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1. Introduction

It is critical to the success of the tenure and promotion process that every faculty member understand the process and the expectations and goals. Once a year, informational meetings are held with all faculty members eligible for promotion. The purpose of these meetings is to review and discuss promotion policies and procedures, and the expectations the department has for successful promotion and tenure cases. These meetings are hosted by the Department Head. Additional members of the Mechanical Engineering and Dwight Look College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committees often participate.

Included in these guidelines are the latest versions of:

a. Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Packages—Submission Guidelines;


d. Departmental Guidelines and Standard Operating Procedures.

Faculty members are strongly encouraged to review this information and ask any questions that they may have about tenure and promotion policies and processes.

This document provides supplemental information on the department’s activities, describes the Tenure and Promotion Committee and presents the framework and timeline upon which faculty tenure and promotion recommendations are made.

2. Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee Purpose

The Mechanical Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee is defined as “the group whose vote is forwarded as the faculty vote on the candidate.” As indicated in the Departmental Guidelines and Standard Operating Procedures (Appendix D), the departmental T&P Committee “shall advise, assist, and make recommendations to the Department Head on matters related to the appointment, re-appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty appointed under the rules of tenure within the Department.” The vote and report from the committee is the first level of evaluation on all tenure and promotion cases. The Department Head provides input to the faculty on their progress toward promotion on an annual basis and the T&P Committee assists the Department Head in the preparation of promotion documents.

Duties and Responsibilities

The departmental T&P Committee shall review every tenure track faculty member for their Intermediate and Mandatory Tenure Reviews. Additional reviews may be done at the request of either the candidate (through the Department Head) or the Department Head. Tenured associate professors shall be reviewed by the committee for promotion upon request by either the candidates (through the Department Head) or the Department Head. Prospective faculty members whose recommended appointment is with tenure must also be reviewed by this committee. If, as a result of an annual performance review, a tenure track faculty member is recommended by the Department Head for non-reappointment prior to their Mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the T&P Committee and the results of this
review must be submitted through the Department Head to the Dean with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

For the tenure and promotion process, the T&P Committee is charged with:
   a. Review and evaluation of the candidate's dossier;
   b. Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate’s teaching, research, and service (authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated);
   c. Preparing a complete report and recommendation explaining the committee’s vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and, if applicable, an overview of the candidate’s progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure (to be signed by all committee members).

3. Tenure and Promotion Process

   The Department Head will, in a memo to the faculty, request that each faculty member update her/his Curriculum Vitae and prepare a Faculty Progress Report (FPR). The departmental T&P Committee will then begin the evaluation process through a series of meetings. The following describes the sequence of events in this stage of the process:

1. Members of the T&P Committee shall receive (or have made otherwise available) all pertinent assessment material prior to the first meeting. This material includes:
   a. Three page statement maximum on their teaching, research, and service philosophies;
   b. Curriculum Vitae;
   c. A list of eight potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. According to university guidelines, the reviewers should be from peer institutions/programs or better. The candidate should also be asked to provide a list of individuals that they do not want contacted as an external reviewer;
   d. A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional);
   e. Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR);
   f. Copies of five selected refereed publications (their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M) to be forwarded to external reviewers;
   g. Other materials as may be requested by departmental T&P Committee or the Department Head (i.e., a teaching portfolio, etc.).

   **It is the responsibility of the candidate to see that these items are current and correct upon submission to the Department Head. Signed and dated updates by the candidate should be distributed immediately to the Department Head, and incorporated into the candidate’s original copy items.

2. At the first meeting of the T&P Committee, the committee will conduct an initial review of each faculty member’s progress, seeking to identify those individuals whose progress to date seems to warrant strong consideration for promotion for the coming year. For those individuals so identified, the T&P Committee will appoint subcommittees who will study the cases in detail and report back to the committee as a whole at a meeting later in the process.

3. The T&P Committee will hold additional meetings for the purpose of reviewing those cases under study by the subcommittees. The subcommittees will present their report on their candidate and the case is discussed. Action will be taken on each case.
4. The Chair of the T&P Committee shall transmit the committee’s recommendations to the Department Head. There will be no communication between the committee members or the Chair of the committee and any faculty or any candidate. All communication will be transmitted from the committee Chair to the Department Head and from the Department Head to the candidate.

5. The Department Head will consult with the T&P Committee in finalizing the list of external letter writers, which will include four names from the candidate’s list and four from the Department list. The Department Head will then request the external letters.

6. The T&P Committee shall reconvene during the summer or early in the fall semester for the purpose of continuing the assessment process for these faculty members for which external letters have been requested/received. At this meeting, the T&P Committee will take final action on each of these cases. More than one meeting may be held if needed.

7. The Chair of the T&P Committee will transmit, in writing, the final recommendations of the committee to the Department Head.

8. The T&P Committee will provide assistance, as deemed appropriate, to the Department Head in the preparation of promotion documents for transmittal to the College of Engineering.

For those assistant professors who require an Intermediate Review, the Department Head will meet with each of the faculty members to discuss the assessment and will work to determine, as deemed appropriate, a course of action that would facilitate the professional development of the faculty member. The College Manager for Faculty Services will provide each department with a list of Mandatory and Intermediate Review candidates. The following items should be requested of the Intermediate Review candidate by a reasonable deadline to conduct the review:

1. Three page statement maximum on their teaching, research, and service philosophies;
2. Up-to-date Curriculum Vitae;
3. Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR);
4. Copies of two of their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M.

Membership of the Departmental T&P Committee

The Mechanical Engineering Departmental Guidelines and Standard Operating Procedures are the basis for the appointment of the T&P Committee.

The T&P Committee is comprised of seven tenured faculty members. Five members shall be elected from among the tenured full Professors in the department by the voting faculty and two members are appointed by the Department Head. Both appointed and elected members shall serve a staggered three-year term such that no more than half the members shall rotate off on an annual basis. The Chair of the T&P Committee is appointed by the Department Head. As of 2013, the Dean has requested the inclusion of associate professor(s) in the departmental T&P Committee. The departmental guidelines are currently being revised to reflect this change.

The terms of membership of the T&P Committee will begin in January of each year. Such terms provide continuity for the committee, which conducts its work primarily over a January-through-October time frame.

Conduct and Confidentiality

The following items describe certain important aspects of the conduct of meetings and, in general, the deliberations of the T&P Committee.
1. **Confidentiality.** It is absolutely imperative that the deliberations of the T&P Committee be kept in strict confidence. Members of the committee (including the committee Chair) should not discuss any aspects of the deliberations with anyone outside the committee and should not approach any faculty member under discussion for any reason. **Only the Department Head shall convey the business of the T&P Committee with individual faculty members.** Failure to maintain strict confidentiality will erode the effectiveness of the T&P Committee since members will become reluctant to be frank and may lead to misunderstandings concerning issues, attitudes, decisions, and procedural matters. It is the responsibility of the Department Head to protect the confidentiality of written documents related to the T&P Committee’s work.

2. **Duties of the Chair.** The Chair of the T&P Committee is responsible for planning all meetings (setting and publishing the meeting agendas), conducting the meetings, preparing summaries of the deliberations of the meetings and to make sure that all required data upon which deliberations are complete and available to the members of the committee. The Chair provides the communication to the Department Head.

## 4. Tenure & Promotion Timeline (2015-2016)

The tenure and promotion cycle and process run from mid-January until early May of the following year. The tenure and promotion process timeline, with important dates and points noted, follows. Faculty members eligible for promotion and members of the T&P Committee who are responsible for the process are kept informed in writing, as appropriate, by the Department Head.

The promotion and tenure activities timeline follows:

### January 2015
- Meeting to review tenure and promotion procedures and discuss timeline;
- Request materials from candidates for Mandatory and Intermediate Reviews;
- Send request to associate professors to ask if they would like consideration of promotion—request materials from any potential candidates;
- Select Tenure and Promotion Committee members to join Department Head in review meetings with 2nd and 4th year assistant professors.

### March 2015
- Through the Dean of Faculties, the Provost requests that Deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings;
- **All materials due from Intermediate candidates;**
- **All material due from Mandatory and Promotion cases;**
- T&P Committee meets to discuss Intermediate candidates;
- Initial recommendation on each candidate from T&P Committee to Department Head;
- Recommended date to send solicitation letters to external reviewers (no later than May 31).

### April 2015
- Department Head recommendation and complete dossiers for Intermediate candidates to Dean.

### May 2015
- Department Head deadline to send out requests for letters.
June-July 2015

- Follow progress of letters, send additional requests if needed.

August 2015

- Provide T&P Committee vote results and Department Head recommendation to each mandatory and promotion consideration candidate.

September 2015

- Department Head submits recommendation letter, T&P Committee vote and recommendation, and complete dossiers to Dean.

November 2015

- Deans submit electronic copies of college chart, Faculty Biography Table, Faculty Summary Data Table and External Reviewers Chart for all candidates to the Dean of Faculties.

December 2015

- Deans submit recommendations to the Provost by sending electronic and hard copy files of all candidates to the Dean of Faculties.
- Department Head is informed of the College recommendations and notifies candidates accordingly.

January 2016

- Deans meet with the Provost and the Dean of Faculties and review recommendations.
- Provost forwards recommendations to the President.
- Department Head is informed of the Provost’s recommendations and notifies candidates accordingly.

February 2016

- President meets with the Provost and the Dean of Faculties and reviews recommendations.
- President forwards recommendations for promotion to the Chancellor and for tenure to the Board of Regents, through the Chancellor.
- Department Head is informed of the President’s recommendations and notifies candidates accordingly.

May 2016

- Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases.
- Department Head informs candidates of the final decision made in their case.

September 1, 2016

- Promotion and tenure decision become effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intermediate Review Candidates</strong> ¨Kick-off¨ meeting; request materials from candidates (due early March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>All materials due from intermediate candidates; T&amp;P Committee meets to discuss intermediate review candidates; recommendation on each candidate from T&amp;P Committee to DH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH中间评审委员会的候选人推荐和完整材料送到院。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final deadline for review letter requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow progress of letters; send additional requests if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review candidate packages; external review letters due to the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide T&amp;P Committee vote and DH recommendation to each candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH提交推荐信；T&amp;P委员会推荐；完整的案卷送到院。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oct.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean submits electronic copies of college chart, Faculty Biography Table, Faculty Summary Data Table, and External Reviewers Chart for all candidates to the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean submits recommendations to the Provost by sending electronic and hard copy files of all candidates to the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH is informed of the College recommendations and notifies candidates accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean meets with the Provost and Dean of Faculties and reviews recommendations. Provost forwards recommendations to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>President meets with the Provost and the Dean of Faculties to review recommendations. The President forwards recommendations for promotion to the Chancellor and recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents, through the Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aug.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sept. 1st</strong></td>
<td>Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.</td>
<td>Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2014</td>
<td>Through the dean of faculties, the provost requests that deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2014</td>
<td>Deans submit electronic copies of college chart (no need for College P&amp;T and Dean’s vote at this time). Faculty Biography Table, Faculty Summary Data Table and External Reviewers Chart for all candidates to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2014</td>
<td>Deans submit recommendations to the provost by sending electronic and hard copy files of all candidates to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Deans meet with the provost and the dean of faculties and review recommendations. The provost forwards recommendations to the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>President meets with the provost and the dean of faculties and review recommendations. The president forwards recommendations for promotion to the chancellor and for tenure to the Board of Regents (BOR), through the chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2015</td>
<td>Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2015</td>
<td>Reception for those promoted and/or tenured. Time and place to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All promotion and tenure candidate dossier materials are due to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by December 3, 2014. If unusual circumstances necessitate submission of any materials after the due date, the dean of the college must first obtain approval to submit late materials from the dean of faculties.

IMPORTANT CHANGES FROM LAST YEAR:
- Deadline for dossiers submission to Office of the Dean of Faculties: December 3, 2014
- Candidate statement instructions
- Use of mail merge to generate Candidate Dossier Coversheet from College Chart (optional)

II. DEFINITIONS

*College chart* - a form listing candidates’ names, departments, ranks, and other information. Instructions on how to complete the college chart, example of the completed chart and link to template can be found in Appendix B.
Dossier - A file for a single candidate that includes documents submitted by the candidate, outside peer-review letters, reports prepared by the various voting bodies (departmental P&T committee, department head, college P&T committee, dean) and other supporting materials. Departments initiate the preparation of the dossiers and then forward them to their colleges for further processing and completion. Example and link to PDF template of candidate dossier can be found in Appendix D.

Eligibility to Vote. The criteria for voting eligibility are:

1. Only tenured TAMU faculty are eligible to vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion.
2. To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must also hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate.
3. Both tenure and non-tenure track faculty members who hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to vote on non-tenure track promotion cases.

Example: For assistant professors seeking promotion and tenure to associate professor, only tenured faculty holding the rank of associate professor or above are eligible to vote. For tenured associate professors seeking promotion to full professor, only tenured full professors are eligible to vote.

File set - A complete set of materials on all candidates from a college. A file set consists of the College Chart and Dossier for all the candidates listed on the chart. Departments will be responsible for compiling and organizing the candidates’ dossiers, and then sending the dossiers to the college for final organization into the file set. For instructions on how to organize dossiers and file sets refer to Section VIII. Links to form and chart templates can be found in Section X (Appendices).

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee - A single faculty committee which is charged with reviewing candidates who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and whose members are voting on those candidates.

- The Department Head cannot be a member of the P&T committee and should not participate during P&T committee evaluation and deliberations of the candidates. It is also recommended that college and university level administrators do not participate in P&T committee deliberations, as this can be perceived as a conflict of interest because these individuals have access and may influence the dean/provost's decisions.
- The “P&T committee” is defined as “the group whose vote is forwarded as the faculty vote on the candidate.”
- There cannot be different P&T committees for different candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the same department. Departments can have different committees for tenure and non-tenure track reviews.
- Different members or subsets of members of the P&T committee can be assigned with the task of leading the evaluation and discussion of different candidates and/or evaluation areas (teaching, research, and service or other scholarly, creative activities). However, the organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates. All members of the P&T committee who are eligible to evaluate and vote on any given candidate should be active participants of the evaluation process of that candidate. Members of the P&T committee who do not read a candidate’s dossier and who do not attend the committee meeting should abstain from voting. Some members of the P&T committee might be ineligible to evaluate and vote on some candidates (e.g., an associate professor cannot evaluate a promotion to full; see “Eligibility to Vote,” above).
Each department and/or college P&T guidelines must explain how the composition of the departmental and college level P&T committees is determined. These guidelines must be developed in consultation with the faculty at large or with a representative faculty committee. The P&T committee can be formed by all tenured associate and full professors, or all full professors only, or by a subset of all tenured faculty. Colleges and departments can create promotion committees composed of non-tenure track faculty, or include non-tenure track faculty in the regular P&T committee, for the evaluation of non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion. Only faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying can evaluate the dossier. Non-tenure track faculty cannot vote in cases involving tenure-track candidates; however, they can participate and vote on non-tenure track promotions for ranks below.

III. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CANDIDATE

IMPORTANT: Deadlines for submission of these documents are determined by individual departments and or colleges. Please refer to department and/or college guidelines for additional information.

A. Candidate’s Statement on Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service (Dossier Item 1)

IMPORTANT: NEW THIS YEAR: The candidate’s statement must address IMPACT in addition to quality and productivity overtime (Please see Appendix H for guidelines and suggestions).

Description
Written by the candidate, this is a concise statement which allows the candidate to explain the quality, productivity overtime, and impact of their teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments. Each of the three areas should be individually addressed. This statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across all three areas. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. The statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good research ideas and teaching and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.

The candidate’s statement on Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service is an important document both for the candidate’s reflections and for contextualizing the other materials in the dossier. The statement should be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (college P&T committee, dean, provost and president) and by a professional readership (departmental and external reviewers). It should be jargon free, enlightening and exciting. The statements on candidate’s teaching, research, and service or other scholarly, creative activities should provide a context for review of the entire case. For those candidates involved in interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborative research the statement is a good place to inform reviewers of the candidate’s contribution to the projects.

Format & Guidelines
- Three typed pages (maximum), single-spaced; 10 or 12-pt font; 1-inch margins
- For specific guidelines on how to write candidate’s statement, please refer to Appendix H of this guidelines.
B. Candidate’s CV (Dossier Item 2)

Description
The curriculum vitae will reflect experiences and development in the candidate’s career as a teacher and scholar. It provides an overview of the candidate’s academic accomplishments.

Format & Guidelines
- **IMPORTANT**: Departments and colleges may have specific formatting requirements. Please refer to department/college guidelines for detail information.
- The curriculum vitae should be concise and padding should be avoided.
- List refereed publications (or other types of creative works) separately from those that were not refereed, and caption the lists accordingly. Provide complete documentation for each citation, including the date of publication and inclusive page numbers.
- Items that have been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled. (Most departments ask to see an acceptance letter.) Items that have been submitted but not yet accepted should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list.
- It is strongly encouraged that if any coauthors are the candidate’s undergraduate or graduate students (past or present) they are delineated in a manner so that this relationship is discernible.

Signed Statement
The candidate must include a signed statement with the CV acknowledging that the CV being submitted is the most current and is correct as of the date of the signature. This statement and signature may be appended onto the end of the CV document. **IMPORTANT**: This is different from Verification of Contents Statement (Dossier Item 3) described below.

Additions or changes to the CV
Additions or changes to the CV after initial submission may occur at any level of the review and evaluation process. In general, it is advisable to use caution and limit changes to the CV to additions, updates, or corrections that are substantive in nature. For example, candidates may request to update their CV after learning that a pending grant has been funded, a paper submitted for publication has been accepted, a new contract for a book has been signed, an important recognition has been awarded, etc. **Modifications to the dossier must be clearly marked and documented**. For example, a memo may be inserted into the CV section stating exactly what has changed (e.g. “Grant proposal X to NSF, listed as pending on page Y, has now been awarded”). The insert should contain a statement that the candidate deems the changes to be accurate as of this date and should be signed and dated by the candidate. **Requests of addition or changes to the CV must be submitted through the department head**, who in turn will forward it to the evaluating body currently reviewing the dossier.

C. Grants Summary Chart
The candidate must include a copy of the Grants Summary Chart that lists the candidate’s grant information in a table format (see example and link to template in Appendix E) at the end of the CV.

