepare a recommendation in coordination with the Center/Resident Director, as appropriate, and it must include the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the recommendation letter to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences or appropriate Agency Director.

After the vote and final decision are made, the Department Head shall inform the candidate of the results of the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote and recommendation, and forward the recommendation to the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Director of AgriLife Research, or the Director of AgriLife Extension, as appropriate.

**College, University, and System**

Candidate and dossier review pathways are depicted in the diagram below.

![Diagram](image)

Approval of promotion by the TAMU Chancellor and/or tenure by the Board of Regents usually occurs in May. Promotions and tenure thus approved become effective the following September 1. Faculty are notified of the promotion decision from the Vice Chancellor for Agriculture and Life Sciences through the Dean or Director to the Department Head and Center/Resident Director.

**RIGHT OF APPEAL**
The right of appeal of an unfavorable decision is specifically acknowledged. A TAMU candidate who receives a notice of non-reappointment due to receiving an unfavorable recommendation for tenure from the President may appeal that decision to the President as per 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). Candidates who are faculty within AgriLife Research have the right to present grievances concerning promotion in professorial rank according to Texas A&M AgriLife Research Procedures on Faculty Promotion. Candidates who are faculty within AgriLife Extension have the right to present grievances concerning promotion in professorial rank according to Professorial Career Ladder System for Extension Specialist.

**TYPICAL SCHEDULE OF DEADLINES FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS**

Mid-term candidates do not need to provide names of external references, as external letters of assessment are not required for mid-term evaluations.

- **April** Candidate shares draft of dossier from mentors and perhaps others, and solicits suggested improvements.

- **May 1** - Candidate submits Dossier to Department: The candidate submits the Dossier to the Head/Resident Director and/or Departmental P&T Committee.

- **May 7:** Department posts Mid-term Dossiers at password-protected websites for review by P&T Committee members.

- **Mid-May** Departmental P&T Committee meets to discuss and vote on each candidate. This meeting shall convene at 1:30 pm two (2) work days after final grades for all students are due (see TAMU Registrar's website for Academic Calendar).

- **May 15-22** Head/Resident Director and/or Departmental P&T Committee write and insert reports. Final documents assembled.

- **May 24** Department submits Dossier Package to College for compliance review: This should include the candidate’s CV, separate Statements on Teaching, Research and Service, and other materials, the Dept. P&T Committee report, Head/Resident Director report(s), and any internal letters.

- **May 27-31** College vets Dossier Package & Department corrects: College vets Dossier Package for compliance with preparation guidelines, and informs the Department of necessary changes. The Department makes corrections and submits final version of Dossier Package by June 1.

**TYPICAL SCHEDULE OF DEADLINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CONSIDERATION**

Candidates should recognize that the overall process of review for promotion and/or tenure spans a period of about 18 months. For example, to vie for promotion and/or tenure immediately after six years, i.e., at the beginning of the 7th year, the candidate would commence the process about mid-way of the 4th year of employment.

Potential candidates wishing to be considered for tenure/promotion should submit their request in writing to the Department Head/Center/Resident Director. Department Head/Center/Resident Director and Associate Department Heads will review such requests with the respective potential candidates.
February-March: Department notifies candidates of upcoming review and instructs candidates to begin compiling their respective dossier.

Early May: Department Head requests specific information from the candidates (curriculum vitae, outside references, etc.). The Head completes a list of potential authors for letters of reference.

Early June: Outside letters are requested from External Reviewers, Inter-Disciplinary Programs and Centers and AgriLife Center Directors.

Mid- to Late July: All requested documents are due from the candidate to the main departmental office for review. Comments and suggestions are relayed to the candidate for amendment prior to distribution to the departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee.

Mid-August: Final packets will be distributed to the Committee.

First Tuesday of September -- The Committee convenes to systematically discuss each candidate’s packet and record votes, then prepares evaluation statements and evaluation summary for each candidate.

Mid-September: Packets, accompanied by votes of the Committee and the Unit Head's recommendations, are sent in electronic form to the College to be vetted for compliance to packet guidelines. After corrections by the candidate and Department to address compliance issues, the final version (hard copies) is forwarded to Dean/Director.

* Guidelines on References: Selection of Outside Reviewers.

The dossier should contain a minimum of three (3), but preferably 5-7 letters from external reviewers who have been asked to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. All evaluation letters received from external reviewers must be included in the candidate's package, irrespective of number or gist.

Such evaluators should be leading individuals in their discipline and, where possible, from peer institutions or better. Care should be taken in selecting outside referees to ensure that a) they are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge - i.e. no co-authors, longtime personal friends, former students, or former mentors, and b) they have similar experience as the candidate and/or hold at least the equivalent rank for which the candidate is being considered.

The candidate should provide to the Department Head a list (including names, addresses, and contact information) of nine (9) individuals whom they consider appropriately qualified to evaluate their dossier. Ideally, these individuals will be (i) free of conflict of interest, (ii) readily if not widely recognized in relevant fields of endeavor, and (iii) from institutions of high caliber. Of course, in specialized disciplines, familiarity and conflicts of interests are relatively more common, and the most qualified experts may not be at institutions considered equal or superior to our own institutions. To facilitate the Head's selection of an optimal subset of suggested referees, candidates should therefore briefly describe their rationale for choosing specific referees, and also the types of past interactions with a given referee; the candidate will provide a table that
categorically lists conflicts with the nominated referees (see Appendix for suggested Table format and content). For suggested referees associated with institutions that might not be recognized widely as "high caliber", candidates should justify the choice by describing the nominated referee's credentials and stature in the field. Explanations may help, e.g., [1] in a narrow research discipline, some level of familiarity and interaction may be common among successful researchers in the same discipline; [2] co-authorship with a referee resulted from a large-group effort and publication that involved no direct research interactions.

In addition, the candidate should also provide a list of names of any individuals whom they do not want the Department to contact.

The Department will insure that there is a mix of reference letters solicited (some from the candidate’s list and some by the Department), and none from anyone designated by the candidate as not to be contacted. It is the Department’s responsibility to clearly delineate in the dossier who suggested the specified reviewers. All letters received must be included in the dossier.

Candidates involved with one or more Interdisciplinary Programs, Centers, or Institutes should inform the Head of the involvement, so that the Head can solicit appropriate input from them regarding the candidate.

APPENDICES:

1. CANDIDATE-NOMINATED REFEREES for EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTERS (PROMOTION and/or TENURE). Template shows desired information about conflicts with nominated referees.
CANDIDATE-NOMINATED REFEREES for EXTERNAL EVALUATION LETTERS (PROMOTION and/or TENURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE’S NAME:</th>
<th>-------</th>
<th>Potential Conflict of Interest? (N = No, Y= Yes) -------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominated referee:</td>
<td>Contact information</td>
<td>Advisor or Advisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / Institution</td>
<td>Email / Telephone / Postal (or Courier)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>