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# Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2019</td>
<td>Through the dean of faculties, the provost requests that deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6, 2019</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, Faculty Tenure Table, Faculty Summary Data Table, External Reviewers Chart, Grants Summary Chart, Dossier Coversheet and Candidate Picture for all tenure candidates to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2019</td>
<td>Deans submit recommendations of <strong>ALL</strong> cases to the provost by sending electronic files of <strong>ALL</strong> candidates for to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Deans meet with the provost and the dean of faculties and review recommendations for <strong>candidates</strong>. The provost forwards recommendations to the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February 2020</td>
<td>President meets with the provost and the dean of faculties and reviews recommendations. The president forwards recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents (BOR), through the chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2020</td>
<td>BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases. Congratulatory letters for tenure and promotion will be sent mid-May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2020</td>
<td>Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL** tenure and/or promotion dossier materials are due to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by **December 5, 2019**. 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.
II. 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 4.4.1.4 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 Rule 12.01.99.M2—
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 must clarify beforehand the role of the committee members during deliberations of
colleagues from their own departments (this must be addressed by the college and/or department P&T
guidelines).

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.

B. Reconsideration of a Case

If the dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the
department head 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 P&T committee and dean before a final recommendation
concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

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).
C. Notifying Candidates of Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations

Candidates must be advised, by the department head or dean, in colleges without departments, 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 (not applicable in colleges without departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>Department head notifies candidate upon submission of recommendation to the dean (not applicable in colleges without departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Committee</td>
<td>Dean notifies department head (or candidate directly in colleges without departments) upon receipt of the committee’s recommendation; the department head notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean notifies department head (or candidate directly in colleges without departments) 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 (or candidate directly in colleges without departments), 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 (or candidate directly in colleges without departments), who notifies candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents</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>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Additions or Changes to the CV

Additions or changes to the CV after initial submission may occur at any level prior to the submission of the final dossier to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

In general, it is advisable to 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.

Note: All modifications to the dossier should be submitted in a memo stating exactly what has changed (e.g. “Grant proposal X to NSF, listed as pending on page Y, has now been awarded”). The memo 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 modifications to the dossier must be submitted through the department head or dean, in colleges without departments, who in turn will forward it to the evaluating body currently reviewing the dossier. This memo should be placed in front of the originally submitted CV.

### Important

- If the report of the previous review 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.

### E. 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 (or directly to the dean in colleges without departments), 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.

### F. Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Probationary Period

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 below.

### Non-Reappointment

Since the probationary period consists of a series of one-year appointments, 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 meet the expectations 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.

Please see University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf) or the Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review (http://dof.tamu.edu/dof/media/PITO-...
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 2013 + 7 years of probation – 2 years =2018. The mandatory review will start in Fall 2018; if successful, the Board of Regents will grant tenure in Spring 2019, and the promotion and/or tenure will become effective on September 1, 2019).

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 2014

<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>5 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2015 (due AY 2015-2016)</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important

- The semester of hire does not determine the start of the “Tenure Clock”, the calendar year does.
- 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.
- The Board of Regents will review recommendations in the spring semester of the tenure review (academic) year.

Extensions to the Probationary Period (“Tenure Clock”)

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 and should be requested prior to their mandatory year. 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):
  o serious illness or injury;
  o having responsibility for the primary care of an infant or small child;
  o having responsibility for the primary care of a close relative who is disabled elderly or seriously ill;
  o 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.

### Important

- Request to extend the probationary period should be made as soon as possible after the compelling circumstances are identified.
- Candidates may choose not to use the approved extension if not needed.

### 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.**

### Negative Promotion Recommendation

#### Important

- For a promotion case with a negative outcome, a minimum of **ONE YEAR** before resubmission is required (e.g. if a candidate was not recommended for promotion during AY 2018-19, the earliest they can submit the dossier again is AY 2020-2021).
- Exception requests can be made to the Dean of Faculties only with concurrence of the Department Head and Dean.

### G. 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.

**Important**

- A copy of each department and college’s guidelines for promotion and tenure should be forwarded electronically, on an annual basis, to: Sandra Harnden (csh811@tamu.edu)

### H. 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) programs 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.

### I. Academic Professional Track Faculty Promotions

The review process for Academic Professional 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 timeline as all other promotions (e.g., Section I. Timeline). Academic Professional Track promotion packages should not be forwarded outside of the regular promotion and tenure timetable.