D. Verification of Contents Statement (Dossier Item 3)

Description
This is a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he/she has submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration. The list of materials might include such things as: philosophy statement(s), curriculum vitae, articles, books, portfolios (teaching, research, service, other), student evaluations, list of external reviewers, do not contact external reviewers list, and other materials submitted by the candidate.
Format & Guidelines
- A dated statement signed by the candidate.
- In the statement, the candidate should list all materials he or she is submitting to the departmental review committee.

This list should not include departmental reports, outside letters, or other materials not submitted by the candidate.

E. Faculty Biography Table

Description
The Faculty Biography Table will summarize biographical information of the candidate. This table will be forwarded to the Chancellor (all candidates seeking promotion) and Board of Regents (all candidates seeking tenure), and published in the spring recognition booklet featuring newly tenured and/or promoted faculty (all candidates granted tenure and/or promotion) (link to template can be found in Appendix F). IMPORTANT: the content and format of the Faculty Biography must follow the format detailed below, as required by the Texas A&M University System.

Instructions
Faculty Biography Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Present Rank</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr./Mr./Ms. First Last</td>
<td>Department (full name no abbreviations)</td>
<td>Present Faculty Rank</td>
<td>9/1/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terminal Degree (Year) Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience evaluated towards tenure or promotion</th>
<th>Institution (Include previous and current institution) (See section c. below for explanation and example)</th>
<th>Title (Include “Tenured” and “Year” if tenure was awarded at other institution) (See section c. below for explanation and example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (Include semester and year beginning and ending) (See section c. below for explanation and example)</td>
<td>Institution (See section c. below for explanation and example)</td>
<td>Title (See section c. below for explanation and example)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments (See section d. below for explanation)

Statement on Teaching (See section e. below for explanation)

Justification for Early Tenure, if Applicable (See section f. below for explanation)

TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE (if applicable)

Required information:
- Name, department, Present Rank and Effective Date (9/1/2015 for all candidates)
- Terminal degree, year, and institution
- Experience evaluated towards tenure or promotion.
  - (a) Faculty being considered for tenure or promotion (tenured faculty). Should include only experience that is considered in the evaluation for tenure or promotion (i.e., experience while in a tenured or tenure track position). Non-tenure track positions such as graduate assistant, teaching assistant, lecturer, post-doc and adjunct faculty positions are usually not considered as part of the tenure decision and should...
not be included. Positions such as those for System agencies or other post terminal degree experiences in which partial credit is considered should be included with years of credit indicated.

Include semester and year the faculty joined Texas A&M University in this section.

**Example of date joined Texas A&M with no other tenure track experience:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2009-Present</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each institution and each position towards tenure or promotion, list semester and year appointment started and ended, institution, and position.

**Example of date joined Texas A&M with previous tenure track experience:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Institution 1</th>
<th>Position 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Institution 2</th>
<th>Position 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2008-Sp 2011</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Fa 2011-2012</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the faculty member received tenure at previous institution or at Texas A&M, indicate in parenthesis by position and include year, i.e., Associate Professor (Tenured 2010).

**Example of date joined Texas A&M with tenure being granted at other institution and/or Texas A&M:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Institution 1</th>
<th>Position 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Institution 2</th>
<th>Position 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2005-Sp 2010</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Fa 2010-Sp 2011</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Tenured 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2011-Present</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Associate Professor (Tenured 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) For candidates being considered for promotion on the non-tenure track, any experience in an academic position at the level of lecturer or higher should be included.

**Example of experience with tenure at another institution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Institution 1</th>
<th>Position 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Institution 2</th>
<th>Position 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2005-Sp 2010</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Fa 2010-Present</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d. Accomplishments** should include area of specialty and address those issues on which the decision to grant tenure or promotion was made:

- Research, creative activities, and other scholarly endeavors;
- Student advising, counseling, and other student services;
- Committee and administrative service to university;
- Service to profession, community, state or nation;
- Professional growth;
- Quality of patient care, where applicable; and
- Patents or commercialization of research, where applicable.

The emphasis may differ because of the differences in departments’ missions and academic specialty.

Do not include pre-terminal degree experience in summation unless experience provides better insight into effectiveness of current faculty effort or fills in gaps of professional career such as an Ed.D. and serving as school superintendent.
Include awards, honors, and special recognitions for work as well. A listing of memberships in professional organizations should be avoided unless it also includes contributions made to organization such as presentations at professional meetings or leadership positions an organization.

e. **Statement on Teaching**: should include reference to teaching evaluation and effectiveness (do not use numerical description of student evaluations: i.e. 4.5 on a 5 scale; instead, use adjectives: e.g.: solid, outstanding, excellent, good, adequate, at departmental average..., and put in context to the department averages for the course level) and any notable honors or awards received.

f. **Justification for Early Tenure**: If early tenure is being requested, the department head or dean must provide a brief justification statement.

**EXAMPLE of Faculty Biography Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Present Rank</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joseph Batch</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. (2005)</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2008-Sp 2011</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2011-Present</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Batch’s area is organic chemistry with a specialty in polymer chemistry, transition metal catalysis, polymer synthesis, asymmetric organic synthesis, and organometallic chemistry. He has authored three publications on efforts to combine the physiochemical properties of a polymer with the reactivity of a low molecular weight compound. This work involves fundamental research both in synthesis and catalysis. He has received grants of $750,000 from NSF.

Dr. Batch teaches first year organic chemistry and one advanced organic chemistry course for undergraduates as well as two graduate level organic chemistry courses. He has received outstanding student evaluations (above department average) each year and has chaired four graduate student committees and served on four others.

Dr. Batch is being recommended for early tenure because…..

**New this Year**

- The Faculty Biography template is a protected form
- Limit the combined content of sections (d) (Accomplishments) and (e) (Statement on Teaching) of the Faculty Biography Table to 200-250 words
- Departments are expected to review all Faculty Biography Tables to ensure they are in compliance with the above guidelines

**F. Faculty Summary Data Table**

Summary data tables will not be forwarded to the Chancellor and Board of Regents, but will be used by the dean of faculties and other Texas A&M University officials to quickly respond to questions and requests for information. Summary data tables must use the format provided below (link to template can be found in Appendix G). Entries in the right-hand column should be formatted as bulleted lists. Leave table cells blank if they do not apply to the candidate. Do not change the titles of the cells.

| Teaching Philosophy | • Main point one |
### EXAMPLE of Faculty Summary Data Table

| **Teaching philosophy** | • Includes as much hands-on learning in the courses as possible, with the overarching goal of creating a link between the textbook and the real world.  
• Constantly updating his course material, homework assignments, problem sets, exams, design projects, and notes, to ensure that his course reflects the changes in the field |
| **Courses Frequently Taught** | • BAEN 387 |
| **Number of Graduate Students Chaired or Co-Chaired** | • MS 7  
• PhD 3 |
| **Other Teaching Accomplishments** | • Developed 2 new undergraduate courses  
• NFS grant has allowed him to recruit and mentor a large number of students from underrepresented groups |
| **Teaching Recognitions and Awards** | • Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department Excellence in Teaching Award, 2008  
• Montague Teaching Scholar in the Texas A&M University Center for Teaching Excellence, 2009 |
| **Peer-reviewed Journal Articles** | • 13 |
| **Peer-reviewed Proceedings** | • 7 |

---

* Give the total sum of all grants awarded to the prospective faculty member and his/her collaborators  
† Of the total sum, give the amount corresponding to the individual faculty member. If unknown, divide each award(s) by the number of PIs and CoPIs authoring each grant and then sum.
New this Year
- Do not change the format of the Faculty Summary Data Table template
- Departments are expected to review all Faculty Summary Data Tables to ensure they are in compliance with the above guidelines

G. Other Materials and Documentation (Dossier Item 13, optional)

Description
This section is for any materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process or letters from TAMU faculty members. Annual performance evaluation by department head and mid-term review report to candidate may be included in this section.

**IMPORTANT:** departments and/or colleges may require that certain documents be included in this section. Please refer to department/college guidelines for specific requirements.

Supportive materials such as the teaching portfolio (if utilized) and copies of books or articles should be retained in the college, and not sent to the Office of the Dean of Faculties with the P&T package.

**IMPORTANT:** Candidates may have to submit additional documents for department and college review. Please review department and/or college guidelines for requirements.

IV. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS LETTERS (DOSSIER ITEM 8)

Description
Outside reviewers’ letters allow an opportunity for authorities in the candidate’s field to evaluate the candidate’s accomplishments and potential. External letters may reflect more than just scholarship. Reviewers may be asked to judge an individual’s teaching or other activities, as well as reviewing books or articles. (If a reviewer is asked to judge an individual’s teaching ability, it is recommended that they be sent a teaching portfolio or equivalent materials to review.) Be aware that letters from dissertation advisors do not carry the same weight as those from unbiased evaluators, and unsolicited letters from former students carry little weight whether they are supportive or negative about teaching performance. Such letters from former advisors and former students must be placed in Tab 13 (Other Materials and Documentation).

Guidelines
- Complete the *External Reviewers Chart* for this section of the dossier (see example and link to template in Appendix C) and provide as excel file. This should be filled out by whoever is responsible for contacting the reviewers and should include the names of **ALL** the external reviewers.
reviewers contacted (only those to whom the candidate’s dossier was sent to) and specify which ones were put forward by the candidate and which ones were suggested by the department head or P&T committee. Also include a separate document listing the names and contact information for the reviewers and provide a “biography” showing the qualifications and credentials of the reviewers listed on the chart.

- **IMPORTANT:** The department should aim to include 5 to 7 letters from external reviews (which may require asking for more than the desired number). The minimum number of letters required is 3.

- Letters may be received on official letterhead but emailed letters are also acceptable if that is the preference of the reviewer.

- Most outside reviewers should be from **peer institutions or better**, but letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable. In some cases, the preeminence of institutions is obvious. Where the stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, include an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer is appropriate. For example, an institution of lower reputation than Texas A&M may have one of the strongest programs in the candidate’s field. Although letters may be requested from outstanding individuals outside the academy, the file should still include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities.

- **IMPORTANT:** Include a list of the department’s peer and aspiring institutions if other than AAU-level institutions, and the basis for the selection.

- Include a copy of the letters requesting outside reviews, as well as **all letters received in response**. (If a form letter is used for all reviewers, a single copy may be included, with a notation added to this effect.) Letters should be essentially uniform.

- It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates.

- It should be understood that a lack of response from a reviewer who has been asked to send a letter should not be interpreted as a negative statement against the candidate.

**Procedures for Requesting Outside Letters**

1. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers. The candidate may also provide a list of those who should not be consulted.

2. The department head or P&T committee provides a list of possible reviewers.

3. From the two lists, a group of **at least seven** are selected and contacted by the department head or P&T committee chair.

4. Take care to select outside referees:
   - A. whose objectivity is not open to challenge (i.e., avoid coauthors, longtime personal friends, former students, or former mentors unless more than the minimum of three letters are presented).
   - B. whose rank at their institution is equivalent to or better than the one for which the candidate is being considered.
   - C. who do not appear on the candidate’s “do not contact” list

5. Ensure that a mix of letters is solicited- some suggested by the candidate and some by the department. Clearly indicate in the **External Reviewers Chart** who suggested which reviewers, which requested letters were or were not received. All requested letters that are received must be included in the dossier.

6. **IMPORTANT:** It is not recommended that the solicitation letter asks if the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion at their institution but instead asks to evaluate the candidate’s work and its current and potential national and/or international prominence.

7. The solicitation letter should request specific examples of the candidate’s current and potential quality, impact, and independence of their scholarship (for all tenured and tenure
track faculty, and for non-tenure-track faculty if applicable). The letter may request an opinion regarding teaching and/or service.

8. The solicitation letter 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.

9. If a solicitation letter containing the elements of (7) and (8) in addition to the candidates dossier is sent, and the referee declines to write a letter for the candidate, you must still list this referee’s name in the chart among those solicited and indicate that they declined.

10. **IMPORTANT.** If the faculty member is a member of an interdisciplinary program at Texas A&M University, an additional letter should also be requested from the chair of the program. The request must also be included on the external reviewers chart and the letter included in section 8 of the dossier with the other external reviewers’ letters. In the external reviewers’ chart indicate that this reviewer is from an **Interdisciplinary Program.**

**V. DEPARTMENT REVIEW**

A. Department Evaluation of Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service (Dossier Items 4-7)

**Description**

These are summary reports on the candidate’s teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service. They should reflect the views of the voting committee’s members.

**Note:** The drafting of the summary reports may be assigned to an individual faculty member or subset of faculty members of the department’s P&T committee. The summary reports can be edited and modified to reflect the views of the entire committee if necessary.

**IMPORTANT:** Votes should not be included in the individual teaching, research, and service reports.

These reports should allow subsequent reviewers to find documented evidence for statements made in the reports. However, they should not repeat information that can be found elsewhere in the dossier. They may refer to the outside letters and other materials without directly quoting them.

**Format & Guidelines**

- Three or four individual reports on teaching (Dossier Item 4), research and/or other scholarly, creative activities (Dossier Item 5) and service (Dossier Item 6) or other activities (Dossier Item 7, if applicable).
- Written by faculty from the department P&T committee, **not by the department head or the candidate.**
- Authorship of each performance-area report should be made clear by listing the names of the individual or individuals who wrote each report. These reports can be edited to ensure they accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee. A typed statement at the end of each report such as, “The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee” will suffice.
- Thorough analysis should be given to all three areas (teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service).

Additional information and guidelines specific to each report can be found below. 

*Teaching Report*
The category of "teaching" includes, among other things:
  - Classroom and laboratory instruction
  - Development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods
  - Publication of instructional materials including textbooks
  - Supervision of graduate students

In the report on evaluation of teaching, the following must be included for each candidate:

1. **Peer evaluation of course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods**, as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate's course offerings.  
   **Note:** Peer reports of structured classroom observations are helpful, but are not required.  
   If such a report is provided, it should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance.  
   If a department has engaged in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, these evaluations would be a natural addition to this section of the dossier.

2. **Student ratings of teaching**, with comments on these evaluations by peers: Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and in tabular form) of the student ratings must be presented, with numerical data set in the context of departmental standards and norms.  
   (A department that does not utilize numerical ratings should provide a careful summary and analysis of the verbal responses over a multi-year period.)

3. **Peer evaluation of other teaching contributions** of value to the department, such as the direction of graduate students and undergraduate researchers, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses, pedagogical publications, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching-related activities.

Do not include letters of testimonial from colleagues or students (these may be placed in Dossier Item 13: Other Materials).

Research and/or Other Scholarly, Creative Activities Report
For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publications.  
For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of scholarly, creative activity, such as architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, and sculpture.

Within the report, describe authorship protocols within your discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.

Service Report
This report might include service to the institution, to students, colleagues, the department, college, and the university.  
It may also include service beyond the campus, such as service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

Other Activities Report
This report is for any activities that do not fit into any of the other three.  
This section should be left blank if it is not relevant to the candidate.
B. Department P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation (Dossier Item 9)‡

Description
The P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendations is advisory in nature. The main purpose of this report is to convey the essence of the departmental committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance as it relates to his or her suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure. The report should make it clear that adequate consideration was given to teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service (or relevant categories for the particular faculty member appointment), and that the recommendation was based on a set of written and widely circulated promotion and tenure guidelines promulgated by the college and/or department (which are reviewed and updated regularly). A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities and the committee’s concerns. The report should reflect the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate’s case, and the committee’s recommended action. For example, “the majority thought the quantity of publications was good, but questioned the quality,” or “a minority was concerned about the rate of productivity,” or “the research and scholarly publications were excellent but a few committee members expressed concerns about the quality of the teaching.” Do not include direct quotes of committee members or minutes of the meeting. Make sure that the discussion report correlates with the vote.

Format & Guidelines of the Departmental P&T Discussion Report and Recommendations

- The overall summative, overarching Departmental Committee discussion report and recommendations should cover teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service.
- Summarize the most relevant issues explaining the outcome of the vote. A record of votes alone does not document the important issues in the deliberations.
- Avoid direct quotes, minutes, or transcripts of the proceedings.
- Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents (although other documents, such as the teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service reports may be referred to).
- Make sure that the committee’s recommendations are consistent with evidence of performance as documented in the rest of the dossier.
- The committee’s discussion report and recommendations should address any negative comments made by the external reviewers.
- While the P&T departmental discussion report and recommendations should emphasize a case based on the evidence that supports the recommendation, an explanation of contrary statements in the departmental reports, external letters, or members’ votes should be explained and given a sense of the weighting on the overall decision. Discussion and views of any minority or dissenting faculty should be reflected in the discussion report.
- The committee’s discussion report and recommendations should reflect the committee’s acceptance of the conclusions in the analyses filed under the individual Teaching, Research and/or other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service reports. If those analyses do not reflect the deliberations of the committee and the committee’s recommendation, then the committee report must explain this.
- IMPORTANT: The names of all the committee members voting in each case should be included in the report.

‡ Only one report should be submitted and submitting minority reports is discouraged. However, if this is impossible and a committee must submit minority reports, they will only be accepted if the reports indicate the name(s) of those submitting the minority report(s). Unattributed minority reports will not be accepted.
The vote (i.e. number of yes, no, abstain, absent, recused, total eligible) of the P&T committee must be included in a table format in the discussion report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recused</th>
<th>Total Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All committee members should review the contents of the committee discussion report and recommendations. Members should indicate their agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome. IMPORTANT: This should be done by having all voting committee members sign the report. An email agreeing to the content of the report can be used in place of a signature.

### Department Head’s Presence at P&T Committee Meetings

Committee discussions and recommendations regarding candidates should be independent of any administrator’s recommendation, opinion, or influence. For this reason, it is recommended that the department head or their delegates not attend the meetings during which the committee is processing a case. However, if the committee wishes to have the department head present, and if the department’s guidelines or bylaws make it clear that this may occur, the committee may elect to ask the department head to attend. In this case, the department head should be present for meetings on all candidates, not selective ones.

### C. Department Head Recommendation (Dossier Item 10)

#### Description
This report gives the department head an opportunity, after reviewing the candidate’s dossier, reports and recommendations generated by the P&T committee, and external reviewers’ letters, to convey the rationale that ultimately leads to his or her recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. This report should include a discussion of the P&T committee’s evaluations/recommendations, as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the department head wishes to make.

