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I. Introduction

A. Context

The College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) Guidelines for Review, Tenure and Promotion describe college policies and procedures for conducting reviews and making recommendations for tenure and promotion for tenure-track faculty. The guidelines align with policies and procedures established by the Texas A&M University System and are supplemented by additional policies and procedures adopted by academic departments.

B. Current University Policy

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, 1997, 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

University Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review

System Policy 12.01

DEAN OF FACULTIES AND ASSOCIATE PROVOST
MAR 26 2013
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Instructions and timelines for implementing these policies are distributed annually by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost and are available at: http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/DOF_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf

II. CEHD Criteria for Review, Tenure, and Promotion

General criteria for retention and advancement within faculty ranks are stated in the System and University policies, rules, and guidelines referenced above.

Faculty promoted to the rank of Associate Professor should exhibit clear evidence of accomplishment measured against the contributions of beginning associate professors in her or his discipline; a focused area of research/creative activity; competence in the area of teaching; and willing citizenship, as demonstrated by participation in departmental, college and university service activities.

Faculty promoted to the rank of Professor should exhibit an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against beginning full professors in her or his discipline; evidence of a national or international impact in the level of research/creative activity; proficiency in the area of teaching; and evidence of valuable service activities. In most cases, promotion to Professor is based primarily on excellence in research/creative activities; however, in very rare cases, one can be promoted based on evidence of her or his teaching or service having a national or international impact on the field. In this case, the faculty member should still demonstrate clear evidence of research/creative activity accomplishments.

Faculty members should consult the specific expectations outlined by each department within the College.

III. CEHD Procedures for Review, Tenure, and Promotion

Updated instructions for implementation of CEHD policies and procedures will be distributed annually by the Dean.

A. Timelines

1. Probationary Period. The probationary period for non-tenured tenure-track faculty shall be specified in their letter of offer and may cover any number of years up to the University maximum of seven. The semester of hire does not determine the “Tenure Clock;” the calendar year does. The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows:

   Calendar year hired + probationary period − 2 years = Fall semester of Tenure consideration year (e.g., regardless of the month, if contract start date is 2007 + 7 years of probation − 2 years = 2012. The mandatory review will start in 2012).
Sometimes, under extenuating circumstances, a faculty may initiate a request with the department head to extend the probationary period. The “Agreement Concerning the Extension of Probationary Service and Waiver” is used when a department wishes to extend the probationary service of a faculty member. This form is usually accompanied by a memo explaining why the probationary period needs to be extended. Alterations to the probationary period must be approved by the Department Head, CEHD Dean, and the Dean of Faculties.

2. Annual Reviews. Each non-tenured tenure-track faculty member not undergoing a Tenure and Promotion or Mid-Term Review shall receive written feedback regarding their progress toward tenure and promotion based on a review of their current A-1 and vita from both their Department Head and Department Review Committee. The department will use the A-2 to provide feedback in a face to face meeting with the faculty.

3. Mid-Term Reviews. Formal mid-term reviews for non-tenured tenure-track faculty members shall occur during the spring of their third year. CEHD mid-term reviews follow the same procedures as promotion and tenure reviews up through the level of the Dean. In the case that a mid-term review does not have a positive outcome, the Dean may recommend an additional review be conducted the following year. Otherwise, the faculty member will be given a one-year notice of termination of employment.

4. Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Prior to Mandatory Year. Non-tenured tenure-track faculty members may request consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor prior to their mandatory year. 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 departmental, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service. (If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for tenure, a review is conducted again at the mandatory time)

5. Promotion to Professor. Faculty members holding the rank of Associate Professor may request consideration for promotion to Professor at any time. 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. The case for excellence in one or more of these areas must be made very clear as well as evidence of leadership and national or international impact.

B. College Review, Promotion, and Tenure Structure

The CEHD review, tenure, and promotion process has four levels: 1) Department Committee, 2) Department Head, 3) College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, and 4) Dean.
1. **Department Committee.** Composition and operation of the Department Committee shall be determined by each department, consistent with University policies and rules, and shall be specified in departmental policies and procedures. The Department Committee is responsible for preparing the Department Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and Other Activities (these evaluations should not be prepared by the candidate or the Department Head) and the Department Committee Report and Recommendation. Authorship of these statements must be identified and individuals who have a close relationship with the candidate should not prepare the evaluation statements. For example, to void conflict of interest, the candidate’s former graduate advisor or a co-author/collaborator should not write the evaluation statements.

If committee members differ in terms of their evaluation, that should be noted in the evaluation statement, and the department statement should clearly communicate the areas of difference and explain their rationale. Negative comments from external reviewers should be addressed by the departmental committee. Members of the Department Review Committee should have the opportunity to review the candidate’s Evaluations of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other Activities prior to submission to the Department Head. The Department Committee Report and Recommendation should contain a record of the vote and should address the reasons for any negative votes or abstentions among committee members.