The process is unique, however, in the following ways:

- The university does not require outside letters (although they may be included if desired), since it is recognized that faculty in some academic professional track appointments do not have external visibility. However, departments and/or colleges may require external letters in their units for some titles and not others, based on assigned responsibilities, expectations and criteria. Please refer to department and/or college promotion guidelines for specific requirements.
  - Exception to this requirement are faculty members on the Research track, for whom external letters are required. The guidelines for external letters are the same as described in Section IV.
- If the department and/or college guidelines request internal letters of support for academic professional track faculty, ensure that the letter writers are not members of the P&T committee.
- 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).
Academic professional track faculty seeking promotion will submit a dossier for review, organized in the way described in **Section III**. Committees, department head and dean reports should make clear the criteria and weighting used for the consideration. Each college may have its own (approved and published) criteria for reviewing academic professional track packages. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by department committee, department head, college committee and dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the dean of faculties, for approval by the provost and president.
III. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CANDIDATE

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

The candidate’s statement must address *impact* in addition to *quality* and *productivity overtime* *(Please see Appendix II 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 within each of their areas of responsibility (e.g. teaching, research/scholarly or creative work, and service accomplishments). Each of the areas of responsibility should be individually addressed. This statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across all areas of responsibility. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on, and interpretation of the quality and impact of their efforts and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. The statement, in conjunction with the annotated CV should provide evidence that good research ideas and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.

The candidate’s impact statement on *Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities, and Service* is an important document both for providing the candidate perspective about their impact and for providing context for 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/or other scholarly, or creative activities, and service should provide a context for review of the entire case. For those candidates involved in interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaborative research, both the annotated CV and the statement should act together to inform reviewers of the candidate’s contribution to the projects.

**Important**

- All dossiers must include the common required documents (e.g. statement, CV, and various forms and summaries detailed in this section).
- Further, department/colleges should inform the candidates of all the expected additional documentation necessary to be submitted by the candidate (e.g. teaching portfolio, representative assignments or exams, syllabi, representative publications, non-traditional work products, etc.).
  - Note that these documents will not be included in the dossier submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties but will be kept at the department/college and requested by the Dean of Faculties if needed.
- Deadlines for submission of these documents are determined by individual departments and/or colleges.
  - Please refer to department and/or college guidelines or request for applications for additional information.
### Examples of evidence for excellence in each of the 3 major areas of responsibility.

These non-exhaustive lists summarize a more extensive treatment of indicators of outstanding merit or merit in [University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#) (See link to Appendix I near the end of the rule).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research or Scholarly Work</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Publications</td>
<td>Peer-evaluation</td>
<td>Officer in a (inter)national professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing a scholarly book</td>
<td>Narrative of significant continuous improvement</td>
<td>Serving as a program chair at a (inter)national meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major research or fellowship awards</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Governmental commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of publications</td>
<td>Student Outcomes</td>
<td>TAMU administrative role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or Scholarship Awards</td>
<td>Publication of Instructional Materials</td>
<td>Editor or member of editorial board for a major journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juried works of creative activities</td>
<td>Essential Course Development</td>
<td>Reviewer journals and grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review panel service</td>
<td>Teaching awards</td>
<td>Officer on Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited national presentations</td>
<td>Direction of Graduate Students</td>
<td>Chairing a major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited international presentations</td>
<td>Invited teaching at peer or better institution</td>
<td>Evidence of professional service to local community or public, including clinical work and extension service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant external peer-reviewed research funding</td>
<td>Student professional development and mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications with teaching focus in leading journals</td>
<td>Significant service as an advisor</td>
<td>Committee chair in (inter)national professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public activity in performing or diverse arts</td>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant self-development activities, such as Intensive Workshops or Faculty Development Leave that improve research effectiveness</td>
<td>Service as a course coordinator</td>
<td>Advising a student organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of graduate committees</td>
<td>Departmental service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student placement in industry or academia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced teaching effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Format & Guidelines

- Three typed pages (maximum), single-spaced; 10 pt font minimum; 1-inch margins

For more specific and more elaborate guidelines on how to write the candidate’s statement, please refer to [Appendix II](#).

### 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

- The *curriculum vitae* should be concise and *padding should be avoided*. 

• List refereed publications (or other types of scholarly or creative works) separately from those that were not refereed, and label the lists accordingly. Provide complete documentation for each citation, including the venue, date of publication and 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 or under preparation, if included, should be listed in a separately clearly labeled list.
• Indicate any undergraduate, graduate student or post-doc coauthors mentored by the candidate (past or present) using a clear label.
• Make sure to describe authorship protocols within your discipline, specifically the order of authors, and your contribution as co-author if you are not the lead author.
• Be accurate about reviewing duties and service duties etc.
• Annotate your CV, as needed, to highlight the impact of your work and your specific contributions.