#### Format & Guidelines
- Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case
- Provide the context of this particular case within the department
- Explain special consideration cases (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances...)
- Explain any mixed or negative votes, if not explained in the department P&T committee discussion report and recommendations
- Address any negative comments by external reviewers if not properly addressed by the P&T committee
- Explain the department head’s vote, especially if it is contrary to the departmental recommendation

### VI. COLLEGE REVIEW

#### A. College Committee Report and Recommendation (Dossier Item 11)

#### Description
Similar to the department P&T committee discussion report and recommendations (Dossier Item 9), this document should reflect the committee discussion, primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other and the final committee vote. The vote of the committee in a table format (i.e. number of yes, no, abstain, absent, recused, total eligible) must be included in the report and all committee members should review the contents of the committee report. Members should indicate their agreement with what is stated in the report, and that the document reflects their discussion and voting outcome. IMPORTANT: This should be done by having all voting committee members sign the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recused</th>
<th>Total Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean Presence at College P&T Committee Meetings**

Committee discussions and recommendations regarding candidates should be independent of any administrator’s recommendation, opinion, or influence. For this reason, it is recommended that the dean and/or their delegates not attend the meetings during which the college P&T committee is processing a case. However, if the committee wishes to have the dean and/or their delegates present, and if the college’s guidelines or bylaws make it clear that this may occur, the committee may elect to ask the dean and/or their delegates to attend. In this case, the dean and/or their delegates should be present for meetings on all candidates, not selective ones.

**B. Dean Recommendation and Summary (Dossier Item 12)**

**Description**

This is similar to the department head report (Dossier Item 10). As with that report, the dean’s report is an analysis of the case which should provide a general basis for strength or weakness, explain any mixed or negative votes (if not explained in the College Committee Report), and explain the dean’s vote—especially if it is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations.

The dean’s report makes an independent determination and should be helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing/quoting other materials in the package. This is especially important for cases that have generated strong differences in recommendation during the evaluation process.

**Reconsideration of a case**

If the dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the department head’s recommendation, in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.6.3, the dean shall inform the department head and faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The department head may then resubmit the case for further consideration to the dean. If a case is resubmitted, it shall be re-reviewed by the college-wide promotion and tenure committee and dean before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the provost.

Any petition for reconsideration must be based upon either (a) new evidence that is not already contained within the dossier or (b) substantial new arguments that were not made in the first presentation.

In the case of reconsideration requests by the department head to the dean, the basis for seeking the reconsideration of the case and any supporting materials are considered additions to the dossier and should be included in Dossier Item 13 (Additional Information).
Changes or additions to the dossier
Changes or additions to the dossier do not trigger nor prohibit re-reviews by evaluation bodies that have already produced a vote based on the older version of the dossier. Therefore, the department or the college (depending where the dossier is at the time the change is introduced) should indicate whether previous evaluation levels re-reviewed the material (e.g., “The department P&T committee reviewed the updated material(s) on 9/27/09”), along with the results of the re-review (e.g., “The new information did not change the recommendation of the P&T committee). Re-reviews by previous evaluation levels are rare occurrences, except in cases where the dean is asked to reconsider his/her vote. It is advisable to consult with the Dean of Faculties before requesting or conducting any re-review.

Note: If the report of the previous level is specific in naming a change or addition that would alter their vote from negative to positive, and that change or addition happens, it may not be necessary for that level to re-review. For example, if a departmental P&T committee indicated (in the report) that those who voted negatively would—if the candidate had a signed book contract, for example—be persuaded to change to a positive vote, and if that contract came through while the file was at the dean’s level, the dean could simply include that in his or her report.

VII. PROCESS INFORMATION

A. Committee Proceedings (Department and College)

- Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence.
- In presenting cases for promotion and/or tenure, departments should make clear any distinctive expectations that have existed with respect to particular candidates, which therefore should be brought to bear in the review. If a case is to be reviewed according to atypical criteria, that fact must be made clear in the presentation of the file. (See section 4.5.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2–University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.) In cases for promotion to full professor, please make the basis for the argument for excellence clear.
- Promotion and tenure are matters of central concern to many faculty members and to the university. Failure to provide and adhere to criteria for the granting of promotion and tenure can do long-term damage to a department and college, and certainly a negative decision can do long-term damage to an individual’s career. The process must uphold high standards and at the same time observe scrupulous standards of fairness.
- Department heads, deans, and committees should take care to consult the University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion to be thoroughly familiar with criteria for tenure and/or promotion by rank and with procedures.
- College committees should clarify beforehand the role of the committee members during deliberations of colleagues from their own departments (this should be addressed by the college P&T guidelines).

B. Notifying Candidates of Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations

Candidates should be advised, by the department head, of the recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure at each level of review. In the event of a negative tenure decision, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If it is requested by the faculty member, the statement of reasons will be provided (usually by the department head) after the president informs the deans of his decision.

The following chart outlines the notification process. Notification should be made as soon as possible after a recommendation is made at a given level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Review</th>
<th>Notification Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Committee</td>
<td>Department head notifies candidate upon receipt of committee recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>Department head notifies candidate upon submission of recommendation to the dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Committee</td>
<td>Dean notifies department head upon receipt of the committee’s recommendation; the department head notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies department head upon submission of recommendation to the provost (through the dean of faculties); the department head notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Dean of faculties notifies dean, who notifies department head, who notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>President notifies provost who notifies the dean of faculties who notifies dean, who notifies department head, who notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor (promotion candidates)</td>
<td>An official letter of congratulations will be sent to all promotion and/or tenure candidates by the dean of faculties and the president as soon as possible after the BOR has officially acted on the president’s recommendations for tenure candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents (Only candidates being considered for tenure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Candidate's Right to Withdraw

At any point in the process, a candidate may elect to withdraw his or her name from further consideration. This must be a written request. In the case of mandatory tenure considerations, this will mean submitting a written resignation. The request should be submitted to the department head, who in turn will communicate the decision to the college dean. The dean will communicate the resignation to the dean of faculties if the dossier has been received by the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Dossiers that are withdrawn will be shredded.

D. Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Probationary Period

Note: Guidelines on annual and mid-term (3-year) reviews are a separate document that is available on the Dean of Faculties web site (http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/Annual_Midterm_Review_Guidelines.pdf).

Mandatory Review (Penultimate Year)

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines focus primarily on procedures for the Mandatory (penultimate year) Review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required; however, conducting the review earlier is often appropriate and encouraged. (If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for tenure, a review is conducted again at the mandatory time).
The department head should initiate the mandatory review process, if they do not, any faculty member who is in their next-to-last year of probationary service should notify the department head that the year for a tenure judgment has been reached. This communication should be made in writing in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the matter by any party.

The timing of penultimate year reviews is illustrated in the table in the next section.

**Non-Reappointment**

Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year contracts, a decision not to reappoint an individual who is on probation can be made any time up to the year of the mandatory review. Non-reappointment should be considered if performance is unsatisfactory to the point that it is clearly unlikely the person will qualify for tenure, as neither party benefits from prolonging an unsatisfactory situation. Such a decision is made, of course, with great care and only in compelling circumstances. Please note that notification of non-renewal may be made in spite of a prior decision to extend the probationary period. However, once notification of non-renewal is made, no probationary period extension may be requested.


**The “Tenure Clock” (Timing of Reviews)**

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 month, if contract start date is in 2009 + 7 years of probation – 2 years = 9. The mandatory review will start in Fall 2014; if successful, the Board of Regents will grant tenure in Spring 2014, and the promotion and/or tenure will become effective on September 1, 2015).

Any individual hired for a tenure-track position will be required to submit materials for review during the academic year prior to the end of their probationary period. The timing of this depends upon the length of the probationary period (see chart below).

For example--For a faculty member **hired in calendar year 2009**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If probationary period is:</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between:</th>
<th>Mandatory Tenure Review (at all levels) will occur:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2012 (due 2012/2013)</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2011 (due 2011/2012)</td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT:
1. The semester of hire does not determine the start of the "Tenure Clock", the calendar year does.
2. The length of the probationary period will be found in the faculty member’s original letter of hire and the “agreement concerning probationary service of new faculty” form.
3. The Board of Regents will review recommendations in the spring semester of the tenure review (academic) year.
4. See the separate Guidelines for Annual and Midterm Reviews (http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/tenure_promotion/Annual_Midterm_Review_Guidelines.pdf) or more information about midterm review timing.

Extensions to the Probationary Period

Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member, recommendation by the department head and dean, and approval by the dean of faculties.

Extensions are usually for one year, but a longer period may be requested in compelling circumstances. Any extension greater than one year must be approved by the provost. A faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases:

- The faculty member is taking leave without pay, or a reduction in service to 50% time for a semester or academic year, provided the leave is not taken solely for the purpose of pursuing activities that will enhance the faculty member’s qualifications for promotion and tenure.
- The faculty member has encountered circumstances that may seriously impede progress toward demonstrating qualification for the award of promotion and tenure. Such circumstances might include (but are not limited to):
  - serious illness or injury;
  - having responsibility for the primary care of an infant or small child;
  - having responsibility for the primary care of a close relative who is disabled elderly or seriously ill;
  - any serious disruption of the probationary period for unexpected reasons beyond the faculty member’s control.

The above guidelines for extension were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the president of the university.

Reconsideration in the Terminal Year

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure in the mandatory year who is not successful may be reconsidered in the terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the provost that reconsideration seems appropriate. The sole ground on which a department head may propose making such an exception to general practice is that the case has substantially changed since the mandatory consideration. The dean of faculties will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.
E. Department and College Written Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure

University Rule 12.01.99.M2–University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and tenure requires that each College and the Libraries develop written guidelines describing their own evaluation criteria in accordance with those specified for the University. In those units in which the goals and objectives of departments differ significantly, departments should also have written evaluation guidelines. The rule states that guidelines should be redistributed to faculty at least every three years, and steps should be taken to ensure that faculty are thoroughly familiar with these guidelines. For the sake of openness of the process and the maintenance of an atmosphere of trust, it is also advisable to announce the names of members of departmental and college evaluation committees on an annual basis.

A copy of each department and college’s guidelines for promotion and tenure should be forwarded electronically, on an annual basis, to:
Megan Smith (megan.h.smith@tamu.edu)

F. Early Promotion and Tenure

Since promotion and tenure are linked for individuals hired as assistant professors (or instructors), a recommendation for early promotion must be coupled with a recommendation for early tenure, and vice-versa.

G. Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments

University Rule 12.01.99.M2–University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion, sections 4.6.2.1. and 4.6.2.2., indicate that faculty members having joint appointments (if funded) or having appointments with interdisciplinary (intercollegiate) faculties are to 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. Each unit must have guidelines governing faculty review, promotion and tenure (and these guidelines must be approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties, and reviewed by that office whenever significant changes are made to them).

In the case of joint appointments involving more than one college, both deans (and both college level promotion and tenure committees) provide recommendations to the provost. Candidates who are involved with Interdisciplinary Programs, Centers, or Institutes must request a letter from the program chair or director. Such letters should be solicited simultaneously with external reviewers’ letters so they may become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental P&T committee. The report by the committee of an interdisciplinary faculty may consist simply of a letter including comments on teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service, and intercollegiate cooperation. Please include both the letter requesting this review as well as the letter received.

H. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotions

The review process for non-tenure track faculty (such as Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, or “Adjective” Assistant Professor to “Adjective” Associate Professor) is very similar to that of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and is on the same timetable (e.g., section I. Timeline). Non-tenure track promotion packages should not be forwarded outside of the regular promotion and tenure timetable.

The process is unique, however, in the following ways:
- Outside letters are not required (although they may be included if desired). It is recognized that some of those in non-tenure track appointments do not have external visibility.
However, departments and/or colleges may require external letters in their units. Please refer to department and/or college promotion guidelines for specific requirements.

- The weighting of teaching, research, and service may differ significantly from what is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty. The categories of Teaching, Research and/or other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service may in fact be changed to more appropriately reflect the individual's responsibilities and to reflect the evaluation guidelines developed by the college and/or department (regarding those positions).

- Request for promotion of Research Faculty must be routed through the Vice President for Research prior to submission to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

Non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion will submit a dossier for review, organized in the way described in section III. Committees, department head’s and dean’s reports should make clear the criteria and weighting used for the consideration. Each college may have its own (approved and published) criteria for reviewing non-tenure track packages. Non-tenure track promotion packages will be evaluated by department committee, department head, college committee and dean. Non-tenure track packages will then be forwarded to the dean of faculties, for approval by the provost, president, and chancellor.

I. Faculty Members Hired Before Terminal Degree Has Been Issued

New faculty members hired as instructors because they have not yet received a terminal degree may be promoted to assistant professor upon receipt of that degree. Instructor titles are tenure accruing. If the unit wishes the tenure clock not to start until the person obtains the terminal degree, the faculty member must be given a non-tenure track title.

If hiring paperwork was previously sent to the dean of faculties that indicated the hire would be at the level of assistant professor conditional upon receipt of the degree, the dean of faculties will only require a memo indicating that this has occurred. If the individual was officially hired at the level of instructor, then upon receipt of the degree the title may be changed to assistant professor, after degree verification, with a memo to the dean of faculties.

VIII. DOSSIER AND FILE SET ORGANIZATION

A. Organization of Faculty Dossiers

Departments initiate the preparation of the faculty dossiers and then forward them to their colleges for further processing and completion.

Each candidate dossier (both hard and electronic copy) must include:

- Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet (See Appendix A)
- Tab 1: Candidate statement on teaching, research and service (Item 1)
- Tab 2: Candidate CV (Item 2)
  - Candidate CV
  - Signed statement
  - Candidate grant chart
- Tab 3: Verification of contents statement (Item 3)
- Tab 4: Department report of teaching (Item 4)
- Tab 5: Department report of research (Item 5)
- Tab 6: Department report of service (Item 7)
- Tab 7: Department report of other activities (if applicable) (Item 7)
- Tab 8: External reviewers letters (Item 8):
  - External reviewers chart
For each candidate’s dossier please do the following:

1. Fill out a Dossier Cover Sheet to be included at the front of each candidate dossier (see example and link to template in Appendix A).

2. Use tabbed divider sheets to separate the sections (Items 1-13) of the candidate’s dossier.

3. The PDF version of the dossier will have to be set up as a multi-document file with “bookmarks.” A PDF template with all required bookmarks and instructions is available at http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms.

4. **IMPORTANT:** For all documents, except for those with signatures, please provide original PDFs. This means that files must be saved as PDFs rather than scanned as PDFs. This is important, because the quality of scanned PDFs is low, and the scans do not allow the search function to be used.

**IMPORTANT:** By November 6, 2014 colleges must submit, for each candidate, electronic copies of the following documents to the Office of the Dean of Faculties (dof@tamu.edu):

- College Chart (Excel) (no need for College P&T and Dean’s vote at this time)
- Faculty Biography Table (Word)
- Faculty Summary Data Table (Word),
- Candidate External Reviewer Chart (Excel)

**B. Organization and Submission of File Sets**

**File Set Hard Copies**

Three (3) hard copies of each candidate dossier (organized in file sets) plus one electronic copy (PDF format) must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by December 3, 2014.

**Dossier Files Organization**

- Each candidate’s dossier (including the Dossier Cover Sheet) must be placed in a manila folder with the appropriate label. Labels should be placed on the tab of each manila folder. Typically, Avery 5366 (or similar) labels work well with the folders and are recommended. Each Label should contain the following information:

```
Last Name, First Name - Rank sought
Department/College - 2014-2015
```

Example of manila folder label

```
Smith, John – Associate Professor with Tenure
Nutritional Sciences/Agriculture and Life Sciences– 2014-2015
```
For the hard copy dossiers, Tabs with numbered dividers (1-13) must be used in order to assist the reviewers in locating Dossier Items 1-13. Avery 11142/3 dividers (or similar) are recommended.

File Set Organization
Three (3) identical file sets must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by December 3, 2014.

All manila folders (candidate dossiers) should be placed in brown expandable folders within banker boxes for delivery to the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Universal 15343 (or similar) expandable file folders are recommended.

IMPORTANT: The manila folders must be organized in the following order:
1. Category
   A. Promotion with tenure candidates
   B. Tenure-only candidates
   C. Tenured, promotion-only candidates
   D. Non-tenure track, promotion candidates
2. Department
3. Last name (alphabetically, from A to Z)

Example of hard copy file set organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Promotion with tenure</th>
<th>3. Tenured, promotion-only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Chemistry</td>
<td>o Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Davis</td>
<td>o Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o McDonald</td>
<td>o Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Statistics</td>
<td>o Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Perez</td>
<td>o Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Smith</td>
<td>o Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Tenure-only</th>
<th>4. Non-tenure track, promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Biology</td>
<td>o Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adams</td>
<td>o Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Mathematics</td>
<td>o Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Carter</td>
<td>o Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lopez</td>
<td>o Walton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single copy of the college chart must be submitted with each hard copy set.

Banker Boxes
Banker boxes are preferred for transporting your documents to the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Each box should be intact and should contain a secure lid and should weigh no more than 35 pounds.

Electronic File Set (Flash drive)
An electronic copy of the file set must be submitted with the 3 hard copies to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by December 3, 2014.

As with hardcopies, supporting materials (such as copies of articles) should not be included in the electronic submission.

The flash drive should contain six electronic folders labeled:
Folder 1: College Promotion and Tenure Chart
Folder 2: Promotion with tenure candidates
Folder 3: Tenure-only candidates dossiers
Folder 4: Promotion-only (Tenured) candidates
Folder 5: Promotion only (non-tenure track) candidates
Folder 6: CVs (only for candidates seeking tenure)
Folder 7: Candidates photographs

Folder 1 should contain:

- An Excel copy of the college P&T chart.

Folders 2-5 should contain:

- Folders labeled as [Department name]. Each department folder should contain:
  - A PDF portfolio of each candidate’s dossier. Labeled as: [Last Name, First Name]
  - An Excel-file of each candidate grant chart. Labeled as: [Last Name, First Name Grants Chart]
  - An Excel-file of each candidate external reviewers chart. Labeled as: [Last Name, First Name Reviewers Chart]

Folder 6 should contain: Separate PDF copies of each candidate’s CV only for those seeking Tenure with Promotion and Tenure-only (required by the BOR).

- Name individual CV files as [Last Name, First Name CV].
- The System requests that the candidate’s name on the CV appear exactly as it appears on the faculty biography table.
- CVs may not contain personal contact information such as home address, home phone number, social security number, or personal email address. (Please remove before sending.)

Folder 7. Every year, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Dean of Faculties create a booklet, with photographs, honoring those who receive tenure and/or promotion, during the current year of consideration. Photographs should be a head or upper-body shot in which the head is 1” high. Electronic (digital) photos are required and must be a minimum of 300 dpi. Please do not copy and send website photographs (their quality in the printed booklet will be poor).