The departmental representative to the College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee may attend the department committee meeting but is not eligible to vote at the department level. The report should reflect that the faculty member abstained due to his/her service on the college-level committee.

2. **Department Head.** The Department Head is responsible for preparing the Department Head’s Recommendation. The Department Head’s Recommendation should provide a composite evaluation of the candidate’s record and include sufficient information to support judgments regarding teaching, research, and service. Negative comments from reviewers and/or the Department Committee and negative votes or abstentions from the Department Committee should be addressed in the Department Head’s recommendation, even if these comments are factually wrong or misguided.

3. **College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee.** The committee has five members. Each department elects one tenured, full professor representative to the committee for a 3-year term. All tenure track faculty members are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the College at-large member. Individuals who hold administrative positions as Department Heads or who serve on the dean’s staff are not eligible to serve on the committee.
The fifth member is an associate professor representative elected as a college at-large representative who serves a 2-year term. The at-large representative cannot be from the same department for two consecutive terms. The at-large representative participates in discussions and votes in cases involving third year reviews and tenure and promotion to associate professor. In order to capitalize on the developmental opportunities for associate professors, the at-large representative may be present during discussions involving promotion to full professor but does not vote on promotion to full professor. In the event the associate professor representative is reviewed for promotion to Full Professor during this two-year term, the individual will not complete his/her term, and an election for a new 2-year position will be held.

This committee is responsible for preparing the College Committee’s Report and Recommendation. All members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather than to serve as advocates for their departments. The Report and Recommendation of this committee should include sufficient information to support its judgments on teaching, research, and service and should address the reasons for negative votes or abstentions among its members.

4. **The Dean** is responsible for preparing the Dean’s Recommendation and Summary.

C. **External Letters.**

1. **Number.** The department must aim to receive 5 to 7 letters from external reviewers although the minimum number required is 3. All letters that have been requested and received must be included.

2. **Authors.** Review letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and one nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals “tainted” by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors). Letters should not be sought from among the names on the “do not contact” list provided by the candidates.

3. **Institutions.** Letters should come from “peer institutions or better” (i.e., top-tier, Research Extensive universities) but letters from notable leaders in the field who are not within a peer institution are also acceptable. In such a case, a rationale must be provided as to why the letter was solicited in the Description of the Qualifications of the External Reviewers. Letter writers should hold at least the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

4. **Letter Samples.** A sample of the letters or emails used to solicit external reviews should be included in the candidate’s file. It is not recommended that the solicitation letter asks if the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion at their institution. Instead the reviewer should be asked to evaluate the candidate’s work and its current and potential national and/or international
prominence (or progress toward them in the case of mid-term reviews). The solicitation must contain the following statement: “Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state and your review could be requested and relinquished.” Examples of letters are available from the office of the Executive Associate Dean.

5. **Letter Availability to Candidates.** Under Texas law, external letters are available to the candidate upon request to their department head in writing.

### D. Preparation of Dossier

1. **Vita.** The candidate’s vita should distinguish between peer-reviewed (refereed) publications and non peer-reviewed publications. The candidate’s role in grant and contract activities should be clearly specified. It is advisable for the vita to make clear the candidate’s role in multi-author publications. It is strongly encouraged that if any coauthors are the candidate’s graduate students (past or present), they are delineated in a manner so that this relationship is discernible.

   The curriculum vita should be accurate, concise, and padding should be avoided.

2. **Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Research, and Service.** These statements should be concise and more than a summary of the vita. Rather, they should help a reviewer make sense of the candidate’s vita and clarify why the individual has chosen specific scholarship areas and how these areas will be developed in the future. Candidates should clearly state the impact of their work or potential for impact in the case of assistant to associate professors.

### IV. CEHD Promotion and Tenure Estimated Calendar Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January of each year</td>
<td>Dean Notifies Department Heads of schedule and procedures for tenure track reviews to occur in the next academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February of year prior to review</td>
<td>In consultation with Department Head (DH), candidate begins preparing dossier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Through the Dean of Faculties, the Provost requests Deans to initiate tenure and promotion proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-September</td>
<td>Department solicits external letters and completes departmental review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Departmental Review Committee (DRC) meets to discuss candidate(s) materials and vote on its recommendation(s). DRC recommendation(s) is forwarded to Department Head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>DH reviews candidate(s) material and DRC recommendation. DH recommendation is forwarded to College Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>College Review Committee (CRC) reviews candidate(s) material, DRC and DH recommendations. CRC recommendation is forwarded to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January of year reviewed</td>
<td>Deans meet and review recommendations with the Provost and Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Provost forwards recommendations to President. President forwards recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the TAMU System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1 following the successful P&amp;T review</td>
<td>Tenure and Promotion decisions become effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. CEHD Third-Year Review Estimated Calendar Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action/description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January of each year</td>
<td>Dean Notifies Department Heads of schedule and procedures for tenure track mid-year reviews to occur in the next academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September –Beginning of year three</td>
<td>In consultation with Department Head (DH), candidate begins preparing dossier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-February</td>
<td>Department solicits external letters and completes departmental review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Department Review Committee (DRC) meets to discuss candidate(s) materials and vote on its recommendation(s). DRC recommendation(s) is forwarded to Department Head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>DH reviews candidate(s) material and DRC recommendation. DH recommendation is forwarded to College Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>College Review Committee (CRC) reviews candidate(s) material, DRC and DH recommendations. CRC recommendation is forwarded to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Dean reviews candidate(s) material, DRC, DH and CRC recommendations. Dean’s feedback provided to candidate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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College of Education and Human Development
Procedures for Review of Clinical Faculty