Important

➢ There is not a mandated University CV template. Departments and colleges may have specific formatting requirements. Please refer to department/college guidelines for detail information.
➢ Do not include any personal information: i.e. home address, marital status, children, birthday, citizenship, UIN or SSN, etc.

Signed Statement

The candidate must include a signed statement with the CV:

This CV submitted is most current and correct as of the date of this signature.

Signature: Date:

This statement and signature may be appended onto the end of the CV document.

This is different from the 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 prior to the submission of the final dossier to the Office of the Dean of Faculties. For more information please refer to Section II. D of this document.

C. Grants Summary Chart

The candidate must include a copy of the Grants Summary Chart accurately listing their grant information at the end of the CV. This chart can include the career long awards to the faculty member. Be sure the grants and associated details listed in the CV and the Grant Summary Chart are congruent.

D. Verification of Contents Statement (Dossier Item 3)

Description

This statement by the candidate accurately describes the materials they have submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration. The list of materials might include such things as: the 3-page impact statement, curriculum vitae, articles, books, portfolios (teaching, research, service, other), student evaluations, list of suggested external reviewers, list of do not contact external reviewers, and any 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

Description
The Faculty Biography is a 200-word maximum bio of the candidate, which will be published in the spring recognition booklet featuring newly tenured and/or promoted faculty.

Items to be include in Faculty Biography:
- Candidate’s name
- Terminal degree, institution where earned, year earned
- Year and rank they joined the Texas A&M faculty
- Focus areas for teaching
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to teaching and/or teaching impact (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Teaching awards or honors (if applicable, optional)
- Focus areas for research and/or scholarship or creative activities
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to research and/or scholarship or and creative activities (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Research awards or honors (if applicable, optional)
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to service (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Service awards or honors (if applicable, optional)

F. Faculty Summary Data Table
Faculty summary data tables should include career totals and 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 required template. Entries in the right-hand column should be formatted as bulleted lists. Leave table cells blank if they do not apply to the candidate.

IMPORTANT:
- Departments are expected to review all Faculty Summary Data Tables to ensure they are in compliance with the above guidelines and are a match to the candidate’s CV.
- Faculty Data Tables should not be more than one page in length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Frequently Taught</th>
<th>List each course number and title on a separate line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduate Students Chaired or Co-Chaired</td>
<td>Masters (Completed/In Progress): Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Proceedings</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Monographs</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapters</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote/Invited Presentations</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
<td>• Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| External Research Funding (Entire career)   | • Total Awards—Dollar Amount ¹  
• Awards Attributable to Candidate—Dollar Amount ² |
| Internal Research Funding (Entire career)   | • Total Awards—Dollar Amount ¹  
• Awards Attributable to Candidate—Dollar Amount ² |
| Awards Received                             | • List Award(s) and year(s) given |
| Teaching Accomplishments                    | • Accomplishment one |
| Other Research, Scholarship, or Service Accomplishments | • Accomplishment one  
• Accomplishment two, etc. |

¹ Give the total sum of all grants awarded to the prospective faculty member and his/her collaborators  
² 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 Co-PIs authoring each grant and then sum.

G. Other Materials and Documentation (Dossier Item 13)

**Description**

This section of the dossier is for any materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include letters from students, peers or collaborators 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 the candidate may be included in this Item.

**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), copies of student evaluations, and copies of books or articles which are included in the candidate's dossier as part of the review process will not be included in Item 13 and remain as part of the dossier at the department and/or college levels, and not sent to the Office of the Dean of Faculties with the P&T dossier.
IV. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS LETTERS (DOSSIER ITEM 8)

Description
External review letters are an essential component of the tenure and promotion review process. The purpose of external review letters is to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Accordingly, external reviewers should be nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline who are therefore qualified to speak with authority about the candidate’s accomplishments, future potential and impact to the field. Texas A&M University requires that external reviewers be from peer* (AAU public institutions from Vision 2020; see footnote and below for list) or aspiring institutions.

In general, external reviewers are asked to evaluate the candidate’s scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Therefore, if a reviewer is asked to judge an individual’s teaching effectiveness, it is recommended that they be sent a teaching portfolio or equivalent materials to review.