Example of electronic file set organization:
IX. RESOURCES

Questions about the organization and submission of the dossiers, file sets, and P&T Recognition Booklet materials should be directed to:

Lena Koestler, Faculty Affairs Coordinator
979-845-4274, lena_koestler97@tamu.edu, or

Megan Smith, Manager – Faculty promotion, Development and Recognition
979-845-4274, megan.h.smith@tamu.edu

Questions about the promotion and tenure evaluation process may be directed to:

Michael Benedik, Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, or

Blanca Lupiani, Associate Dean of Faculties
979-845-4274
dof@tamu.edu

Note: Colleges may have submission requirements and guidelines that do not contradict but complement these printed guidelines. Please refer also to your college guidelines and college's P&T coordinator for direction. You may also visit http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tp-guidelines for further information.
X. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet (Submitted as PDF)

TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE
NEW THIS YEAR. In order to facilitate the process of P&T information submission, and to ensure that the data in college chart and candidate dossier cover sheets are the same, we have developed a new college chart, which can be used to fill in all the candidate dossier cover sheet information using mail merge. The use of these documents will require that the college chart is completed (all information must be filled in before the mail merge is done) before the Candidate Dossier Cover Sheets are generated using mail merge.

The WINDOWS instructions for doing the mail merge are as follows:

- Open “Candidate Dossier Coversheet” mail merge form in Word
- Open “College Chart” in Excel
- Click “Mailings” tab in Word
- Click “Select Recipients”
- Click “Use Existing List”
- Find where you have your “College Chart” saved and click “Open”
- Select “P&T College Chart” and click “Ok”
- Click “Mailings”
- Click “Finish and Merge”
- Click “Edit Individual Documents”
- Under “Select Records” pop-up window select “All”
- Click OK
- The first page of the merged document will be blank.
- Save the document as PDF and extract each candidate dossier coversheet to add to candidate dossier.

The MAC instructions for doing the mail merge are as follows:

- Open “Candidate Dossier Coversheet” mail merge form in Word
- Go to “Tools” and select “Mail Merge Manager”, the following pop up menu will appear

1. In the “Mail Merge Manager” pop up window click “Create New” and select “Form Letters”
2. In the “Mail Merge Manager” pop up window click “Get List” and select "Open Data Source”
3. Select and open the “P&T College Chart” from the location you saved it at
   a. A window will pop up indicating that “The file needs to be opened by excel...” Click “OK”.
4. In the "Open Workbook" pop up window select the "P&T College Chart" workbook and click "OK"

5. In the Mail Merge Manager pop up menu click “Complete Merge”
6. The first page of the merged document will be blank.
7. Save the document as PDF and extract each candidate dossier coversheet to add to candidate dossier.

For the “Candidate Dossier Coversheet” mail merge form (same word document for Windows and Mac), please visit: [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)

If you prefer to fill in the information in “Candidate Dossier Coversheet” and “College Chart” separately, please use the “Candidate Dossier Coversheet” PDF form found here [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)
Example Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF FACULTIES

CANDIDATE DOSSIER COVER SHEET FOR PROMOTION & TENURE
2014-2015

Name of Candidate: Smith, John
College: Life Sciences
Current Rank: Assistant Professor
Department: Nutritional Sciences
Highest Degree Earned, Year Granted, Institution: Ph.D., 2000, University of Somewhere
Year Started at Texas A&M: 2009
Total Years of Academic Service at Current Rank: 5
Action being considered: Tenure and Promotion, Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure
Effective Date of Last Promotion (if applicable): N/A
Academic Year for Mandatory Tenure Consideration (if applicable): 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOSSIER ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTES &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action By:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: College Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)

Use the supplied Excel spreadsheet to prepare the TAMU Promotion and tenure College Chart. All candidates should be sorted into four categories on one chart:

- The first category is for candidates being considered for promotion with tenure; these are almost always faculty going from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure.
- Candidates being considered for tenure-only. These are candidates who hold the rank of associate or full professor without tenure. Most colleges will not use this category.
- Tenured candidates being considered for promotion-only are those going from associate professor to full professor.
- Candidates being considered for non-tenure track promotion are those going from lecturer to senior lecturer or “adjective” assistant professor to “adjective” associate professor or “adjective” associate professor to “adjective” professor.
- The Texas A&M University System requests that the candidate’s name on the CV appear exactly as it appears on the college chart and in the biography table. In other words, if the CV says “Sam Smith,” the college chart and biography must also say “Sam Smith,” not “Samuel Smith.” If a middle initial appears on the CV (e.g., “Samuel H. Smith”), it must appear that way on the other two documents, and so on.
- **IMPORTANT:** The teaching experience of each candidate must be indicated in semesters. Please refer to the examples on ROWS 6-9 of the P&T College Chart 2014-15 Excel template. This information must be in exact agreement with that provided in the Faculty Biography Table.
- Please do not add dashes to the UIN numbers.
- Do not use abbreviations for departments, titles and universities.
- Place the chart as the first item in each hardcopy set. Please do not put a copy in every candidate’s file. Also provide the P&T College Chart 2014-15 as an excel file (not as PDF) in the flash drive containing the electronic dossiers for all candidates.
College Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)
TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE
For chart template, please visit: http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms
**Appendix C: External Reviewers Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)**

*TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT*

*For chart template, please visit: [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Reviewer</th>
<th>Requestor (Candidate, Department)</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Letter Received (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Johnson</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Petters</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Watson</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Appendix D: PDF Dossier Template

TO BE ASSEMBLED BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE

For template, please visit: http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms

How to Use the “Candidate PDF P&T Dossier Template”

To add each required document to this PDF under the bookmarked Title Pages follow these steps:
1. Save the documents to be added as a PDF. To make a PDF from Word or Excel:
   a. Go to: File
   b. Save as
   c. From the Format pull down menu select PDF
2. Open the “Candidate PDF P&T Dossier Template”
3. Click the “Thumbnail” view on the left side of the document
4. This will display the Thumbnails of the bookmarked Title Pages
5. Drag the PDF file of the document you want to insert under the Title Page for that specific document (Shown as a blue arrow)
6. All the pages of that document will appear under the Title Page in the Thumbnails
Appendix E: Grants Summary Chart

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE**

For chart template, please visit: [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of candidate (Last, First):</th>
<th>Smith, John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department: Nutritional Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Sought: Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Grant</th>
<th>External or Internal</th>
<th>Dates of the Award</th>
<th>Funding Agency</th>
<th>Competitive Grant Y/N</th>
<th>Role (PI, Co-PI, Co-I)</th>
<th>Title of Grant</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Amount Attributable to Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>Agrilife</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>co-I</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Faculty Biography Table (Submit as Word document not as PDF)

TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE

For table template, please visit: http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Present Rank</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joseph Batch</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. (2005)</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2009-Sp 2012</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2012-Present</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Batch’s area is organic chemistry with a specialty in polymer chemistry, transition metal catalysis, polymer synthesis, asymmetric organic synthesis, and organometallic chemistry. He has authored three publications on efforts to combine the physiochemical properties of a polymer with the reactivity of a low molecular weight compound. This work involves fundamental research both in synthesis and catalysis. He has received grants of $750,000 from NSF.

Dr. Batch teaches first year organic chemistry and one advanced organic chemistry course for undergraduates as well as two graduate level organic chemistry courses. He has received outstanding student evaluations (above department average) each year and has chaired four graduate student committees and served on four others.

Dr. Batch is being recommended for early tenure because.....
### Appendix G: Faculty Summary Data Table (Submit as Word document not as PDF)

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE**

*For table template, please visit: [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)*

| Teaching philosophy | • Includes as much hands-on learning in the courses as possible, with the overarching goal of creating a link between the textbook and the real world.  
|                     | • Constantly updating his course material, homework assignments, problem sets, exams, design projects, and notes, to ensure that his course reflects the changes in the field |
| Courses Frequently Taught | • BAEN 387 |
| Number of Graduate Students Chaired or Co-Chaired | • MS 7  
| | • PhD 3 |
| Other Teaching Accomplishments | • Developed 2 new undergraduate courses  
| | • NFS grant has allowed him to recruit and mentor a large number of students from underrepresented groups |
| Teaching Recognitions and Awards | • Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department Excellence in Teaching Award, 2008  
| | • Montague Teaching Scholar in the Texas A&M University Center for Teaching Excellence, 2009 |
| Peer-reviewed Journal Articles | • 13 |
| Peer-reviewed Proceedings | • 7 |
| Books/Monographs | • 1 |
| Book chapters | • 2 |
| Conference Presentations | • Invited: 2  
| | • National: 26  
| | • International: 9 |
| External Research Funding (Entire career) | • Total awards: $1.5M  
| | • Awards to candidate: $600K |
| Other Research, Scholarship, or Creativity Accomplishments | • Patents awarded: 1  
| | • Patents applied for (pending): 3  
| | • Associate editor of the Transactions of ASABE |
| Research/Scholarship/Creativity Recognitions and Award | • Presidential Early Career Award in Science and Engineering, 2007 |
Appendix H: Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Statement Guidelines

Modified from: http://www.slideshare.net/UO-AcademicAffairs/writing-a-tenure-statement-2011

“The personal statement … is your opportunity to make your own case. The statement communicates a quick sense of whether you know who you are, where you’ve been, and where you’re going in your career”

“…the personal statement provides context for your achievements beyond what is visible on the c.v., showing that they fit into a meaningful plan for your development as a scholar, teacher and university citizen”

☒ The personal statement allows you to explain the value and impact of your teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments.

☒ The candidate’s statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across three areas: research, teaching, and service. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. Your statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good research ideas are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.

☒ The statement should be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership including college P&T committee, dean, provost and president and by a professional readership comprised of the departmental and external reviewers. Write in language that is understandable to readers from diverse disciplines. Make it jargon free, enlightening and exciting.

☒ Writing a statement helps you understand what your contributions have been, and what impact you have had. Understanding these, in turn, can help you see where you want to go, and think better about how to get there.

☒ KEY ELEMENTS of the statement are: quality of work, productivity over time, and impact.

☒ Advocate for yourself, but be factual; confident but not boastful, intelligent but not stuffy.

☒ Blending of categories is inevitable – e.g., mentoring undergraduates in a research laboratory can (and presumable should) be considered both teaching and research, and can be addressed in either (or both) section(s).

☒ Make this your best writing. It is not uncommon for outside evaluators to draw upon your own comments in their written evaluations.

☒ Convey the excitement of your research and teaching

☒ Emphasize the broadest implications of your work

☒ Highlight potentially hidden strengths

☒ Explain gaps in your record – be your own spin doctor, contextualize the strategic choices of your career

☒ Simplify, integrate, summarize!
DON’T make it a chore to read your personal statement
   ➢ Emphasize primary areas of strength
   ➢ Avoid excessive detail, explain selected examples well

DON’T use excessive technical jargon
   ➢ It can be an impediment to readers outside your field
   ➢ Explain critical terms in a simple and clear way

DON’T ignore your weaknesses
   ➢ Imagine your worst critics – use your statement to undermine their case
   ➢ Be honest – acknowledge weaknesses, but demonstrate how you have overcome them

How to address weaknesses

Your statement is the place to acknowledge and address issues in teaching, research, and service that might be perceived as weaknesses. In the statement you have the opportunity to demonstrate that you recognize the issue, you have learned from it, and you have moved forward in an appropriate and professional way. A narrative reflection on success and challenges can help reviewers understand inconsistencies in your record.

An example: If you had a series of poor teaching evaluations for a period of time, you need to address it.
   ➢ If the teaching evaluations were poor early on, but improved with time, discuss what you did to overcome the challenges. How did you adjust your teaching methods to address the needs and/or concerns of the students?
   ➢ If your teaching evaluations were weak during a semester in which you were experimenting with a new course or new teaching method, what did you learn from the constructive feedback?

The Research Statement

Quality of your Research/Original Creative Work
   ➢ How your strategy for conducting research or your approach to original creative work contributes to the quality of your efforts.

Relevance of your Research/Original Creative Work
   ➢ How your research is relevant to issues that relate to your field(s) of study

Impact of your Research/Original Creative Work
   ➢ How does your work break new ground or how is it innovative

Programmatic Nature of your Research/Original Creative Work
   ➢ How your individual research projects contributed to your program of research, or how individual projects contributed to the focus of your original creative work.

Sustainability of your Research/Original Creative Work
How your research shows promise for ongoing publication and external research funding (as applicable) = **TRAJECTORY!**

- **Productivity in Research/Original Creative Work**
  - How the strategic decisions you made on publishing and presenting your work furthered your program of research/focus or original creative efforts

- **Interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborative research**
  - How your work contributes to the success/is essential to interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborative research projects.

- **Using Teaching and Service to Enhance Research/Original Creative Work**
  - How your class discussions have been used to explore potential questions for your own research/original creative work (or vice versa)
  - How your service to professional associations has provided opportunities to further your program of research/focus of original creative work (or vice versa)

- Include goals for the future, position your work (future and past) within a larger body of work

- **TRAJECTORY!**

- Be optimistic yet realistic
  - If you cannot be positive about your contributions, few others will think they should be
  - Portray things in their best light, but don’t over-reach – readers may call your bluff

**Promotion to Full Professor**

- Years in rank beyond six do not change the expectations of what is required; there may be a shift in emphasis between criteria to reflect the many differences individual professional careers
- If it played a key role in your tenure case, it is of historical interest and can be used to document impact (citations, reviews…)
- Evidence of an enhanced international/national reputation
- Leadership roles
  - Conference organization vs. presentation
  - Panel leader vs. member
  - Professional society board position vs. membership

**The Teaching Statement**

- **Fostering Student Achievement**
  - **Impact:** How your philosophy of, methods of, or assumptions about teaching is/are congruent with the typical needs of your students
  - **Impact:** How you foster student achievement by balancing high standards for performance with appropriate levels of support

- **Course Content**
- **Impact**: How your course content has contributed to the attainment of knowledge and skills needed by your students
- How you ensure that your course content, including instructional resources that you have developed, is congruent with current knowledge and professional practice

![Course Development](image)
- **Impact**: How your development of courses has contributed to the attainment of knowledge and skills needed by your students

![Curriculum Development](image)
- **Impact**: How your development of specializations, majors, distance learning programs, certificate programs, or degree programs has contributed to the attainment of the knowledge and skills needed by our students

- **Mentoring and Academic Advisement of Students**
  - **Impact**: How your work in mentoring and academic advising contributes to your students’ professional identities and the development of skills in research and practice

- **Using Research and Service to Enhance Teaching**
  - **Impact**: How you have used your research to improve your instruction (courses, directed individual study, and supervised research)
  - **Impact**: How you have involved students in your research
  - **Impact**: How you used your professional association work to keep your courses up-to-date with current knowledge and practice

**Promotion to Full Professor**
- Evidence of high-quality performance
- To some extent, increasing “higher level” efforts
  - Course/curriculum conceptualization, design
  - Instructional technology
  - Other modern/innovative teaching techniques
  - Mentorship of junior faculty
  - Student committee service
- External speaking engagements supportive of record of teaching excellence

**Service Statement**
- Nature of your Service to the Program, Department, School, College, and University
  - **Impact**: How your service contributions relate to ongoing or emerging needs of the institution
  - **Impact**: For senior faculty, efforts you have made to mentor other faculty
- Nature of your Service to the Profession
  - **Impact**: How your service contributions relate to ongoing or emerging needs of the profession
Nature of your Service to Society
   - **Impact**: How your work contributed to meeting needs identified in your community, state, nation, and other countries

Using Teaching and Research to Enhance Service
   - **Impact**: How your teaching has contributed to the provision of continuing professional development offerings
   - **Impact**: How your research expertise has contributed to the work of your professional organization
   - **Impact**: How your research expertise has contributed to being an editorial board member for a refereed journal or a Federal grant review committee
   - **Impact**: How our research expertise has contributed to the work of your program, department, school, college, and university

**Promotion to Full Professor**
- Greater expectations
- Leadership roles
  - Committee chair vs. member
  - Conference organization vs. presentation
  - Panel leader vs. member
  - Professional society board position vs. membership

**In Summary**
- Balance technical vs. accessible
- Only one part of your P&T file, but…..
- …your best chance to make your best case
- Opportunity to
  - Clarify any uncertainties in your CV
  - Write your own letters of evaluation
  - Demonstrate your ability to teach

**References/Resources**
- Google search: personal tenure statement
- James P. Sampson, Jr., David F. Foulk, and Marcy P. Driscoll, College of Education, Florida State University ([http://www.coe.fsu.edu/content/download/50741/352387/file/Writing-Personal-Statements-for-Faculty-Evaluations.pdf](http://www.coe.fsu.edu/content/download/50741/352387/file/Writing-Personal-Statements-for-Faculty-Evaluations.pdf))
- The Irrepressible Women Planners. 2003. The Yellow Book: How (Not) To Get Ahead in Academia. Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, Faculty Women’s Interest Group
- Examples of tenure and or promotion statements: [https://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure/exemplars](https://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure/exemplars)
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1. GENERAL

The policies for academic freedom, ethics, responsibility, tenure, and promotion at Texas A&M University apply equally to current faculty members and to subsequent appointees. These policies seek to establish a spirit of cooperation, good faith, and responsibility and to provide useful guidelines for situations not specifically described in this document.

2. FACULTY AND EMPLOYMENT

2.1 Definition of Faculty:

2.1.1 In general, a faculty member, to whom the academic freedoms and responsibilities described in this document pertain, is any full-time or part-time employee of Texas A&M University with an appointment as a Professor at any rank, an Instructor, a Lecturer at any rank, or a Librarian (I, II, III, or IV).

2.1.2 A faculty member is not automatically eligible for tenure. See Section 4.1.1.

2.2 Employment Contract:

2.2.1 All new faculty members shall be provided with an appointment letter stating the initial terms and conditions of employment. Any subsequent modifications or special understandings in regard to the appointment, which may be made on an annual basis, will be stated in writing and a copy will be given to the faculty member. All faculty members, unless the terms and conditions of their appointment letter state otherwise, are expected to engage in teaching, scholarship, and service. Essential job functions for a position may vary depending upon the nature of the department in which the faculty member is employed, the nature of the discipline in which the faculty member holds expertise, external funding requirements attached to the position, licensing or accreditation requirements, and other circumstances. It is therefore important that essential job functions for each faculty position be listed in the initial appointment letter. For example, all of the following that are applicable should be listed: teaching responsibilities, responsibilities for advising students, independent and/or collaborative research responsibilities, engaging in patient care, committee assignments, conditions imposed by external accrediting agencies, conditions for holding a named professorship or a position that combines academic and administrative duties, and any other
specific essential functions for the position in question. All appointment letters must indicate whether the appointment being offered is with tenure, tenure-accruing, or non-tenure-accruing.