These procedures are intended to provide additional guidance; they do not supplant TAMU rules regarding the retention of non-tenure track faculty. In particular, clinical faculty are afforded at least the same level of protection as is afforded by University policies (12.01.99M2, section 2.2) regarding Senior Lecturers in cases of termination of employment, notice of non-reappointment, or notice of intention not to reappoint a faculty member.

Appointments of clinical faculty are one-year renewable contracts, contingent on satisfactory annual evaluations and program needs. There will be a three-year probationary period after which the candidate will undergo a departmental and college-level review as described below.

Clinical faculty are evaluated annually in accordance with College and University policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. This document provides guidance for the evaluation, continuation, and promotion of clinical faculty. In addition to the annual evaluation requirement, a departmental and college-level review will be required in the third year of appointment leading to the promotion review. Clinical faculty are strongly encouraged to consult with the department head and appropriate departmental faculty before they formally request to be considered for promotion (clinical assistant to clinical associate and/or clinical associate to clinical full professor). Timelines for promotion are not tied to third-year reviews.

Departmental Review
The department will make available to each clinical faculty a copy of the departmental review and promotion guidelines. The guidelines will identify examples of meritorious performance under each of the areas of responsibilities.

All faculty workload must include teaching and service and may include scholarship and other creative or performing activities, depending on the assignment.

Professional development is an ongoing activity that cuts across teaching, service, and scholarship/creative/performance activities. It is an expectation that faculty members will engage in professional development activities.

General Guidelines
Mandatory probationary reviews take place in the spring of initial third year of employment.

Candidate's Portfolio
Candidates for reappointment submit a portfolio of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities. The portfolio will contain, but not be limited to the following:

1. The candidate’s dossier consisting of (a) a statement (not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the areas of assigned responsibility; (b) curriculum vitae; and (c) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility as applicable within the general headings of (i) teaching; (i)
service/engagement/ professional activities and/or (iii) scholarship and/or performing and creative activities.

2. A job description provided by the Department Head

3. A-1 form for the current year; and

4. A-2 forms for the previous two years.

This portfolio will be submitted to the department head no later than the first day of the spring semester.

Departmental Clinical Faculty Review Committee
The Departmental Clinical Faculty Review Committee (CFRC) will consist of the 4-6 clinical faculty members at the rank of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor. For review of Clinical Full Professor, the committee will consist of Clinical Full Professors only. For departments with insufficient clinical faculty at the ranks of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor, the committee will be composed of all clinical faculty members of appropriate rank from the department and either tenured departmental faculty members with knowledge of the clinical faculty role or clinical faculty members of appropriate rank from other departments in the college. The department head in consultation with the dean selects these committee members.

The candidate’s portfolio of teaching, curriculum and program development, professional development, and professional activities will be reviewed by the CFRC. After a review of the candidate’s portfolio and credentials, the CFRC will vote on reappointment. This vote and associated CFRC recommendations will be forwarded in writing to the department head. The CFRC recommendation should be based on the individual’s written job description and performance expectations.

Departmental Approval
Upon review of the recommendations for reappointment by the CFRC, the department head will make a recommendation to accept or deny the recommendation. The department head will forward this recommendation, along with results of the vote of the CFRC and its recommendation, to the office of the dean.

College Review

College-Level Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee
The college level Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee (CFAC) reviews candidates for reappointment and candidates for promotion. It is responsible for conducting a thorough review of each file that is submitted by departments. It is also responsible for submitting in writing to the dean its recommendations for reappointment or promotion and a report of its vote on each file. The CFAC also advises the dean on issues pertaining to appointment, review, and promotion, such as guidelines for promotion and procedures for conducting reappointment and promotion reviews.