Important
- Candidates should NOT contact potential external reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter.

Guidelines
- Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, and promotion to full professor must include a minimum of FIVE (5) arm’s length letters, although seven (7) is preferred.

Important
- If a department and/or college identifies peer or aspiring institutions other than those recognized by the University, the list must be approved by the Dean of Faculties and the justification for the selection included in each dossier.

- Requirements for external or internal letters for academic professional track faculty promotions are determined at the department and/or college level with the only exception of Research track for whom external letter are required.
- All letters must be from peer¹ or aspiring institutions. If letters from clear leaders in the field from non-peer or non-aspiring institutions are requested, the department head must first consult with and get approval from the dean. The dossier must then 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 dossier must still include at least four (4) letters from individuals in peer or aspiring programs/universities.

¹University of Texas Austin, University of California Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, University of California Los Angeles, University of California San Diego, University of Wisconsin Madison University of Florida, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Illinois Urbana, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, University of California Davis
External reviewers must be arm’s length and not have a vested interest (professional, personal or financial) in the outcome of the decision. Their selection must, therefore, be limited to those whose professional and personal relationship with the candidate can provide an objective and unbiased review:

- At least ten (10) years from last collaboration or co-authorship
- Not be from the same institution where the candidate worked previously
- Not be from the same institution where candidate obtained their terminal degree
- Not be from a previous advisor, mentor, committee member or mentee
- Not be from students from the same advisor

**Important**

- In some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate.
- In such a case, the dean will get approval from the Dean of Faculties prior to soliciting a letter.
- Justification and approval must be included in the dossier.

External letters must be from Full Professors. If letters are requested from Associate Professors, and if the circumstances necessitate from out of rank reviewers, the department head must consult with, and get approval by the dean. Such approval must be documented in the dossier.

In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply:

- External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion dossiers for tenure-track, and academic professional track.
- External reviewers who are academic professional track can only review promotion dossiers for academic professional track candidates.
- If an external reviewer, who is an academic professional track faculty member, were to review a tenure track dossier, the letter from the reviewer would not be counted as one of the five required arm’s length letters.

External letters cannot be requested from the “do not contact” list submitted by the candidate.

No more than one letter can be requested from the same institution.

**Procedures for Requesting and Documenting Outside Letters**

- The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers and if desired a “do not contact” list. With the list of possible reviewers, the candidate must also provide a signed checklist attesting of the qualification of the external reviewers as “arm’s length”, appropriate rank and track and from appropriate institutions [Candidate External Reviewer Checklist](#).

- The department head or P&T committee provides a list of possible reviewers. With the list of possible reviewers, the department must also provide a signed checklist attesting of the qualification of the external reviewers as “arm’s length”, appropriate rank and track and from appropriate institutions see [Department External Reviewer Checklist](#).

- From the two lists, a group of at least seven are selected and contacted by the department head, associate dean/dean or P&T committee chair, as indicated in the unit guidelines.

- It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates, and about equal numbers from the candidate and department list.
• A minimum of three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the department/college suggested list.

• All solicitation letters must use the University Standard External Review template (Appendix I).
  o Colleges will have the option to modify the letter based on the need of their discipline, but must obtain approval from the Office of the Dean of Faculties prior to modification.

• When requesting letters, please use email and clearly state in the subject line of the message the request – e.g. “Candidate Name Tenure and Promotion External Review Official Request”

• It is the responsibility of the unit to ensure receipt of least five (5) letters, thus the person responsible for requesting and tracking the external reviewer letters (department head, associate department head/ P&T committee chair/associate dean/dean) should follow up as needed to make sure the letters are received, acknowledged, and acted on in the required timeline.

• External reviewers can send their letters via mail on official letter head or via official academic email address.

• Include an example of the letters requesting outside reviews

• All letters received for each candidate must be included in the dossier.

• Include a separate document listing the name, title, affiliation, contact information and a half a page (maximum) biography highlighting specific qualifications and credentials for each of the reviewers listed on the chart.

• When requesting letters, please use email and clearly state in the subject line of the message the request - e.g. "Candidate Name Tenure and Promotion External Review Official Request."

#### Important

- If reviewers decline or do not respond to the request, additional reviewers must be contacted to ensure the minimum required number of letters (five) is received.
- If needed, the department/college will ask the candidate for additional reviewers to ensure a balanced distribution of letters from each list.
- If an external letter writer discloses a potential conflict of interest, the department/college must solicit an additional letter to ensure the minimum of five (5) letters is met. The original letter would remain in the file and listed under the "not arm's length" section of the External Reviewers Chart.
- It should be understood by those reviewing the candidate 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.