2.2.2 If the appointment is tenure-accruing, the appointment letter will indicate the length of the period of probationary service at Texas A&M University and state the credit agreed upon for appropriate service at other institutions. The specific probationary period does not, however, constitute the term of the initial appointment. All appointments during the probationary period are for a fixed term of one year or less and are subject to renewal or non-renewal each year of the probationary period.

2.2.3 Unless otherwise specified in the appointment letter, or mutually agreed upon revision thereof, tenure-accruing appointments and appointments with tenure guarantee employment for nine months or the equivalent.

2.2.4 All faculty members will receive an annual notification of the terms and conditions of appointment for the next fiscal year within two weeks after the Texas A&M University budget has been approved by the Board of Regents. This notice shall contain the rank of appointment, tenure status, inclusive dates of employment, salary, and any special conditions. Any changes to essential job functions noted in the original letter of appointment also should be included, after appropriate consultation with the faculty member. Any changes to the terms and conditions of appointment may be appealed through Rule 12.01.99.M4 (Faculty Grievance Procedures Not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights). Faculty members are obligated to fulfill the terms of employment for the following year, unless they resign prior to 30 days after receiving notification of these terms.

2.3 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:

2.3.1 Tenure Track

2.3.1.1 Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;

2.3.1.2 Not later than December 15 of the second year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; and

2.3.1.3 At least twelve months before the expiration of a probationary
appointment after two or more years in the institution.

2.3.2 Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

2.3.2.1 A Lecturer who has held any faculty appointment other than Assistant Lecturer for the equivalent of 5 or more academic years of full service within a 7 year period shall be provided a one-year notice if it is the University's intent not to renew the appointment.

2.3.2.2 A faculty member promoted to or hired at the rank of Senior Lecturer shall be provided a one year notice if it is the University's intent not to renew the appointment.

2.3.2.3 Any request for an exemption to either of these provisions must be based on a major programmatic revision or budgetary cutback. Such a request with appropriate documentation must be submitted by a college dean through the Provost to the President for approval.

2.4 All faculty members are entitled under Texas law to see their personnel files and to obtain, at their own expense, a copy of the information in these files.

2.5 Annual Review

2.5.1 An annual review will be conducted in a timely fashion for all faculty members at the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecturer, Instructor, Librarian (I, II, III, or IV), Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor. The purpose of the annual review is to provide a mechanism to facilitate dialogue between the administration and faculty. Annual review provides valuable information to the department head about the faculty members' accomplishments and to the faculty members with regard to the department head's assessment of their progress in the discipline and in the context of department goals. Annual reviews are to be conducted in an environment of openness and collegiality, with an emphasis on constructive development of the individual faculty member and the institution.

2.5.2 The focus of the annual review process will vary from rank to rank. For lecturers and librarians of all ranks, the annual review process will serve primarily as an evaluation focusing on performance and potential for appointment. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the annual review must take into account the fact that progress in a scholarly career is a long-term venture; therefore, a three to five year horizon may be necessary for the accurate evaluation of scholarly progress. Furthermore, an annual review process should be conducted differently depending upon the different stages of a faculty member's career. For non-tenured, tenure-track assistant professors and instructors, the annual review process must also provide indication as to progress toward tenure and promotion (see 4.3.5). For tenured
associate professors, the process should be used to identify the faculty member's progress toward the requisite stature for promotion to professor. For professors, annual review should be part of the ongoing process of communication between the faculty member and the institution in which both institutional and individual goals and programmatic directions are clarified, the contributions of the faculty member toward meeting those goals are evaluated and the development of the faculty member and the University is enhanced. In all cases, the annual review shall serve as the primary documentation for evaluation of job performance in the areas of assigned responsibility and for merit salary increases.

2.5.3 To ensure consistency over time, each department shall publish its annual review procedure on paper or by electronic means. Annual review procedures for the department shall be approved by the respective college dean before publication and shall be reviewed by the Dean of Faculties for consistency with this section. The creation and modification of this document should be a product of joint deliberation by faculty members and the department head. If there is no need for department specific guidelines, a college-wide document, developed jointly by faculty and administrators and reviewed by the Dean of Faculties, is sufficient. The annual review procedure document must include the following elements:

2.5.3.1 Purpose of annual review. These include the purposes set forth in (2.5.1) and (2.5.2) as well as any department specific purposes.

2.5.3.2 Period of evaluation (may be longer than one year; see 2.5.2) and aspects of performance to be evaluated, as appropriate for each job title.

2.5.3.3 Annual Activity Report format and content. Examples of possible content include (a) a statement of assigned duties, consistent with (or consisting of) the appointment letter or current position description (2.2.1); (b) a list of activities, accomplishments, and awards; (c) documentation, including such items as course syllabi, evidence of student learning, published papers or books, evidence of effectiveness in service, teaching portfolio, etc.; (d) self-evaluation in the context of the assigned duties of the faculty member and the missions of the department and University; and (e) a statement of goals (see 2.5.5.1).

2.5.3.4 Basis for evaluation. All sources of information to be used for the evaluation must be specified. The following are examples of possible sources of information: (a) Annual activity report (required as a source); (b) personal observation by evaluator; (c) discussions with colleagues, students, and/or others; (d) student evaluations of teaching; (e) peer evaluations of teaching. Note that the standard end-of-semester student evaluations of teaching must not be the only instrument used in determining teaching quality and effectiveness.
2.5.3.5 Timeline and procedures for evaluation. These must be consistent with sections 2.2.1, 2.5.5.2, 2.5.5.3, and 2.5.5.4.

2.5.3.6 Complaint procedure if annual review fails to follow published guidelines (generally, letter to dean with copy to Dean of Faculties).

2.5.4 Department heads with faculty who have budgeted joint appointments will collaborate with the heads of the appropriate units to develop accurate annual reports. In all cases there should be one department where more than 50% of the appointment is located; the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation. Input will be sought from heads of departments in which a faculty member holds non-budgeted appointments.

2.5.5 The exact form of the annual review may differ from college to college, or even from department to department within a college, but must include the following components.

2.5.5.1 Faculty member's report of previous activities. The report should be focused on the immediately previous academic or calendar year, but should allow a faculty member to point out the status of long-term projects and set the context in which annual activities have occurred. The report must incorporate teaching, research, and service. Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals.

2.5.5.2 A written document stating the department head's evaluation and expectations. The department head will write an evaluation for the year in a memorandum or in the annual report document transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member indicates receipt by signing a copy of the document. This memorandum, and/or the annual report and any related documents, will be entered into the faculty member's departmental personnel file. Moreover, this memorandum and/or annual report shall also include a statement on expectations for the next year in teaching, research and service.

2.5.5.3 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member. There will be an annual opportunity for a personal meeting to discuss the written review and expectations for the coming year if either party believes it is needed. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

2.5.5.4 Performance Assessment. In assessing performance and determining salary increases, the weights given to teaching, research, and service shall be consistent with the expectations as determined in 2.5.5.2 and 2.5.5.3 above and with the overall contributions of the faculty member to the multiple missions of the department and University.
For example, persons with solely teaching responsibilities who attain excellence in all aspects of teaching should receive comparable merit to persons with multiple responsibilities who attain excellence.

3. ACADEMIC FREEDOM, ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITY

3.1 Academic Freedom: Institutions of higher education exist for the common good. The common good depends upon an uninhibited search for truth and its open expression. Hence, it is essential that faculty members be free to pursue scholarly inquiry without undue restriction, and to voice and publish individual conclusions concerning the significance of evidence that they consider relevant. Each faculty member must be free from the corrosive fear that others inside or outside the University community, because their views may differ, may threaten his or her professional career or the material benefits accruing from it.

Each faculty member is entitled to full freedom in the classroom in discussing the subject being taught. Within the bounds of professional behavior, faculty members also have full freedom to express disagreement with other members of the university community. Although a faculty member observes the regulations of the institution, he or she maintains the right to criticize and seek revision. Faculty members also are citizens of the nation, state, and community; therefore, when speaking, writing, or acting outside the classroom, they must be free from institutional censorship or discipline. On such occasions faculty members should make it clear that they are not speaking for the institution.

3.2 Academic Ethics and Responsibility: For faculty members the notion of academic freedom is linked to the equally demanding concept of academic ethics and responsibility. As a faculty member, a person assumes certain ethical obligations and responsibilities to students, to fellow faculty members, to the institution, to the profession, and to society at large. Some of these are listed below:

3.2.1 Faculty members have ethical obligations and responsibilities to the students of Texas A&M University.

3.2.1.1 Faculty members should foster scholarly values in students, including academic honesty, the free pursuit of learning, and the exercise of academic freedom.

3.2.1.2 Faculty members should act professionally in the classroom and in other academic relationships with students. Faculty members should exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter that has no relation to their subject.

3.2.1.3 Faculty members should maintain respect for the student and for the
student's role as a learner. Faculty members should evaluate students on the true merit of their academic performance. Faculty members should be available at reasonable intervals to students for consultation on course work.

3.2.1.4 Faculty members shall not engage in any exploitation, harassment, or illegal discriminatory treatment of students.

3.2.2 Faculty members have ethical obligations and responsibilities to other members of the university community.

3.2.2.1 Faculty members shall neither harass nor exploit any member of the university community.

3.2.2.2 Faculty members shall respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, faculty members show due respect for the opinions of others.

3.2.2.3 Faculty members shall acknowledge the academic contributions of others, strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues, and accept their share of faculty responsibilities for contributing to the governance of the institution.

3.2.3 Faculty members have ethical obligations and responsibilities to Texas A&M University as an institution.

3.2.3.1 A faculty member's comments regarding matters of public concern are protected even though they may be highly critical in tone or content, or even erroneous. The constitutionally protected rights of faculty members, as citizens, to freedom of expression on matters of public concern cannot be abridged. Faculty members, like all citizens, are liable for all actions that are not constitutionally protected.

3.2.3.2 Faculty members should recognize that their primary responsibilities are to the institution as they determine the amount (if any) and character of work done outside of the institution. Such outside work shall be consistent with University regulations. Although faculty members may follow subsidiary interests, these must never compromise their freedom and willingness to draw intellectually honest conclusions.

3.2.3.3 When considering the interruption or termination of their service, faculty members should take into account the effect of their decision upon the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

3.2.4 Faculty members have ethical obligations and responsibilities to their
profession and deriving from their membership in the professorate. The fundamental responsibilities of a faculty member as a teacher and scholar include maintenance of competence in his or her field of specialization and exhibition of such professional competence in the classroom, studio, library, or laboratory and in the public arena by such activities as discussions, lectures, consulting, publications, or participation in professional organizations and meetings.

3.2.5 Faculty members have ethical obligations and responsibilities to the public. The demonstration of professional integrity by a faculty member includes recognition that the society at large will judge the profession as well as the institution by his or her statements and behavior. Therefore, the faculty member should strive to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to be willing to listen to and show respect to members of the society at large expressing different opinions, and to avoid creating the impression that the faculty member speaks or acts for the college or the University when speaking or acting as a private person.

4. TENURE AND PROMOTION

4.1 Eligibility for Tenure:

4.1.1 To be eligible to receive tenure, a faculty member generally should be an employee of Texas A&M University who holds academic rank as instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor or distinguished professor. Members of the faculty whose appointments are ordinarily temporary, part-time, or otherwise clearly short-term, e.g., lecturers, visiting professors of any rank, graduate students serving as teaching assistants, and post-doctoral fellows are generally not entitled to tenure and consequently will ordinarily not be subject to the provisions of this document regarding the probationary period for tenure. Full-time research associates also are normally considered to have term appointments and are considered to hold positions that are without tenure and not tenure-accruing.

4.1.2 Faculty members who hold joint appointments with other state, federal, or private agencies or with two or more parts of The Texas A&M University System may or may not be entitled to tenure, depending upon the nature of their duties and the terms of the written agreement of their appointments. Normally, all individuals whose service accrues credit toward tenure and those who are already tenured receive on the average at least one-third of their salary from Texas A&M University teaching funds.

4.1.3 Administrative personnel, such as department heads and deans, who hold academic rank in addition to their administrative titles retain their tenured status as faculty members, but administrative positions per se are not subject to tenure. Those members of a library staff who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor or Distinguished
Professor are eligible for tenure.

4.2 Tenure Policy:

4.2.1 Tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in the academic position held unless dismissed for good cause. Tenure is based on the need to protect academic freedom and is irrevocable except as specified in Section 5.

4.2.2 De jure tenure is obtained only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents.

4.2.3 Faculty members awarded tenure at other institutions in The Texas A&M University System or any other institution have no claim to tenure at Texas A&M University.

4.2.4 Except when otherwise specified in the initial appointment letter, or a mutually agreed upon revision thereof, a tenured faculty member is guaranteed nine months of full-time employment or the equivalent. (See Section 2.2.1 and 2.2.3).

4.3 Tenure System Components:

4.3.1 The probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed seven years of full-time service, beginning with appointment to the rank of instructor or a higher tenure-eligible rank. Under extenuating circumstances, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be extended with the written concurrence of the faculty member involved, the department head, dean, and the Dean of Faculties. The probationary period may include appropriate full-time service at other institutions of higher education. If a faculty member has served a term of probationary service at one or more institutions, the probationary period at Texas A&M University may be for fewer than seven years. In such cases, however, the person's total probationary period in the academic profession may be extended beyond seven years.

4.3.2 Faculty members holding tenure-accruing appointments in a library will be evaluated for tenure based on the policies of the library as approved by the Dean of Faculties.

4.3.3 Assistant professors at Texas A&M University will be evaluated for promotion to associate professor and for tenure concurrently and will not be awarded one without the other.

4.3.4 Persons whose initial appointment to the Texas A&M University faculty is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible for tenure upon appointment.
4.3.5 Periodic Review:

4.3.5.1 Each department shall review the performance of all faculty members who are accruing credit toward tenure on an annual basis. Each faculty member shall be advised in writing of the results of this review. The purpose of regular reviews is to provide a candid evaluation of the individual's achievements so that both the individual and Texas A&M University may benefit by improved performance or by the encouragement to continue exemplary performance.

4.3.5.2 For faculty subject to a probationary period of seven-years or more at Texas A&M University, a third-year review is mandatory. This evaluation will familiarize the faculty member with the tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the tenure decision. This review should mimic the tenure review process as closely as possible; a minimal third-year review would include dossier items contributed by the candidate and internal letters of recommendation, and would be reviewed at the department and college levels by appropriate faculty committees as well as the department head and dean.

4.3.5.3 A thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is mandatory. Such reviews may be made earlier and are, in fact, encouraged whenever it appears appropriate. If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for promotion and tenure, a review will be conducted again at the mandatory time. If the department head has not already initiated the review process, each faculty member serving in the next-to-last year of probationary service should notify the department head that the year for a tenure judgment has been reached. This communication should be made in writing in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the matter by any party.

4.4 Tenure and Promotion Criteria:

4.4.1 Categories of Performance:

4.4.1.1 Teaching: This category includes, among other things, classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; and supervision of graduate students.

4.4.1.2 Creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities: For most disciplines, this category consists of research and publication. For some disciplines, however, it may include other forms of creative activity. Architectural design, engineering
technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, and sculpture are examples.

4.4.1.3 Service: This includes service to the institution, to students, colleagues, department, college, and the University—as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large.

4.4.2 College and Library Criteria:

4.4.2.1 The faculty and administrators of each college and of a library shall jointly develop written guidelines describing the evaluation criteria employed in the unit.

4.4.2.2 Both the guidelines and the evaluation process itself shall pay due regard to the difficulties inherent in quantifying academic performance. See Section 4.3. The guidelines shall be periodically reviewed and approved by the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics. In those units in which the goals and objectives of departments differ significantly, departments should also have written evaluation guidelines. Continuity in performance criteria and in the application thereof is essential. Therefore, criteria should be changed only after careful and thorough joint deliberation by faculty members and administrators in the unit.

The guidelines shall include:

(1) Criteria that are employed to judge the level of performance of faculty in each category of performance. (Examples of possible indicators of performance are given in Appendix I.)

(2) The normal level of performance required in each category of performance in order to be awarded tenure. Achieving the normal level does not ensure tenure.

(3) The normal level of performance required in each category of performance for appointment or promotion to each rank. Achieving the normal level does not ensure appointment or promotion.

(4) A description of the procedures employed in evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion.

University, college or library, and department guidelines shall be given to all faculty as appropriate. New faculty members shall receive the guidelines along with a statement of any special conditions or expectations related to
their employment when they join the Texas A&M University faculty. Such guidelines shall support the adequate evaluation and reward of a faculty member's interdisciplinary responsibilities.

4.4.3 University Criteria: In addition to the criteria developed in the college or a library, the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for tenure or promotion are:

4.4.3.1 Assistant Professor: Faculty members holding a tenure-accruing appointment with the rank of instructor will be promoted to the rank of assistant professor upon the receipt of the terminal degree.

4.4.3.2 Associate Professor:

(1) an exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field;

(2) professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University;

(3) an area of specialization germane to the programs of Texas A&M University, one not currently represented on the tenured faculty, or one that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority; and

(4) evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

4.4.3.3 Professor:

(1) continuing accomplishment in teaching;

(2) continuing accomplishment and some measure of national recognition in research or another form of creative activity; and

(3) evidence of valuable professional service.

4.5 Tenure and Promotion Evaluation:

4.5.1 Categories of Performance (should be made consistent with Appendix I).

4.5.1.2 Scholarship and creative activity. This category covers all forms of intellectual work which are based on a high level of professional expertise, are original, are documented and validated as through peer
review or critique, and are communicated in appropriate ways so as to have significance beyond Texas A&M University. Examples may include architectural design, engineering or veterinary technology, artistic works, and research articles.

4.5.2 In most cases, the judgments of professionals in the faculty member's field provide the best and most reliable basis for making sound decisions about tenure and promotion. Consequently, the level of accomplishment and potential relative to disciplinary norms and standards as judged by peer review should be the heart of the tenure and promotion process. Accomplishments that are not subject to peer review generally should not be a major consideration in tenure and promotion evaluations.

4.5.2.1 The faculty and administrators of each college and of a library shall jointly develop written guidelines describing the evaluation criteria and procedures employed in the unit, consistent with University criteria and procedures.