Membership on the CFAC consists of one Clinical Full Professor elected by each department’s clinical faculty. Additionally, a Clinical Associate Professor is elected as a college at-large representative. Each member of the committee serves a 3-year term. All clinical faculty are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the at-large representative. Members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather than to serve as advocates for their departments.
College Approval
The dean will review all applications for reappointment forwarded by department heads and will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, the dean will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head shall then have the opportunity to ensure that all appropriate materials have, in fact, been properly enclosed with the portfolio, and that all relevant arguments have been put forward. If the dean still disapproves the request for reappointment, the dean shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval.

Recommendations for Non-Reappointment and Termination of Employment
Termination of Employment: Notice of non-reappointment or of intention not to reappoint a faculty member shall be given in writing in accord with the following standards:

Clinical faculty members will normally have annual appointments for their first five years of service.

Notification of non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible, but in all cases, they should be notified no later than one month after the Board of Regents has approved the next fiscal year TAMU budget.

Recommendations for non-reappointment of a clinical faculty member with less than five full-time equivalent years in a seven-year period would be effective at the end of the current contract.

Faculty members who have continuously been employed for five full-time-equivalent years during a continuous seven-year period are entitled to 12 months’ notice if they will not be reappointed.

A decision to dismiss a clinical faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment and a decision not to reappoint a clinical faculty member shall be based upon adequate consideration of the individual’s professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.
College of Education and Human Development
Procedures for Promotion Review of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in College of Education and Human Development. Clinical faculty are generally full-time faculty (generally funded by the State) who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in clinical training, supervision, service activities, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, clinical faculty can participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate.

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Clinical Assistant Professor
- Doctoral degree or terminal degree
- Minimum of 3 years of relevant professional experience (e.g., teaching experience, clinical practice, supervision)
- Evidence of effective post-secondary teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of clinical expertise in the professional program area
- Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership activities.

Suggested Criteria for Promotion

The department will make available to each clinical faculty a copy of the departmental review and promotion guidelines. The guidelines will identify examples of meritorious performance under each of the areas of responsibilities.

Clinical faculty can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements. All faculty workload must include teaching and service and may include scholarship and other creative or performing activities, depending on the assignment. Professional development is an ongoing activity that cuts across teaching, service, and scholarship/creative/performance activities. It is the expectation that clinical faculty will engage in professional development activities.

The categories below are the recommended requirements for promotion to the respective clinical faculty rank. Each department will provide indicators for meritorious performance in each of these categories for the specific rank. Appendix I to University Rule 12.01.9.M: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion provides examples of indicators that may be applied in the evaluation of faculty.

Faculty must meet performance expectations in teaching and service. Performance expectations in scholarship/creative and performing activities apply to the extent to which participation and productivity in scholarly activities are in the individual faculty member's job description.
Clinical Associate Professor

- Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching (e.g., program development, curriculum development, program supervision, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, chairing/co-chairing graduate committees, teaching with technology, leadership in study-abroad programs, etc.).
- Evidence of service/engagement/professional activities within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., membership on department, college, and university committees; leadership in professional organizations, service to professional organizations, planning and delivering workshops and other learning opportunities, involvement in creative works and performances, program/curriculum reviewer, membership on journal review boards, etc.)
- Evidence of scholarship and/or performing and creative activities (e.g., research, scholarly writings, presentations at professional conferences and workshops, grant funding activities, creative performances, public activity in the performing arts, certifications, licensing etc.)

Clinical Full Professor

Candidates must demonstrate the impact of their work and how it contributes to the advancement of the department, college, university and the professions, where applicable. Demonstration of leadership activities is critical for promotion from associate to full clinical professor.

- Consistent evidence of excellence and impact in teaching (e.g., leadership of program and curriculum development, program management, innovation in teaching and learning, advising/mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, chairing/co-chairing graduate committees, teaching with technology, leadership in study-abroad or other special programs, etc.).
- Evidence of service/engagement/leadership within the department, the college, the institution, and/or the profession (e.g., leadership/membership on department, college, and university committees; leadership in professional organizations, service to schools and other organizations, leadership in creative works and performances, program/curriculum reviewer, membership on journal editorial boards, etc.)
- Evidence of excellence and impact in scholarship and/or creative and performing activities (e.g., research, scholarly writings, book and journal publications, presentations at professional conferences and workshops, external grant funding activities, creative performances, public activity in the performing arts, certifications, licensing etc.)

Procedures for Promotion
Promotion to a higher rank should include the following elements at the departmental level:

General Guidelines
Clinical faculty promotion review will be an independent process from the tenure-track faculty review process and will be conducted during the fall semester.

Candidate’s Dossier
The candidate’s dossier includes the following:
1. A statement (not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the areas of assigned responsibility (teaching; service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities). The purpose of this statement is to provide a context for review of the file at each level and for the candidate to demonstrate the impact or potential impact of his or her work.
2. A current curriculum vitae, and
3. Evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility including, but not limited to
   teaching; service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative and performing activities. The
   evaluation must be based on written criteria. The candidate's dossier must be organized to reflect
   the accomplishments in these three criteria.