#### External Reviewers Chart

• The External Reviewers Chart must be submitted as an excel file.
• Specify which letters were suggested by the candidate and which ones were suggested by the department/college.
• All the external reviewers who were contacted to request letters should be listed in the External Reviewers Chart
• Specify which letters were or were not received.
• Specify reason for declination, if known.
• External reviewers must be listed alphabetically, by last name.
V. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT

A. Faculty Tenure Table

Description

The Faculty Tenure Table will summarize the education and employment record of the candidate. This table is required and will be forwarded to the Board of Regents only for candidates seeking tenure.

**EXAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Present Rank</th>
<th>Yrs. Towards Tenure*</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John H. Smith</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Construction Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/1/2020</td>
<td>Ph.D. (2008)</td>
<td>Fa 2008 – Present Assistant Professor University of Michigan Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If Years Towards Tenure from Other Institutions is ≥15 years, please input ≥15 instead of the number of years.**

**Only list the terminal degree in the Education box. Please do not list all degrees.**

Required information:

a. Name (Must match name on CV)

b. Terminal degree, year, and institution

c. Experience evaluated towards tenure

1. Faculty being considered for tenure should include only experience that is considered in the evaluation for tenure (i.e., experience while in a tenured or tenure track position). Academic professional 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.

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

B. Department Evaluation of Teaching, Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities, and Service

Description

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

All faculty participating in the P&T process should adhere to the process guidelines outlined in Section II of this document, as well as, any appropriate departmental or college guidelines.

These reports document the analysis of each area of the candidate’s assigned responsibility. **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.
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. If needed, due to the lack of expertise in the department about a specific discipline, faculty members from other departments/colleges may be asked to participate in the development of these documents. Although these reviewers, external to the department, will not have a vote in the P&T committee, they may be asked to participate in the P&T committee, for that specific candidate’s case, as a non-voting member.

The summary reports should be edited and modified to reflect the views of the entire committee if necessary.

Individual reports should not include votes of the authors

Authorship of the reports should be clearly indicated

---

**Format & Guidelines**

- Three or four individual reports on: teaching (Dossier Item 4); research and/or other scholarly or creative activities (Dossier Item 5); 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. If needed, due to the lack of expertise in the department about a specific discipline, faculty members from other departments/colleges may be asked to participate in the development of these documents. Although these reviewers, external to the department, will not have a vote in the P&T committee, they may be asked to participate in the P&T committee, for that specific candidate’s case, as a non-voting member.

- Authorship of each responsibility-area report should be made clear by listing the names of the individual or individuals who wrote each report. These reports should be edited to ensure they accurately reflect the views of the entire 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” should indicate this.

- A comprehensive evaluation should be carried out for all three or four responsibility areas (teaching, research and/or other scholarly or creative activities, service, and other).

---

**Important**

- Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for the three major responsibility area reports, are available as appendices to this document:
  - Appendix III (Teaching)
  - Appendix IV (Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activities)
  - Appendix V (Service)

- Reports should be well-substantiated analyses of the scope (quality, productivity overtime) and IMPACT of the candidate’s performance.
  - For faculty with joint appointments, committees should have clear understanding of the expectations for each department in the areas of teaching, research and service
Interdisciplinary activities should be evaluated and valued the same as those that are discipline specific.

- IMPACT of the candidate’s performance on student success, through teaching, research and service activities should be addressed and valued, when appropriate.

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

**Teaching Report (Dossier Item 4)**

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student and post-doc research. Teaching should be documented, reviewed, and defined by the department specified course load. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students and post-docs, as appropriate for the discipline, should also be documented and valued.

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 and undergraduate students and post-docs; instruction in the clinical setting. Contributions to the department, college and university efforts in student success are highly valued.

**Guidelines**

Promotion and tenure decisions are not a matter of meeting numeric targets. Rather, the quality of the contributions and the impact to the teaching should be evident. The holistic analysis of teaching conducted for this report should be consistent with standards established by the department, college, and university guidelines.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact of teaching contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

**Important**

- Departments should indicate the materials they expect for this analysis in their P&T guidelines or request for applications.
- Further, if the candidate does not provide the necessary materials the P&T committee should issue a documented request.
- The report should indicate what, if any, issues occurred to limit access to the materials.