The guidelines shall include:

(1) The relative importance and normal level of performance required in each category of performance in order to be awarded tenure. Achieving the normal level does not ensure tenure.

(2) The relative importance and normal level of performance required in each category of performance for appointment or promotion to each rank. Achieving the normal level does not ensure appointment or promotion.

(3) A description of the procedures employed in evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion, including: (a) responsibilities of the faculty member and others in preparing the tenure or promotion dossier; (b) procedures for departmental and college-level review committees: selection of committee members and chair, responsibilities of the committee, procedures for making a recommendation, etc.; (c) procedures for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty members and research scientists, if different; (d) a timeline.

University, college or library, and department guidelines shall be given to all faculty as appropriate. Guidelines should be redistributed to all faculty at least every three years. If guidelines are made available by electronic means, a reminder of that availability and a summary of relevant information should be distributed periodically on paper. New faculty members shall receive the guidelines along with a statement of any special conditions or expectations related to their employment when they join the Texas A&M University.
faculty. Such guidelines shall support the adequate evaluation and reward of a faculty member's interdisciplinary responsibilities.

4.5.3 In evaluating a faculty member being considered for tenure, the appropriate faculty committees and academic administrators shall give adequate consideration to the faculty member's professional performance. Adequate consideration of a tenure case consists of a conscientious review, which seeks out and considers all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the faculty member, and assumes that the various academic units follow their approved procedural guidelines during the tenure and promotion review process (see 4.4.2 and 4.4.3). Such consideration should be based upon adequate deliberation over the evidence in light of relevant standards and exclusive of improper standards. An improper standard is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member. The evaluation of a tenure case should constitute a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgment.

4.5.4 Exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion may sometimes be warranted. Examples would include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. Few faculty will possess qualities such as these, but those who do deserve recognition and advancement.

4.6 Review Process for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor:

4.6.1 The faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion will work with the department head or designated committee to develop a complete file.

4.6.2 In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, department heads shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a tenure and promotion committee as well as other appropriate sources. When the review has been completed, the department head will transmit the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of both the head and the faculty committee to the dean of the college for review.

4.6.2.1 If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with the regular Promotion and Tenure procedures of the relevant departments. If the departments are in the same college, the ad loc department is responsible for forwarding the appropriate
documents to the dean's office. If different colleges are involved, then each department is responsible for forwarding the appropriate documents to its dean's office.

4.6.2.2 If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the ad loc department must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty. The evaluation should be conducted by a faculty group such as the membership committee or executive committee of the intercollegiate faculty and is forwarded to the ad loc department's promotion and tenure committee. The evaluation should include comments on teaching, research, service, and intercollegiate cooperation, and the evaluation must be included in the package of material that is forwarded to the dean's office.

4.6.3 In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide tenure and promotion committee. If the dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the department head's recommendation, the dean shall inform the department head and faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The department may then resubmit the case for further consideration. Any reconsideration, however, must be based upon either (a) new evidence that is not already contained within the dossier, or (b) substantial and entirely new arguments that were not made in the first presentation. If the case is resubmitted, it shall be reviewed by the dean and the college-wide tenure and promotion committee before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics.

4.6.4 The dean will present the college's recommendations through the Dean of Faculties to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics for review. This review and recommendation process will continue through the President of the University and the Chancellor of the System to the Board of Regents, which holds sole authority to confer tenure.

4.7 Notification Process for Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Professor

4.7.1 A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at each level of review. In the event of a negative tenure and/or promotion decision, the faculty member is entitled upon request to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to the decision.

4.7.2 The official decision by the Board of Regents regarding the granting of tenure to and/or the promotion of a faculty member will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member as soon as possible after the Board of Regents has officially acted on the University's tenure and/or promotion recommendation.
4.7.3 If requested by the faculty member, a written statement of reasons (see 4.7.1 above) will be provided by the administrator at the first level at which there was a negative recommendation after the Board of Regents has ruled on the University's tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

5. RIGHTS OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

5.1 A decision to dismiss a non-tenured faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, a decision not to reappoint a non-tenured faculty member and a decision not to grant tenure to a non-tenured faculty member shall be based upon adequate consideration (see 4.5.3) of the individual's professional performance and shall not be made in violation of academic freedom or as a form of illegal discrimination.

5.2 The appeal procedures to be followed are outlined in Section 9.

6. POLICIES GOVERNING THE LOSS OF TENURE

6.1 Tenure is given up when a faculty member:

(1) retires (excluding partial retirement);

(2) resigns; or

(3) is off the Texas A&M University payroll for more than one calendar year unless on approved leave of absence. (Note: Individuals who accept full-time employment in another part of the System, provided that such persons formally notify their department heads annually by March 1 of their desire to retain their tenured positions and their requests are approved by the appropriate administrators, may retain their tenured positions. If a request is denied, the individual will return to the tenured position formerly held or give up tenure.)

6.2 Dismissal of tenured faculty members: A faculty member with tenure shall not be dismissed until he or she has received reasonable notice of the cause for dismissal. Dismissal shall occur only after an opportunity for a hearing, which shall comply with the established procedures in Section 9.

6.3 Good cause for dismissal of a faculty member with tenure shall be limited to the following:

6.3.1 Moral turpitude or unprofessional conduct adversely affecting to a material and substantial degree the performance of duties or the meeting of responsibilities to the institution, students, or associates.

6.3.2 Professional incompetence:
6.3.3 Failure to complete a post-tenure review professional development plan as described in Texas A&M University's post-tenure review policy in that:

(1) the professional development plan's goals were not met by the faculty member, and

(2) the deficiencies in the completion of this plan are of sufficient magnitude to separately constitute good cause for dismissal under section 6.3.2.

6.3.4 Financial and educational:

(1) a bona fide financial exigency; or

(2) the reduction or discontinuance of institutional programs based on educational considerations.

7. REDUCTION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

7.1 Financial Exigency:

7.1.1 Definition of bona fide Financial Exigency: Bona fide financial exigency means a pressing need to reorder the nature and magnitude of financial obligations in such a way as to restore or preserve the financial stability of Texas A&M University. A bona fide financial exigency may exist without all parts of the University being affected. Financial stability means the ability of the University to provide from current income the funds necessary to meet current expenses, including current debt payments and sound reserves, without invading or depleting capital. Evidence of financial exigency may include but is not limited to declining enrollments, revenue cutbacks, and ongoing operating budget deficits.

7.1.2 Declaring Financial Exigency: When the President of Texas A&M University believes that a state of bona fide financial exigency may exist in part or all of the University, the President shall consult with a representative group of faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate, other appropriate faculty members, and administrators. The President has the responsibility to demonstrate bona fide financial exigency. Following these consultations, if the President believes that a state of financial exigency exists, the President shall inform the Chancellor of The Texas A&M University System. If the Chancellor concurs in this assessment, he or she shall inform the Board of Regents. If the Board of Regents finds that the conditions stated in Section
7.1.1 exist, a state of bona fide financial exigency shall be deemed to exist at Texas A&M University.

7.1.3 When faculty dismissals are contemplated on grounds of financial exigency, there shall be early, careful, and meaningful sharing of information and views with appropriate faculty representatives, including the Faculty Senate, on the emergency indicating the need to terminate or reduce programs. Recommendations from faculty representatives, including a group chosen by the Faculty Senate, shall be sought on alternatives available to Texas A&M University to ensure continuation of a strong academic program and to minimize the losses sustained by affected students and faculty members.

Judgments determining where within the overall academic program termination of appointments may occur involve considerations of educational policy, including affirmative action, as well as of faculty status, and should therefore be the primary responsibility of the Faculty Senate or an appropriate faculty body designated by the Senate. The Faculty Senate or its designated representatives should also exercise a primary responsibility in the collective recommendation to the President of relevant criteria when appointments are to be terminated.

7.1.4 Cases involving bona fide financial exigency may permit exceptions to tenure regulations as well as the suspension of the normal notification provisions outlined in Section 2.3.

7.2 The Reduction or Discontinuance of Institutional Programs not Mandated by Financial Exigency:

7.2.1 Programs may be reduced or discontinued without a declaration of financial exigency.

7.2.2 Such decisions shall reflect educational considerations based on long range judgments. Those judgments shall be made in consultation with appropriate faculty representatives, including the Faculty Senate or its designated representatives, and reflect the view that the educational mission of the department or college affected or that of Texas A&M University will be enhanced by the reduction or discontinuance.

7.2.3 The decision to formally reduce or discontinue a program or department of instruction will be based essentially upon educational considerations, as recommended to the President primarily by the Faculty Senate or its designated representatives.

8. GUIDELINES GOVERNING DISMISSALS RELATED TO THE REDUCTION OR DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

8.1 All faculty who, on the basis of a bona fide financial exigency or the reduction or
discontinuance of an institutional program, are selected for termination in breach of their contract right shall be entitled to a hearing before the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure (CAFRT - see 9.5, 9.6, and 9.7). The faculty member must request of the President within 30 days of the receipt of the letter of dismissal a CAFRT hearing. The University shall adhere to the following procedures:

8.1.1 Hearings, if requested by the faculty member, must take place before a faculty member is dismissed.

8.1.2 A faculty member being dismissed shall be furnished with a written statement that:

(1) indicates the basis for the initial decision to terminate;
(2) describes how the initial decision was made; and
(3) discloses the information and data upon which the decision makers relied.

8.1.3 The faculty member shall have the opportunity to respond to the statement provided by Texas A&M University.

8.1.4 Burden of Proof:

8.1.4.1 In Case of a Bona Fide Financial Exigency:

8.1.4.1.1 The burden of proof rests with the faculty member to establish that the termination was based on an illegal reason, was arbitrary, or was capricious. If two or more faculty members are equally qualified and equally capable of performing their academic role, the faculty member or members having tenure shall be given preference over non-tenured faculty. If two or more tenured faculty members are equally qualified and capable, preference for retention shall be given to those with greater length of service at Texas A&M University.

8.1.4.1.2 The University's decision will be overturned only if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the decision was based on an illegal reason or was arbitrary or capricious.

8.1.4.2 In cases of Reduction or Discontinuance of Institutional Programs not Mandated by Financial Exigency:

8.1.4.2.1 The administration has the responsibility to demonstrate that educational considerations led to the decision to reduce or discontinue a program, except that an agreement by the Faculty Senate or its designated representatives, as cited in
7.2.2, that a program is to be discontinued will be considered a presumptively valid demonstration.

8.1.4.2.2 Once there has been such demonstration, the burden of proof rests with the faculty member to establish that the termination was based on an illegal reason or was arbitrary or capricious.

8.1.4.2.3 The University's decision will be overturned only if:

1. the University fails to demonstrate that the decision was based on educational considerations; or
2. a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the decision was based on an illegal reason or was arbitrary or capricious.

8.2 Faculty members involved in adjustments in such emergency situations shall be given opportunities for appointment in related areas, but only if:

1. they are well qualified professionally to fill the appointment and can perform the essential functions of the appointment;
2. such positions are available; and
3. the dean and department head for the new appointment concur.

Financial and other support to the extent possible will be offered to faculty dismissed due to a program discontinuation based on educational considerations if this would facilitate placement in an available position.

8.3 Notice of termination of the appointment of a tenured faculty member under this provision shall be given in writing at least twelve months before the effective date of the termination.

8.3.1 Exceptions to this provision may occur in cases of financial exigency.

8.3.2 Any faculty member whose appointment is terminated because of financial exigency or educational considerations has the right to be reappointed to his or her previous position if it is reestablished within two calendar years.

9. PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR HEARINGS

9.1 Application of Procedures: These procedures shall apply to (1) Tenured Faculty Dismissed for Cause; (2) Non-tenured Faculty Dismissed for Cause Prior to Expiration of Appointments; and (3) Non-tenured Faculty Whose Appointments Are Not Renewed.
9.1.1 Tenured Faculty Members Dismissed for Cause:

9.1.1.1 Before any formal notice of the intended dismissal of a tenured faculty member is issued, the department head must advise that faculty member in a personal conference that dismissal is being considered and the faculty member may request a hearing with the dean. Unless the stated cause for dismissal is sexual harassment (University SAP 08.01.01.M1.02) or scientific misconduct (University Rule 15.99.03.M1), any of these three parties may request mediation by the University Tenure Mediation Committee (UTMC).

9.1.1.2 A decision to dismiss a tenured faculty member must be based on good cause (as defined in Section 6.3) and formal notice of the decision to dismiss shall be given in writing at least twelve (12) months before the effective date of the intended termination. This provision for advance notice need not apply if the conduct that justified dismissal involved moral turpitude.

9.1.1.3 Faculty members who receive written notice of dismissal and who allege that the dismissal is not for good cause shall inform the President of Texas A&M University of such allegations in writing within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the notice of dismissal. The faculty member may request from the appropriate administrators a statement of the reasons for dismissal and a copy of all documents relevant to that decision, such as the dismissal file. Such materials shall be given to the faculty member within seven (7) working days of the initial request.

9.1.1.4 If the faculty member contests the stated reasons for dismissal and requests a hearing by the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (CAFRT), the faculty member shall so inform the President in writing within thirty (30) calendar days after receiving the statement of the reasons for dismissal and a copy of all documents relevant to that decision, if requested. A copy of the stated reasons for dismissal and the faculty member's request for a hearing shall be forwarded by the President to the CAFRT.

9.1.1.5 In the ensuing hearing, the burden of proving that the proposed dismissal is for good cause shall rest with the institution. Findings of the CAFRT shall be limited to determining whether or not the decision to dismiss was for good cause. In addition, the CAFRT may make recommendations to the President regarding possible resolutions.

9.1.2 Non-tenured Faculty Members Dismissed for Cause Prior to Expiration of Appointments:
9.1.2.1 A decision to dismiss a non-tenured faculty member for cause prior to the expiration of an appointment shall be made consistent with 5.1 above, Rights of Non-Tenured Faculty Members. If non-tenured faculty members allege that they were dismissed prior to expiration of appointments in violation of such rights, such faculty members shall inform the President of such allegations in writing within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the notice of dismissal and may request from an appropriate administrator a statement of the reasons for dismissal and a copy of all documents relevant to that decision, such as the dismissal file. Such materials shall be given to the faculty member within seven (7) working days of the initial request.

9.1.2.2 A faculty member, if not satisfied by the stated reasons for dismissal, may request that the decision be reviewed by the CAFRT. Such a request must be made in writing to the President within thirty (30) calendar days after the faculty member receives documentation of the reasons for dismissal and receives a copy of the dismissal file, if requested.

9.1.2.3 In the ensuing hearing, the burden of proving that the proposed dismissal is for good cause shall rest with the institution. The findings of the CAFRT shall be limited to determining whether or not the decision to dismiss was for good cause. In addition, the CAFRT may make recommendations to the President regarding possible resolutions.

9.1.3 Non-tenured Faculty Members Whose Appointments Are Not Renewed Whether or Not the Non Renewal is a Result of a Decision to not Grant Tenure:

9.1.3.1 None of the procedures described in 9.1.3.2, 9.1.3.3, 9.1.3.4, and 9.1.3.5 below shall apply to faculty members who were appointed to non-tenure track contracts only and were not reappointed.

9.1.3.2 A decision not to renew the tenure-track appointment of a non-tenured faculty member shall be made consistent with 5.1 above. If non-tenured faculty members allege that their tenure-track appointment was not renewed in violation of 5.1, such faculty members shall inform the President of such allegations in writing within (thirty) 30 calendar days of receiving the notice of non-renewal. The faculty members may request from an appropriate administrator a statement of the reasons for non-renewal of the tenure-track appointment and a copy of all documents relevant to that decision, such as the tenure/promotion file or the reappointment file. Such materials shall be given to the faculty member within seven (7) working days of the initial request.

9.1.3.3 The faculty member, if not satisfied by the stated reasons for the non-renewal of the tenure-track appointment, may request that the matter be reviewed by the CAFRT. Such a request must be made in writing to the President within thirty (30) calendar days after the faculty member receives the documented reasons for non-renewal of the tenure-track appointment and receives a copy of the tenure/promotion file or the reappointment file, if requested.
9.1.3.4 Upon receiving a request from the faculty member for a review by the CAFRT, the President will notify the Preliminary Screening Committee (see 9.3) of the request. The Committee chair shall schedule a meeting with the faculty member and shall notify the faculty member of the time and place. The Committee shall review the faculty member's allegations and hear any supporting statement that the faculty member wishes to make. The Committee shall then decide whether that information, standing alone and unrebutted, would establish that a violation as described above in Section 5 may have occurred. If a majority of the Committee members reviewing the case finds that such a violation may have occurred, the Committee shall refer the matter to the CAFRT for a full hearing as provided in 9.4; otherwise, the matter shall not be given further consideration and the decision not to reappoint shall stand.

9.1.3.5 In the CAFRT hearing, the burden of proving a violation of the rights of non-tenured faculty members shall rest with the faculty member. The findings of the CAFRT shall be limited to determining whether the decision not to renew the appointment was in violation of such rights. In addition, the CAFRT may make recommendations to the President regarding possible resolutions.

9.2 University Tenure Mediation Committee:

9.2.1 The University Tenure Mediation Committee (UTMC) is a standing committee elected by the faculty. It consists of one faculty member elected from each of the Faculty Senate electoral units. These individuals are selected during the spring semester by a vote of the faculty in each of the Faculty Senate electoral units. They serve three-year terms that are arranged on a rotating basis so that one-third of the membership is replaced each year. Terms of new UTMC members begin September 1 each year.

9.2.2 The UTMC shall operate in an informal and flexible manner and attempt to resolve cases in which the dismissal of a tenured faculty member is being considered. The UTMC may offer confidential advice to involved faculty members and promote modes of settlement which avoid formal hearings and litigation.

9.2.3 The negotiating efforts of the UTMC shall be completed within forty (40) working days from the time its assistance is requested. However, at the request of the chair of the UTMC, if the faculty member and president agree, an extension will be granted. If the UTMC is not able to negotiate a resolution, it shall report its recommendations and findings within twenty (20) working days after the completion of its negotiating efforts to the President and the faculty member. The parties involved may proceed then as indicated in 9.1.1 above.

9.3 The Preliminary Screening Committee:
9.3.1 The Preliminary Screening Committee shall be comprised of those members of the CAFRT who have completed their term of service to the CAFRT during the previous academic year. The term of appointment to the Committee will be for one year. Thus, the members of the CAFRT who complete their service to the CAFRT on August 31 will be members of the Committee until August 31 of the following year. If there are fewer than four outgoing CAFRT members able to serve on the Committee, the President will appoint additional members to the Committee so that there are at least four, but no more than six, members. The members appointed by the President must be tenured teaching faculty members who have served on previous CAFRTs.