The departmental CFRC should communicate to the candidate prior to the evaluation the information that
it deems necessary for its evaluation of the candidate's performance.

External Reviews
The Department Head will select a minimum of two reviewers external to the department, college or
university. One reviewer is to be selected from a list of potential reviewers given by the faculty member;
the other is to be selected from a list developed by the CFRC committee and/or department head in
consultation with departmental faculty within the candidates' area of expertise. These external reviewers
should be selected based on the clinical faculty candidate's assignment and responsibilities. For example,
appropriate reviews might include a teaching evaluation (by a faculty member outside the candidate's
department with expertise in this area), an evaluation by a school-based professional who has interacted
with the faculty member (e.g. principal); clinical practitioners (e.g. licensed psychologists or licensed
exercise physiologists); or faculty with similar responsibilities at other institutions. Care should be taken in
selecting outside reviewers to ensure that they are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge — that
is, not co-authors, personal friends, former students, or former mentors unless more than the minimum of
two reviews are requested. The external reviews shall be considered as one piece of information needed to
make a determination for promotion. Candidate's dossier and job description will be submitted to the
external reviewers. External reviewers should be asked to provide a written assessment of the candidate's
areas of responsibility and performance expectations. (Responsibilities include teaching and
service/engagement, and may or may not include scholarship and/or creative and performing activities).

Department Clinical Faculty Review Committee (Promotion)
The Departmental Clinical Professor Review Committee (CFRC) will consist of the 4-6 clinical faculty
members at the rank of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor. For review of Clinical Full Professor,
the committee will consist of Clinical Full Professors only. Until departments have sufficient clinical
faculty at the ranks of Clinical Associate or Clinical Full Professor, the committee will be composed of any
clinical faculty member of appropriate rank from the department and either tenured departmental faculty
members with knowledge of the clinical faculty role or clinical faculty members of appropriate rank from
other departments in the college. The department head in consultation with the dean will select these
committee members.

For promotion, two additional members of appropriate rank can be added to the committee. The first is a
faculty member selected by the candidate and the second is one faculty member, either clinical or tenured,
that represents the candidate's area of expertise (program). This member is selected by the department
head in consultation with departmental program faculty. Therefore, for promotion only, the CFRC may
consist of 6-8 members.

The CFRC will review the candidate's dossier of teaching, service/engagement, scholarship and/or creative
and performing activities, credentials, and letters from external reviewers. The CFRC will vote on
promotions and produce separate reports to address each of the areas of performance, as well as an overall
report that integrates or summarizes the individual reports and explains the outcome of the vote. This vote
and associated CFRC reports will be forwarded to the department head. The CFRC reports should be
based on the individual's job description and appropriate performance expectations.
Departmental Approval
Upon review of the recommendation for promotion by the CFRC, the department head will make a recommendation to the dean’s office to deny or accept the promotion. The department head’s letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. The dossier must be forwarded to the dean’s level and beyond unless the candidate withdraws in writing from the promotion process.

After department review, the CFRC and department head forward recommendations to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the College Faculty Clinical Advisory Committee (CFAC) and ultimately approval or disapproval by the dean.

College Clinical Faculty Advisory Committee Review
The role of this committee is to advise the dean on matters related to appointment, review and promotion. Members of this committee represent the college and not their own departments. The college CFAC reviews candidates for re-appointment and promotion and submits written reports, recommendations and reports on its votes on each file to the dean. The CFAC consists of one elected member (clinical full professor) from each department and one college member at large (clinical associate professor) for a total of five members serving on the committee. The clinical associate professor does not participate in the review and promotion considerations for clinical full professors.

College Approval
The dean will review all applications for title change forwarded by department heads and the CFAC. The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of the dean’s vote for or against promotion. When the dean does not concur with the department head’s positive recommendation for promotion, the dean will give the department head the opportunity to present new arguments or new data not presented before. The dean must notify the department head and the faculty member, in writing, of his or her final decision.

Provost’s Approval
The candidate’s dossier is forwarded to the Provost’s and President’s office through the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, unless the candidate requests in writing to withdraw his/her application.

Informing Faculty Members
A faculty member shall be advised in writing of the recommendation for or against promotion at each level of review in a timely manner. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision.
College of Education and Human Development

Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion Reviews For Instructional Professors

Adopted by CEHD Dean’s Council
September 7, 2010
College of Education and Human Development
Procedures for Reappointment Review
Instructional Professors

These revised guidelines are intended to bring the College of Education and Human Development in compliance with the new TAMU Systems Policy 12.07 governing Academic Professional Track Faculty. This new systems policy replaced the guidelines under which the instructional professor titles were approved by the Dean’s Council in 2008, and as a result, some of the changes are necessitated by the provisions in the new policy.

These procedures are intended to provide additional guidance for the review of instructional professors; they do not supplant TAMU rules regarding the retention of non-tenure track faculty. Instructional professors in the College of Education and Human Development will have one-year renewable contracts, unless otherwise specified for exceptional reasons. Faculty in these appointments will be expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching but are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. Therefore, instructional professors must demonstrate evidence of performance in teaching and one other area, either scholarly/creative activities or service activities.

Instructional professors are evaluated annually in accordance with College and University policies for annual performance evaluations of faculty. This document provides guidance for the evaluation, continuation, and promotion of instructional professor faculty. In addition to the annual evaluation requirement, a departmental and college-level review will be required in the third year of appointment leading to the promotion review. When an instructional faculty seeks promotion (instructional assistant to instructional associate, instructional associate to full) they should consult with the department head and appropriate departmental faculty. Timelines for promotion are not tied to third-year or reappointment reviews.

Reappointment (Third-Year Review)

General Guidelines
Third-year reviews for instructional professors take place in the spring of the initial third year of employment.

For purpose of review, visiting instructional professors are considered part time/short term and will not be evaluated in the third-year

Candidate’s Portfolio
Candidates for reappointment submit a portfolio of teaching, scholarly research or creative work, and/or service activities, and credentials. The portfolio will contain, but not be limited to (A) the candidate’s dossier consisting of 1) a statement (not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her assigned areas of professional responsibilities, 2) curriculum vitae, and 3) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility including, but not limited to teaching, professional leadership, program development, scholarship, and/or service; (B) a job description that has
been approved by the department head; (C) an A-1 form for the current year; and (D) A-2 forms for the previous two years. This portfolio will be submitted to the department head no later than the first day of the spring semester. The dossier must provide evidence of effective teaching/plus evidence of scholarly research/creative work or service activities. Successful teaching can be demonstrated by student evaluation on teaching, evidence of student learning outcomes, peer review of teaching, course and program development activities, the use of technology to enhance teaching, internal/external grant funding to support teaching, etc.

**Department Instructional Professor Review Committee**

The department head will appoint an Instructional Professor Review Committee (IPRC) of 4-6 members consisting of faculty members from the instructional associate professor rank or higher for review of instructional assistant to instructional associate and instructional professor rank or higher for review of instructional associate to instructional professor. If the department has insufficient instructional professor faculty at the appropriate ranks, members of the following faculty groups from either the department or another department within the college with the appropriate rank can be used: lecturer faculty group, clinical faculty group, tenured faculty group, providing that members have knowledge of the instructional faculty role. The department head in consultation with the dean selects these committee members.

The candidate’s portfolio of teaching, leadership, service and professional/scholarly/creative activities, credentials will be reviewed by the IPRC. After a review of the candidate’s portfolio of teaching, service and professional/scholarly activities, and credentials, the IPRC will vote on reappointment. This vote and associated recommendations will be forwarded in writing to the department head. The IPRC recommendations should be based on the individual’s written job description and performance expectations.

**Department Head Review and Recommendation**

Upon review of the recommendations for reappointment by the departmental committee, the department head will make a recommendation to accept or deny the recommendation. The head will forward his recommendation, along with results of the vote and recommendations of the departmental committee to the office of the dean for review by the College Lecturer and Instructional Professor Advisory Committee (LIPAC) and ultimately approval or disapproval by the dean.

**College Advisory Committee Review**

The College Lecturer and Instructional Professor Advisory Committee (LIPAC) review candidates for reappointment and candidates for promotion. It is responsible for conducting a thorough review of each file that is submitted by departments. It is also responsible for submitting in writing to the dean its recommendations for reappointment or promotion and a report of its vote on each file. The committee also advises the dean on issues pertaining to appointment, review, and promotion, such as guidelines for promotion and procedures for conducting reappointment and promotion reviews.

Membership on the LIPAC consists of one representative from each department and a member at large. One instructional associate professor or instructional professor or one lecturer or senior lecturer is elected by each department’s instructional professor and lecturer faculty group for a 3-year term. Additionally, an instructional professor or a senior lecturer is
elected as college at-large representative. All instructional professors and lecturers within these two faculty groups are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the at-large representative. All members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather than to serve as advocates for their departments.

Dean’s Review and Decision
The dean will review all applications for reappointment and will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the reappointment. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, the dean will inform the department head. The department head shall then have the opportunity to present new evidence or new arguments to the dean to request a reconsideration of the decision.