9.3.2 Each Committee member is subject to challenge for cause. The Committee chair will rule on the validity of any challenge. (Note: Such challenges relate to the ability of a member to render an unbiased decision. The mere existence of friendships or other contacts between a Committee member and other individuals does not necessarily constitute bias.)

9.3.3 The Preliminary Screening Committee will elect its own chair and vice chair, both of whom are voting members of the Committee.

9.3.4 At least three members are needed for a decision. Only those members who have participated in the entire meeting may vote.

9.3.5 The Committee shall establish a time limit for the meeting on a particular case (e.g., two hours) and may extend the time limit by majority vote of the committee during the meeting. During the meeting, the faculty member will present his/her allegations and supporting statements that a violation as described above in IV occurred. The faculty member may have legal counsel and/or other advisors present. Representatives of Texas A&M University (including an attorney from the Office of General Counsel) may attend the meeting as observers. At least two days before the scheduled meeting, the chair must be notified if anybody other than the affected faculty member will be attending the meeting.

9.3.6 The meeting shall be closed unless the affected faculty member requests that it be open.

9.3.7 The findings of the Committee shall be forwarded to the chair of the CAFRT, the President, and the affected faculty member within five working days of the meeting.

9.3.8 The Committee shall be self-governing and, within the provisions of this University statement, shall adopt such rules and procedures as it deems appropriate.
9.4 The Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure:

9.4.1 The Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure shall be comprised of eighteen tenured faculty members. Members shall serve three-year terms arranged on a rotating basis so that one-third of the members are replaced each year. The committee shall be elected during the spring semester by the faculty at-large from a slate of nominees comprised of three tenured teaching faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate caucus in each Faculty Senate electoral unit. Each member of the faculty may vote for no more than the number of seats to be filled. Individuals receiving the most votes will normally become members of the committee; however, to avoid having more than four members of the committee from the same Faculty Senate electoral unit, those receiving fewer votes shall be selected. Terms of new CAFRT members begin September 1 each year.

9.4.2 Each committee member is subject to challenge for cause. The committee chair will rule on the validity of any challenge. (Note: Such challenges relate to the ability of a member to render an unbiased decision. The mere existence of friendships or other contacts between a Committee member and other individuals does not necessarily constitute bias.)

9.4.3 The chair and vice chair of the CAFRT will be appointed from the faculty at-large by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The chair and vice chair will be non-voting and each shall be appointed for a term of five (5) years. Their terms will be staggered whenever possible.

9.4.4 A Hearing Committee will consist of no less than seven voting CAFRT members who are assigned by the chair or the vice chair of the CAFRT. It is preferable to start with nine voting members. An effort will be made to distribute participation on Hearing Committees when multiple cases are heard during an academic year. Only members of the panel who are present for the entire hearing may vote.

9.4.5 When circumstances warrant, the chair and vice-chair of the CAFRT, with approval of the Hearing Committee, may appoint a student member (non-voting), to the committee.

9.4.6 The CAFRT shall be self-governing and within the provisions of this University statement, shall adopt such rules and procedures as it deems appropriate, including rules regarding admissibility of evidence.

9.5 Hearing Procedures:

9.5.1 When a faculty member requests a hearing (in accord with 8.1, 9.1.1.4, or 9.1.2.2 above), or when the Preliminary Screening Committee recommends a hearing for a non-tenured faculty member in accord with 9.1.3.4 above), the CAFRT Hearing Committee shall then set a time for the hearing that will
allow the faculty member a reasonable time in which to prepare for the hearing and shall notify the faculty member of the time and place. The faculty member and the University administration shall exchange witness lists indicating the general nature of the testimony of each witness prior to the hearing at a time specified by the CAFRT Hearing Committee. Witnesses should be present at the hearing so that the faculty member, the university, and the panel may question them. In the event that the presence of a witness is not possible, a conference call may be established by prearrangement with and approval of the chair. The committee may accept written documentation, including statements and depositions, at its discretion. Witnesses may be added at a later date for good cause.

9.5.2 The President will designate the person who will serve as Texas A&M University's representative at the hearing. Both the faculty member and the University administration shall have the right to be represented by legal counsel. Outside the hearing, either party may use legal counsel to assist in preparation of the record and to interview witnesses. Both the University administration and the faculty member shall have the right to call witnesses, to question all witnesses who testify orally, and to have a full stenographic record or an electronic recording of the proceedings, as determined by the CAFRT. Individual witnesses may be represented by legal counsel. Unless special circumstances warrant, it should not be necessary to follow the formal rules of court procedure.

9.5.3 Suspension of the faculty member during these proceedings is justified only if the welfare of the faculty member or that of students, colleagues, or other institutional employees is threatened by his or her continuance or if the continued presence of the faculty member would materially and substantially disrupt the regular operations of the institution. Any such suspension shall be with pay and with appropriate provisions for useful duties whenever possible.

9.5.4 The CAFRT shall allow oral arguments and written briefs on behalf of the President or his or her representative and by the faculty member or designated representative.

9.5.5 The hearing shall be closed unless the affected faculty member requests that it be open.

9.5.6 Due process is understood as following a course of professional proceedings consistent with the rules and principles generally recognized in the academic community. In general, the procedures in this document shall guide the CAFRT in its considerations of due process.

9.6 Findings and Recommendations:

9.6.1 The CAFRT Hearing Committee's findings and recommendations shall be conveyed in writing to the President and the faculty member.
9.6.2 If the CAFRT Hearing Committee recommends against dismissal or non-reappointment and the President accepts that recommendation, the faculty member shall be reinstated and the hearing terminated.

9.6.3 If the faculty member's appointment is proposed to be terminated by the President, the President shall transmit the full report of the Hearing Committee and his or her recommendation to the Chancellor of the System for his or her recommendation and transmittal to the Board Regents. If the recommendation of the President for termination conflicts with that of the committee, both recommendations shall be transmitted to the Chancellor of the System for recommendation and transmittal to the Board of Regents.

9.7 Governing Board: The Board of Regents shall review all recommendations concerning tenured faculty members dismissed for cause and non-tenured faculty members dismissed prior to the expiration of appointments. If the recommendations of the President and the CAFRT Hearing Committee are in accord, the Board may choose to limit its review to the record of the hearing. Where conflict exists between the CAFRT Hearing Committee and the President, the Board should extend its review to include an opportunity for arguments by the principals or their representatives. The Board shall either sustain the decision of the hearing committee or return the matter to the hearing committee for consideration with appropriate instructions. In such case, the committee should promptly reconsider the case, taking into account the instructions of the Board and receiving new evidence if directed to do so by the Board. Upon reconsideration the hearing committee shall forward its reconsidered recommendation to the President and the Board. After review of the hearing committee's reconsideration, the Board shall render its own final written decision with a copy provided to each of the principals.

CLICK HERE TO SEE APPENDIX I

OFFICE OF RESPONSIBILITY: Dean of Faculties
Appendix C - Dwight Look College of Engineering Guidelines and Promotion Procedures For Annual Review, Intermediate Review & Promotion and Tenure of Faculty
1. Introduction

These guidelines and procedures are based on requirements and guidelines found in the following: (1) University Rule 12.01.99.M2: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion; (2) System Policy 12.01: Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure; and (3) Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost’s Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines and Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Review, both published annually. The university’s revisions to the annual review criteria (effective January 1, 2010) have also been incorporated.

2. Expectations and Responsibilities

The expectations of the Look College for its faculty are that they continually strive for excellence in teaching, establish and maintain an impactful research program that leads to a national and international reputation in their area, and be a contributing member of the faculty by providing a reasonable level of service to the department and by providing a reasonable level of service to the profession. More specifically, the mandatory intermediate reviews and the annual faculty reviews are expected to evaluate scholarly contributions to our undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, student advising, research, and engagement. Specifically, the impact of faculty members’ activities on academic endeavors is of paramount importance.

Department heads are primarily responsible for ensuring that university and Look College procedures are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of his or her accomplishments and performance. The overall purpose of these guidelines is to ensure the integrity of the annual review, intermediate review, and tenure and promotion process in order to retain and promote the best faculty possible. Within these overall procedures, it is specifically noted that departmental practices may differ because of variations in department size, the nature of departmental faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. Departmental procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with System Policy, University Rules, and College Guidelines while achieving departmental objectives. Recommended procedures for each of the three review processes are included in this document.

3. Faculty Annual Performance Reviews

All faculty members, whether tenured, tenure track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads are responsible. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 2.5, explains the purpose, basis, and requirements for the faculty annual review process. Section 2.5.4 specifically addresses annual reviews for faculty who hold joint appointments. For faculty holding budgeted joint appointments, “… there should be one department where more than 50% of the appointment is located; the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation.”

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department head to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.” We will follow the spirit of these guidelines, with provisions made for providing more timely input to the faculty involved in the intermediate review process, and
to better facilitate the budgetary cycles. In the Look College, annual reviews will focus either on the immediately previous academic year or the previous calendar year, at the discretion of the department head.

3.1 Required Documentation
In December of each year, department heads should request that all faculty submit a Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information (FPR) form (attachment A).

3.2 Process
During January through March, FPRs are reviewed by the department head, and a departmental/divisional committee as appropriate. The department head meets with individual faculty to discuss their progress and to provide and receive verbal feedback. Other individuals, such as a division head or associate/assistant department head, or tenure and promotion committee chair may also be included in the meeting with individual faculty members at the discretion of the department head. The discussion should specifically address the following areas: (1) teaching and student advising; (2) research and scholarly publications; (3) service; (4) safety and safety compliance; (5) plans for the coming year; and (6) the department head’s summary and recommendations. In evaluating teaching, research, and service, contributions made to support interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs and contributions made to enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences should be recognized.

After meeting with the faculty member, a written evaluation of the faculty member’s progress/performance is prepared by the department head encompassing the areas listed above (sample is available from the college’s manager of faculty services). No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all mandatory university training programs. In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. Likewise, the faculty member must certify their attentiveness to safety and compliance. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial each:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory university training programs.
- I will, on a continuing and timely basis, address any safety deficiencies, report any and all safety concerns to the department head, and demonstrate compliance with safety standards as defined by the Environmental Health & Safety Department.

Faculty members are also required to acknowledge receipt of the written evaluation by returning a signed copy of the document to the department head. A signed copy is to be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file. At that time, the faculty member may add a response to the written evaluation so that it may also be included in their personnel file. If a faculty member has a complaint concerning their written evaluation they may meet with the executive associate dean (EAD), but only after providing a response and discussing that response with the department head. The department head may be included in the meeting with the faculty member, at the discretion of the EAD. As stated in 2.5.3.6 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion, the faculty member may instead write a letter to the dean with a copy to the dean of faculties.

On or before June 15 of each year signed copies of reviews for tenure track faculty should be forwarded to the EAD. Department heads must also provide a memo, which certifies that all faculty (tenured, tenure track, non-tenure track) have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed a copy of their written review. In this memo the department heads should specifically indicate any tenure track faculty member
who is not progressing satisfactorily toward an affirmative tenure decision. Likewise, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member must also be reported. As part of the university’s post-tenure review process, the faculty member must then prepare a written plan for near-term improvement approved by the department head and submitted to the EAD by the June 15 deadline.

**Reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and no later than June 15.**

4. **Intermediate Review of Probationary Faculty Members**

The process of midterm reviews was instituted to ensure that tenure track faculty members have a clear understanding of their current status and progress toward tenure and promotion. The university requires all tenure track faculty members hired with a probationary period of seven years to have an intermediate (or midterm) review. Intermediate reviews for tenure track faculty members hired with a probationary period of between four and six years are encouraged but not required by the university. Department heads may conduct a slightly more in-depth “annual review” of a faculty member on a less than seven year probationary period in lieu of a formal intermediate review. The university requires both departmental and college-level tenure and promotion (T&P) committees review and provide input into the formal intermediate review process.

As an additional note, since the mandatory intermediate review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review (at the department head’s discretion), all items and acknowledgements mentioned above must be incorporated into the intermediate review unless already stated in a separate annual review.

4.1 **Required Documentation**

Department heads should meet with intermediate review candidates during December or January to discuss the intermediate review process. The college manager for faculty services will provide each department with a list of mandatory intermediate review candidates. The following items should be requested of the candidate by a reasonable deadline to conduct the review:

- Three page statement maximum on their teaching, research, and service philosophies
- *Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form* (FPR)
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) (useful for those with experience elsewhere)
- Copies of two of their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M University

4.2 **Process**

During February or March the departmental T&P committee reviews each case and provides written evaluation and recommendations to the department head. Departmental recommendations are due to the college by the second Friday of April. At that time the department head should submit the following items to the EAD:

One original copy in single-sided, unstapled format (folders are not needed), and one electronic copy, both in the following order:

- Department head’s written preliminary report regarding the candidate’s performance in all areas of review. This report must be signed by the department head.
- Departmental T&P committee’s written evaluation/recommendation addressing teaching, student advising, research, scholarship, and service, including any individual reports on teaching, research, and service. Supporting documents, such as teaching evaluation data, may be added after this item.
- Information submitted by the faculty candidate (in the order stated under 4.1).
• During April and May the College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC) reviews each case and provides a written evaluation and recommendation on each to the dean.
• In May and/or June the dean and/or EAD will meet with department heads to discuss all recommendations and the overall outcome of each case. Department heads prepare a final report/memo to faculty members considering input from the CETPAC and the dean. Department heads meet with individual faculty to discuss their progress and present the faculty member with the formal written review. Faculty members will acknowledge receipt of their evaluation by signing the document. A signed copy is sent to the office of the EAD, and the original document is retained in the faculty member’s personnel file.

5. Tenure & Promotion Reviews

5.1 Criteria and Performance Measures for Appointment and Advancement

Section 4.5.4 of the University’s Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 - Section 4.4) addresses exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion.

“Exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion may sometimes be warranted. Examples would include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. Few faculty will possess qualities such as these, but those who do deserve recognition and advancement.”

Most faculty should be evaluated for tenure and promotion on accomplishments in each of the three major categories of performance (teaching and student advising, research, and service/engagement), but with primary emphasis on teaching and the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities, including patents or commercialization of research, where applicable. Recent changes made to the faculty review criteria mandate awarding appropriate credit to faculty who actively work toward achieving the university’s goals in three major areas: (1) supporting multidisciplinary collaboration; (2) enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences; and (3) requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

Imperatives for tenure and promotion in the Look College are: effective classroom instruction, successful advising of undergraduate and graduate students, ability to sustain an independent research program, scholarly contributions, and evidence of service/engagement.

Although some quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, the quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than their numbers. For tenure and promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.

Please see Attachment B for information regarding criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution.
5.2 Outside Professional Experience

It is important that engineering faculty be aware of the current state of professional practice and research. Continuing interaction with industry and the professional research community is essential to a faculty member’s maintaining professional currency. Mechanisms for accomplishing this continuing development may include: summer/temporary employment or faculty development leaves at other universities, within industry or government laboratories, and consulting activities.

5.3 Time of Service within Rank

There is no firm period of service required for advancement in the Look College. Rather, advancement will be based on accomplishments, which merit tenure and/or promotion. Determining the year of mandatory consideration for tenure track faculty is calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Tenure Consideration Year

Normally, one academic year is required for preparation and processing of cases for promotion and/or tenure. Successful recommendations will result in the advancement becoming effective at the beginning of the following academic year (i.e., September 1).

5.4 Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration

The department head and/or the departmental T&P committee should identify candidates for tenure and/or promotion by February 15 of each calendar year. A memo should be sent to all non-tenured tenure track faculty, as well as to all associate professors (tenured and non-tenured) to 1) inform them that they are up for mandatory tenure and/or promotion, or 2) ask them if they would like to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. A reasonable deadline should be established so that the department head can begin the process. Once candidates are identified, they should receive a copy of the current tenure and promotion procedures and guidelines of the university (available from the dean of faculties website), the college and the department (if separate from the college).

5.5 Required Documentation

Department heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the process. They should be instructed (in writing) to prepare and submit the following items to the department head or a designate (typically a staff coordinator for the process) by a reasonable deadline that will allow time for selection of the external reviewers and solicitation of letters by March 31, and no later than May 31:

- A concise statement (three pages, single spaced, maximum) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphasis on carrying out professional responsibilities in teaching, research and service/engagement.
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature.
- A list of between six and eight names of potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. According to university guidelines, the reviewers should be from peer institutions/programs or better. The candidate should also be asked to provide a list of individuals that they do not want contacted to be an external reviewer.
- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address inter/multidisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional).
- The College’s Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR).
- Copies of selected refereed publications (their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M) to be forwarded to external reviewers. Departments may set limits on the number of publications to be submitted.
• Other materials as may be requested by departmental T&P committees or the department head (e.g. a teaching portfolio)

The department head should make it clear to the candidate that these materials may be updated at any stage of the process, and that updates should be signed and dated by the candidate.

5.6 Solicitation of External Reviewers

University guidelines on the method of selection of reviewers must be followed: at least one from the candidate’s list; at least one from the department head’s or departmental T&P committee’s list; and no one designated by the candidate as not to be contacted. In addition, efforts should be made to avoid individuals with whom the candidate has had an unusually close working relationship, such as the candidate’s faculty advisor or post-doctoral advisor. Letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation.

To better facilitate the solicitation of input from external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases, the process should take place mid-spring. Department heads are required to review all potential external reviewers to ensure they are from recognized peer institutions/programs or better and are clear leaders in the field. The departmental T&P committee may provide input. Contact with these individuals requesting their service as a reviewer must be in the form of a personal letter from the department head. The department head may make telephone or email inquiries to potential reviewers prior to the letter request. This letter, along with selected materials for review, should be sent to external reviewers by March 31, and no later than May 31. The college expects a minimum of six letters with a minimum of four letters received from reviewers selected by the departmental T&P committee and/or department head, and a minimum of two letters received from reviewers selected by the candidate. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the candidate’s selections and four from the departmental selections. The solicitation letter 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.*

If a solicitation letter is sent containing a request for specific examples of the candidate’s current and potential scholarship and/or impact of teaching and service and the required statement above, and the referee declines to write a letter for the candidate, that reviewer must still be listed in the dossier reviewer chart, indicating that they declined.