Recommendations for Non-Reappointment and Termination of Employment

Termination of Employment: Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to reappoint a faculty member, shall be given in writing in accord with the following standards:

- All notices of non-reappointment for instructional assistant professors with fewer than five years accumulated full-time service will be effective at the end of the current contract.
- Consistent with University rules, an instructional professor who has held any faculty appointment other than assistant lecturer, or a visiting faculty title, for the equivalent of five or more academic years of full service within a seven-year period shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University’s intent not to renew the appointment.
- All decisions of non-reappointment for Instructional Associate Professors and Instructional Professors require one-year’s notice.
- System policy 12.01, Section 6, will be adhered to when dismissing an instructional faculty for cause.

- A decision to dismiss an instructional professor prior to the expiration of an appointment and a decision not to reappoint an instructional professor member shall be based upon adequate consideration of the individual’s professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.
- The decision and the process to dismiss an instructional faculty for cause shall be guided by System policy 12.01, Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure.
College of Education and Human Development  
Procedures for Promotion Review  
For Instructional Professors

Instructional professors make a unique contribution to the educational and training mission in the College of Education and Human Development. Instructional professors are generally full-time faculty who are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching but are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of scholarly research or creative work, or the area of service. As part of the teaching functions, they are often engaged in supervision, program/curriculum development, and/or other academic activities. In addition, instructional professors can participate in grant activities and serve on various committees and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. They will also be required to demonstrate evidence of continuing professional development.

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Visiting Instructional Professor

For purposes of promotion, visiting instructional professors are considered part time/short term and are not involved in the promotion process.

- Appointment to this rank generally requires a terminal degree; however, in the College of Education and Human development, the minimum requirement is a master's degree. Under extraordinary circumstances, other degrees, certifications, and other qualifications may be considered that demonstrate evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field that the individual will be teaching (For example, exceptional athletic experience with national prominence, renowned performing artist, nationally-renowned educator/teacher, etc.)
- Relevant professional experience (e.g., teaching experience, program/curriculum development, practical experience, supervision)
- Evidence of effective teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of expertise in the professional program area

Initial Employment Requirements for the Rank of Instructional Assistant Professor

- Appointment to this rank generally requires a terminal degree; however, in the College of Education and Human development, the minimum requirement is a master's degree. Under extraordinary circumstances, other degrees, certifications, and other qualifications may be considered that demonstrate evidence of exceptional accomplishment in a field that the individual will be teaching (For example, exceptional athletic experience with national prominence, renowned performing artist, nationally-renowned educator/teacher, etc.)
- Relevant professional experience
- Evidence of superior teaching experience
- Where appropriate, history of license or certification in field of expertise in the professional program area
- Interest in and commitment to engage in professional leadership or scholarly activities
Suggested Criteria for Promotion

Institutional professors can be appointed at any academic rank as long as the faculty member meets the requirements for the rank. The following are the recommended requirements for promotion to the respective instructional professor faculty rank:

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor

Must meet the requirements for instructional assistant professor, demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching and either scholarly/creative activities or service in addition to the following:

- At least five years in rank as an instructional assistant professor
- Consistent evidence of excellence in teaching at an institution of higher education
- Service to the program, college, university, and/or community, regional, and national organizations.
- Participation in program/curriculum development and/or other activities.
- Supervision of program and/or activities
- Evidence of continued professional development and professional activities
- Evidence of scholarly/creative activities

(Successful teaching can be demonstrated by some of the following indicators: student evaluation on teaching, evidence of student outcomes, peer review of teaching, innovative program development and supervision, program leadership, using technology to enhance teaching, internal/external grant funding to support teaching; invitation to teach at domestic or international institutions of recognized excellence, selection for a department, college, or university outstanding teacher award; placement of students in academic or professional positions, etc.)

Promotion to Instructional Professor

Must meet the requirements for instructional associate professor, demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching and either scholarly/creative activities or service in addition to the following:

- At least five years in rank as an instructional associate professor
- Evidence of excellence and leadership in teaching at an institution of higher education
- Evidence of excellence in supervision, program/curriculum development, and/or other academic activities
- Evidence of excellence in professional development activities
- Evidence of leadership and service in professional organizations (e.g., leadership in national/regional conferences, committee involvement in professional organizations, leadership in professional organizations, service as a program reviewer or on a journal editorial review board).
- Service to the college and the university
- Evidence of scholarly research or creative activities (e.g., grant funding activities, scholarly publications in refereed journals, publication of textbooks and other teaching materials, presentations at national refereed conferences, peer-reviewed creative activities, etc)

(See additional indicators of successful teaching listed above)
Procedures for Promotion
The general requirement for time in rank before promotion consideration is five years. Under unusual circumstances, a request can be made to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost through the Dean of the College of Education to consider time in an equivalent faculty rank. For example, a senior lecturer who has served the required number of years and met or exceeded performance expectations may meet the requirement for instructional associate professor.

Promotion to Instructional Associate Professor and Instructional Professor should include the following elements:

General Guidelines
Instructional professor review for promotion within the College requires a review by the Departmental Instructional Professor Review Committee, the Department Head, the College Lecturer and Instructional Professor Advisory Committee, the Dean, and the Provost. This review will be conducted during the fall semester.

Candidate’s Dossier
The candidate’s dossier includes (1) a statement (typically not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, strategies, and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in the areas of assigned responsibility (i.e., teaching, professional development, supervision of programs and/or activities, scholarly activities, and service). The purpose of this statement is to provide a context for review of the file at each level; (2) a current curriculum vitae and (3) evidence of quality performance in the areas of assigned responsibility including, but not limited to teaching, service, professional leadership, program development, and/or scholarship. The evaluation must be based on written criteria. The Department Head should stipulate the information that he/she deems necessary for the evaluation of the candidate’s performance that the candidate is expected to provide.

Department Instructional Professor Review Committee
The Department Head will appoint a committee of 4-6 members consisting of faculty members from the instructional associate professor rank or higher for review of instructional assistant to instructional associate and instructional professor rank or higher for review of instructional associate to instructional professor. If the department has insufficient instructional professor faculty at the appropriate ranks, members of the following faculty groups from either the department or another department within the college with the appropriate rank can be used: lecturer faculty group, clinical faculty group, tenured faculty group, providing that members have knowledge of the instructional faculty role. The department head in consultation with the dean selects these committee members.

For promotion, two additional members can be added to the committee. The first is a faculty member selected by the candidate. The second is one faculty member, instructional, clinical, lecturer, or tenured, that represents the candidate’s area of expertise (program). This member is selected by the department head in consultation with departmental program faculty. Therefore, for promotion only, the IPRC may consist from 6-8 members.
The IPRC will review the candidate’s dossier of teaching, leadership, service and professional activities. The IPRC will vote on promotions. This vote and the committee’s recommendations will be forwarded to the department head. The committee’s recommendation should be based on the individual’s job description and appropriate performance expectations. The departmental review committee is responsible for providing a written evaluation of the candidate’s job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility. This written evaluation provides the basis for the committee’s decision regarding promotion.

**Department Head Review and Recommendation**

Upon review of the candidate’s dossier and the recommendation by the IPRC, the department head will make a recommendation to the dean’s office to deny or recommend the promotion. The department head’s letter will make reference to, and include as an attachment, a job description for the candidate. If the head and the IPRC do not agree on a recommendation, the matter will be forwarded to the dean for consideration. At any point in the process, candidates for promotion may elect, by written request, to withdraw their names from further consideration.

After departmental review, the department head forwards the departmental committee’s vote and recommendation together with his/her recommendation to the office of the dean of the College of Education and Human Development for review by the College Lecturer and Instructional Professor Advisory Committee (LIPAC) and ultimately a review and decision by the dean.

**College Advisory Committee Review**

The College Lecturer and Instructional Professor Advisory Committee (LIPAC) review candidates for reappointment and candidates for promotion. It is responsible for conducting a thorough review of each file that is submitted by departments. It is also responsible for submitting in writing to the dean its recommendations for reappointment or promotion and a report of its vote on each file. The committee also advises the dean on issues pertaining to appointment, review, and promotion, such as guidelines for promotion and procedures for conducting reappointment and promotion reviews.

Membership on the LIPAC consists of one representative from each department and a member at large. One instructional associate professor or instructional professor or one lecturer or senior lecturer is elected by each department’s instructional professor and lecturer faculty group for a 3-year term. Additionally, an instructional professor or a senior lecturer is elected as college at-large representative. All instructional professors and lecturers within these two faculty groups are eligible to vote for their departmental representative and for the at-large representative. All members of the committee are expected to represent the College rather than to serve as advocates for their departments.

**Dean’s Review and Decision**

The dean will review all applications for promotion forwarded by department heads and the Department Instructional Professor Committee. The dean will inform the department head and the faculty member of approval or denial of the request for promotion. When the dean does not concur with the departmental recommendation, he/she will inform the department head of the reasons for disapproval. The department head 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. If the dean still disapproves the request for promotion, she/he shall inform the department head and the faculty member of the reasons for the disapproval. If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean notifies the department head and the candidate of that approval.

**Provost Approval**
If the dean approves the request for promotion, the dean sends a letter recommending promotion to the Dean of Faculties, pending approval by the Provost, President, Chancellor, and Board of Regents.

**Informing Faculty Members**
A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion at each level of review in a timely manner. In the event of a negative decision at the departmental level, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision.

These Instructional Professor Guidelines will be reviewed in FY 2015 (or earlier, if needed) with respect to appointment and promotion criteria, evaluation criteria, and the role of Instructional Professors in the College of Education and Human Development.