At no time is the candidate to inquire about the status of the reviewers he/she nominates, or to contact them.

5.7 Process

Once the necessary number of external review letters has been received, they, along with the other items submitted by the candidate, should be made available to the departmental tenure and promotion committee (see section 7) for review. The candidate’s items may be given to the committee prior to receipt of the external letters at the discretion of the department head. In either case, confidentiality of hard copy and electronic files should be maintained throughout the process. Signed and dated updates by the candidate should be distributed immediately to the committee members and department head, and incorporated into the candidate’s original copy items.

The departmental tenure and promotion committee meets to discuss and vote on each candidate, as described in section 7.2. This committee also prepares teaching, research and service peer evaluations as required for the dossier.
The department head prepares a separate recommendation evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. This document must:

- Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case
- Provide an explanation of the candidate’s impact on academic endeavors
- Provide the context of this particular case within the department
- Explain special considerations (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances)
- Explain any mixed or negative votes if not explained in the committee’s report
- Explain the department head’s vote, especially if contrary to the departmental committee’s recommendation.

Other considerations itemized in section 7.3 should also be addressed. The departmental T&P coordinator then structures all documents into the dossier for submission to the dean.

The department head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including the departmental committee’s vote, the department head’s vote, the dean’s vote, the university’s decision, and ultimately the Board of Regents decision. The dean will notify the department heads of decisions at the college, university and system level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

6. College Tenure & Promotion Committee

6.1 Selection and Structure

University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 4.6.3 states, “In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide tenure and promotion committee.” The CETPAC is comprised of one member from each academic department. The college’s executive associate dean serves as ex officio chair of this committee, and does not vote in this venue.

Department heads nominate two members of the departmental review committee and the dean makes the final decision regarding appointment to CETPAC, ensuring that the committee is diverse. Members serve a two-year term, with half of the representatives being held over for the next year’s committee and half rotating off the committee. Members are not allowed to vote on cases from their home department. Committee deliberations and final votes are presented to the dean. The dean may also seek input from the college’s associate deans, but it is the dean with whom the final decision rests.

6.2 College Committee’s Report and Recommendation

The college committee’s report and recommendation should be similar to the departmental T&P committee report, reflecting the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other.

7. Department Tenure & Promotion Committee

7.1 Selection and Structure

Departmental T&P committees shall consist of five to nine members who, except as noted below, are tenured full professors in the department. The Look College requires that tenured associate professors participate in the committee evaluation of tenure track assistant professors for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Regarding jointly funded appointments, note that only faculty members ad loc’d to the department can participate in that department’s tenure and promotion review process. This committee shall be constituted as follows: at least half or a majority of the committee shall consist of members elected by the departmental faculty. To provide area balance or interdisciplinary representation and ensure diversity
of the committee, the department head may appoint not more than two full professors from outside the
department, or tenured associate professors from within the department. Associate professors must recuse
themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of faculty to full professor. Care
should be taken so that the size of the committee is sufficient to ensure proper evaluation of candidates for
full professor once associate professors have been excused. The members of the committee should be
appointed or elected to staggered terms to ensure that not more than one-half of the committee rotates off on
an annual basis. Two year staggered terms are recommended. The department head shall appoint the chair
of the committee.

As an alternative to the above procedure, the committee may be constituted of all tenured faculty in a
department (preferably maintaining the five member minimum). Tenured associate professors in the
committee are required to recuse themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of
faculty to full professor.

7.2 Operation of the Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee
The departmental T&P committee shall review every tenure track faculty member for their intermediate and
mandatory tenure reviews. Additional reviews may be done at the request of either the candidate or the
department head. Tenured associate professors shall be reviewed by the committee for promotion upon
request by either the candidate or the department head. Prospective faculty members whose recommended
appointment is with tenure must also be reviewed by this committee. If, as a result of an annual performance
review, a tenure track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior
to their mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review
must be submitted through the department head to the dean with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

For the tenure and promotion process, the departmental committee is charged with:

- Review and evaluation of the candidate’s dossier
- Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate’s teaching, research, and service/engagement
  (authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated)
- Preparing a complete report and recommendation explaining the committee’s vote and reasoning for
  their recommendation, and, if applicable, an overview of the candidate’s progress and impact as it relates
  to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure (see item 7.3) (to be signed by all committee
  members).

The committee may seek input from other sources, including division heads or other faculty. However, these
individuals shall not be present during the committee's final deliberations, nor shall they be present during
voting. Since the committee is viewed as advisory to both the department head and the dean, its vote should
be independent of any action by the department head. Hence, the department head should not be present
during committee discussions or voting.

A secret ballot should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to
the department head, who will forward it to the dean. At least two committee members should count the
votes and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members must be
present and absentee ballots should not be used, unless an explicit waiver is received from the department
head or his/her designee. A written proxy may be allowed in emergency situations. Committee members
should not abstain from voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest. In these cases,
the committee member should recuse him/herself from the discussion of the candidate as well as the voting.
7.3 Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee Report

The departmental T&P committee report should address the areas of teaching, research, and service/engagement. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member’s contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, technology commercialization and enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences (at the university and/or college levels). The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the department head, dean, and upper administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities, and the committee’s concerns. Other considerations for the departmental committee report are:

- Authorship of the final report is to be made clear and the report is to be signed by all committee members.
  - University guidelines recommend that a statement such as, “The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee,” appear at the end of each report.

- Authorship protocol must be addressed by the departmental committee or by the department head, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.

- Quality and impact. Departmental committees and department heads should be mindful of the multiple audiences who review the T&P files and need to address “quality and impact” factors within their specific discipline. Assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field. Some example areas: the importance of an award or citation; service and/or election to a professional organization; why published conference papers may be more significant than journal publications.

- Acronyms should be defined at first use, i.e., American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME). Again, assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field.

- Identification of Courses. If reference is made to a course at first use the complete title of the course must be stated i.e. Thermodynamics for Aerospace Engineers (AERO 212).
I. TEACHING

1. **Teaching effectiveness** - list or describe any comments or measures of teaching effectiveness used and results obtained. (No more than a one page summary of student comments should be included - do not include student evaluation forms.)

2. **Educational development** - describe the development of any new courses or major changes or innovations in existing programs or courses, new curricula, new laboratories, and teaching methods, including the application of new technology (e.g. educational software development), but not the normal updating and revision of courses.

3. **Publication of textbooks and of education papers (including papers on educational software developed) in recognized journals**: (Use proper bibliographic format - authors must be in the proper order.)

   A. Other institutions using educational materials developed:

4. **Courses taught** - please indicate information requested below for each course taught, beginning with the most recent (since last hiring action). Insert or delete rows as necessary.
A. Undergraduate and graduate courses (list graduate research courses in I.4.B); sample information is highlighted. Your department will provide the average numerical grade for equivalent level courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Mean Student Evaluation Score</th>
<th>Avg Numerical Grade Earned by Students</th>
<th>Dept Avg Numerical Grade for Equivalent Level Courses</th>
<th>Dept Avg Student Evaluation Score for Equivalent Level Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR 482</td>
<td>FA09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SU09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of students taught:

B. Graduate research courses; sample information is highlighted (insert or delete rows as necessary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Last Name of Student</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGR 691</td>
<td>FA09</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SU09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Student research advising** – list student name, the degree, thesis title, and estimated or actual graduation date. Principal advising is assumed; if co-chair, please indicate.

   PROVIDE CUMULATIVE INFORMATION FOR THIS ITEM (Names of students must be numbered for reference)

   A. Masters

   B. Doctorate

6. **Teaching improvement** – list specific programs or short courses participated in to improve teaching competence.

II. RESEARCH AND/OR DESIGN

   PROVIDE CUMULATIVE INFORMATION FOR ITEMS 1., 2., 3. AND 4. OF THIS SECTION. PLEASE DELINEATE YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS SINCE JOINING TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

1. **Refereed journal publications** – begin with most recent publications first and use proper bibliographic format; authors must be in the proper order. For accepted but unpublished articles, provide appropriate correspondence.

   DESIGNATE PUBLICATIONS WITH STUDENTS (PAST OR PRESENT) WITH AN ASTERISK (*)

   A. Published or accepted journal publications (papers must be numbered for reference):

   B. Journal papers submitted (papers must numbered for reference):

2. **Publication of books or authoritative references** – list in following format:

   [Author's last name and initials, co-authors, title, publisher, publisher location, year.]

3. **Other publications** – begin with most recent publications first and use proper bibliographic format. Acceptance rates may be included to confirm peer review and status of conference venue. Include research reports for sponsors.

   A. Published or accepted conference papers (papers must be numbered for reference):

   B. Other (please specify):

4. **Funded research projects** - list in following format:

   [Title, sponsor, principal investigator, co-principal investigator/s, number of graduate students supported, inclusive dates, dollar value total AND pro-rated amount for the individual faculty member.]
A. Externally funded research projects:

B. Internally funded research projects:

5. Research proposals - list in following format:

[Title, sponsor, principal investigator, co-principal investigator/s, date submitted, dollar value, status];
indicate whether proposal is competitive and subject to peer review.

6. New design methods, techniques or concepts developed – design of generic new operating devices and systems, including patents and software systems in use in industry or elsewhere.

III. SERVICE

1. Professional service – list state, national, and international service only. (These activities must be related to the area of professional expertise and must not earn financial remuneration other than an honorarium.) List in the following format:

[Organization, your responsibility or title, indication whether responsibility is an elected or appointed office, geographical scope and inclusive dates.]

2. University and community service – please limit to major assignments and use format as above. (Note that multidisciplinary service is to be reported in item IV.3.)

IV. MULTIDISCIPLINARY STRATEGIC AREAS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

1. Creation of knowledge or creative activities – list activities related to university landmark areas of research, university recognized centers or institutes, participation in significant multidisciplinary projects and active participation in said projects awarded for $1.5M or more:

2. Teaching – list teaching activities related to interdisciplinary program courses, service learning oriented experiences for students, entrepreneurship classes or activities and disciplinary courses in a learning community that involves students that span two or more colleges:

3. Service/engagement – list participation in major assignments at the university level such as Faculty Senate, a university council or committee, CPI leadership, any recognized faculty network, search committee for a dean or university-level administrator, K-12 outreach, community or corporate partnerships or projects, including funded research, training programs and coursework development:

V. INTERNATIONALIZATION

1. Engagement with the international community of scholars in the field – continued and enhanced leadership at the international level in the field is encouraged and valued. List activities related to
leadership, development and involvement in study abroad and international activities (list international lectures or seminars in V.2):

2. *International invited significant lectures or seminars* – list in the following format:

   [Name, title, group addressed, institution, location, date.]

**VI. DIVERSITY**

1. *Engagement in diversity initiatives* – as with internationalization, continued and enhanced leadership in diversity initiatives is encouraged and valued. List activities that focus on enhancing students’ knowledge of disparities and differences experienced by diverse groups and skills in working among diverse cultures. Examples may be engagement in funded projects, recruitment and retention, workshops, seminars or courses presented or taken, and participation in publication projects or creative activities that enhance understanding of diversity issues in higher education or disciplinary fields:

**VII. PROFESSIONAL OUTREACH**

1. *Continuing education/professional development* - list programs or short courses, dates taught, number of students, and number of times taught previously:

2. *National invited significant seminars or lectures* – list in the following format:

   [Name, title, group addressed, institution, location, date.]

3. *Review of journal papers and/or research proposals* (i.e., where faculty member served as the peer reviewer and inclusive dates):

4. *Consulting* – consulting activities or other professional work of unique character which have potential valuable carry over into the educational process. Include dates and companies:

5. *Other professional outreach:*

**VIII. HONORS AND AWARDS**

1. *Honor and/or award* – list organization, citation, date and where awarded if appropriate.

**IX. SAFETY**

1. *Safety in the teaching and research environment* – faculty members are responsible for reasonable mitigation of safety concerns in the environments they have been assigned as the lead researcher or instructor of record. Please report any observations of the teaching or research environment that seem
to present a safety hazard.

X. IMPACT (COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF YOU ARE BEING CONSIDERED FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW)

1. Please state the overall impact of your academic contributions and activities; limit to one half page.

XI. PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR

1. Professional development plans - please list your proposed scholarly and professional activities for the coming year along with a proposed division of effort:

XII. OTHER ITEMS

Other items, which the faculty member believes, are important and have reported to the department head.

The attractiveness of higher education has always been the excitement of belonging to a scholarly community. A faculty member is free to pursue various activities, some of which may be valuable but are not usually recognized for promotion or tenure. Yet, a faculty member may wish to report these items or call the department head's attention to other items that may fit in with the goals of the department, the college, and the university. Please itemize.
This document supplements the Look College’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures, specifically for the faculty within the Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution (ETID).

It is explicitly recognized that scholarly, archival journal publications are not the only indicators of professional accomplishment and excellence for the ETID faculty. Other appropriate indicators may include:

- Publications of an applied nature in refereed academic proceedings and/or journals and editorially reviewed trade publications
- Textbooks and/or chapters in textbooks
- Case studies published in peer refereed academic publications
- New processes, techniques and devices developed in response to industry needs
- Innovative teaching techniques and publications adopted by peer institutions
- Curriculum and laboratory development and enhancement

For faculty in industrial distribution, recognized publications dealing with management, marketing, logistics, distribution, or similar areas., may also be appropriate indicators.

**Degree and Professional Requirements**

For the ranks of assistant and associate professor on tenure track, a Ph.D. degree in a discipline appropriate to the program is normally required. While a B.S. degree in engineering or engineering technology from an ABET-accredited program is normally required for engineering technology, a degree in business or an alternative educational background may be acceptable in industrial distribution. Other circumstances may exist where relevancy and appropriateness of the faculty member’s education and experience are deemed acceptable.

All departmental programs are oriented toward serving industry. Normally, candidates for appointment and promotion will have industrial experience and remain current in industrial practices in their particular fields of study by interacting with industry and by participating in various professional activities.

Assistant professors in ETID should meet the minimum university requirements for that rank, and will typically have at least three additional years of professional experience to include (but not limited to) consulting, society or association activity in state or national conferences, invited lectures, chaired sessions, or similar activities, with continuing industrial relationships.

Professors should meet the university’s requirements for the associate professor rank, and have at least four additional years of professional experience with strong continuing industrial interaction. For promotion to or appointment as professor, an earned Ph.D., Sc.D., DEng, or other appropriate doctoral degree in a field relevant to the individual’s role in the department is normally required.

Consulting, summer/temporary employment or faculty development leaves with industry, or sponsored research on industrial projects qualifies as industry interactions and industrial experience for purposes of meeting the above requirements.
Criteria for Advancement
Evaluations for appointment and advancement will include the areas of teaching, research or successful design, publications and professional service. Candidates are expected to present evidence of originality and impact of the individual’s work (i.e., texts adopted by other schools; original devices; products or techniques used in industry; consulting expertise resulting in industry’s acceptance of new methods to increase productivity or profitability). Participation in externally funded research, design and development is strongly encouraged. Evaluation of such work will be in terms of its originality and value to the sponsor rather than the size of the funds involved. A candidate for promotion to professor would be expected to have a state and national reputation for his/her accomplishments, and be recognized as an authority in his/her field by peers and industrialists.

To be awarded tenure and/or promoted to associate professor, the ability to remain professionally viable, to lead in further development of the field, and to mentor both students and junior faculty will be strongly considered.
Appendix D - Excerpt from
Departmental Guidelines and Standard
Operating Procedures
6.6 PROCEDURES FOR RE-APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY

6.6.1 The faculty's recommendation to the Department Head regarding continuation in the tenure-track, granting of tenure, and promotion shall be decided by a majority opinion expressed through a secret ballot of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, following an evaluation of the candidate in accordance with the procedures and criteria detailed in these Guidelines.

6.6.2 A candidate being considered for re-appointment, tenure, or promotion shall not take part in the deliberations concerning his/her case, except as otherwise specified in these Guidelines, or
as specified in the College of Engineering or University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion.

6.6.3 Each eligible faculty member, identified by the Department Head or requesting a review, shall meet with the Department Head by March 1 to determine if his/her personnel file contains all the information needed for a review by the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

6.6.4 The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall complete its initial review by March 15 or shortly thereafter.

6.6.5 The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall meet as soon as possible after completion of the initial reviews of all candidates for tenure and/or promotion and determine, by secret ballot, those faculty members for whom it is appropriate to conduct a formal review. This determination shall be based on the candidate receiving votes favoring a formal review by at least one third of the T&P Committee.

6.6.6 Each candidate being formally reviewed shall prepare a dossier that meets university guidelines. The candidate shall provide any additional information requested by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and shall have access to this dossier.”

6.6.7 By June 1, the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall determine, by a majority opinion expressed through a secret ballot, its preliminary recommendations with regard to each of the cases considered.

6.6.8 The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall meet with the Department Head and communicate the recommendations of the committee in each of the cases considered. The dossier on each candidate shall also be made available to the Department Head at this time.

6.6.9 The Department Head or, at his/her direction, the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall then solicit external letters for those cases that have been recommended for further processing. External letters shall also be solicited for those individuals requesting such action or for whom a formal review is mandatory.

6.6.10 After the complete dossier, including external letters and all documentation required by the College of Engineering and/or the University, has been compiled and reviewed, the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall determine its final recommendation to the Department Head, by a majority opinion expressed through a secret ballot. The formal recommendation to the Department Head shall include all materials considered by the committee as well as a written recommendation summarizing the committee's views.

6.6.11 The Department Head shall then prepare his/her recommendations regarding each candidate and shall meet with the Tenure and Promotion Committee to communicate both his/her recommendations and the reasons for the recommendations, before these are forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

6.6.12 A faculty member shall be advised by the Department Head of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion at each level of review.
6.6.13 Every faculty member shall have the right to ask that his/her case for promotion and/or tenure be processed beyond the department level regardless of the recommendation(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and/or the Department Head.

6.6.14 After the start of the review process, the Department Head shall not meet with or attend meetings of the Review Committee(s) and/or the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

7.0 CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

7.1 CATEGORIES OF PERFORMANCE

7.1.1 All recommendations for continuation in the tenure-track, tenure, and/or promotion shall be based on a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the following categories: scholarship in teaching; counseling and advising of students; scholarship in research; continuing education, and national and international outreach; and public and university service. This evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the College of Engineering and University regulations and requirements.

7.2 PEER EVALUATION

7.2.1 Those involved in the evaluation process are encouraged to seek input from the faculty at-large. Peer evaluation shall play an important role in the evaluation process.