In the teaching report, the following **must** be included for each candidate:

1. **Evaluation of course materials** (e.g. course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods), as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate’s course offerings.
2. **Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching:** Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and in tabular form) of the student evaluations 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.) The department must provide these data to the candidates (candidates do not have access to departmental data) to allow them to address the trends within their personal statement. The discussion of the data in the teaching report should include addressing the candidate perspective. At a minimum, a table including the following information should be provided to the candidates and must be included and analyzed in the teaching report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Section</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Candidate Rating Question 1*</th>
<th>Appropriate Average for Question 1*</th>
<th>Candidate Rating Question 2*</th>
<th>Appropriate Average for Question 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Departments decide which question(s) for the student course evaluations will be considered. These questions should be the same for all faculty within the unit.

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

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

**Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities Report (Dossier Item 5)**

Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research, scholarship or creative activities, and be recognized as leaders in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Collaborative work is encouraged where each member of the group documents their major and independent contribution to the impact of the research. Documentation of the individual contributions to collaborative studies is particularly important for tenure-track faculty. Tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor are expected to be recognized leaders nationally, and for many fields internationally, who demonstrate impact that has advanced their field.
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.

**Note:** Publication of scholarship of teaching and learning in quality venues is considered a contribution to research/scholarship performance rather than teaching performance.

**Guidelines**

Promotion and tenure decisions are not a matter of meeting numeric targets. However, contribution and impact generally benefit from cumulative quantity as the level and distribution of productivity is helpful evidence of future promise.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact of research, scholarship or other creative activities contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

- In the report, describe authorship protocols within the candidate’s discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor. Further, for interdisciplinary work, the committees should make a special effort to understand the customs of other disciplines on co-authorship, sequence of authors, and the use of conferences, journals, or monographs as premiere outlets.
- Include a review of selected publications/work (impact in discipline, level of innovation and/or creativity...)
- In multi-authored publications and multi-PI grants, address the candidate’s contributions (and authorship ranking).
- Indicate the degree to which participation in interdisciplinary and team research by the candidate has established more opportunities or greater progress for the candidate.
- If the candidate engages in interdisciplinary/collaborative research, remain flexible as you consider the best approach to ensure a fair analysis of the dossier. For example, if the department committee lacks expertise in a discipline in which the candidate has invested significant effort, consider forming an interdisciplinary ad hoc committee to review the dossier, or use ad hoc members as needed.
- Discuss the degree to which any aspect of the research/scholarship/creative work is difficult, complex, innovative, or risky, and how that might relate to the productivity to date.
- In fields where citations are viewed as an indicator of research impact, the report should include information on the candidate’s citation frequency, and contextual information on citation norms in the field.
- In fields where citations indexes (such as the H-index) are believed to be an indicator of impact, that information is also considered.
- For candidates in artistic fields, the report should evaluate:
  - The quality, selectivity, and stature of a candidate’s performance venues, where appropriate.
  - The candidate’s reputation in the field based on invited talks, shows, performances, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline.

**Service Report (Dossier Item 6)**

A commitment to service is an expectation of all faculty in professorial tiles. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of external service should grow throughout the career of the candidate.

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. Expectations for service vary by discipline, title, and rank.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact of service contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

**Guidelines**

- Go beyond restating the activities listed by the candidate in their CV
- Explain the candidate involvement, contributions, QUALITY and IMPACT of their service activities

**Other Activities Report (Dossier Item 7)**

This report is for any activities that do not fit into any of the other three (e.g. patient care, extension, outreach, etc.) Specific guidance of what should be assessed in this report may be found in department/college guidelines. This section should be left blank if it is not relevant to the candidate.

**C. Department P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation**† (Dossier Item 9)

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 and impact of their work as it relates to their 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 or 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 requires 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.”

**Important**

- Make sure that the discussion report correlates with the vote (i.e. positive report will correlate with positive vote; a positive report with some concerns will correlate with mixed vote; a report with significant concerns will correlate with negative vote).
- **All faculty participating in the P&T process should adhere to the process guidelines outlined in Section II of this document, as well as, any appropriate departmental or college guidelines.**

---

† 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.
Format & Guidelines

- The summative Departmental Committee discussion report and recommendations should address teaching, research and/or other scholarly or creative activities, and service.
- The summary report should not be mere repetition of the synopses of the research, teaching and service reports.
- Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents (although reference to other documents, such as the teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service reports is to be expected).
- Explain the votes, specifically, negative, absences, recusals.
- Summarize the most relevant issues brought up during the discussion and which will explain 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.
- Make sure the committee recommendations in this report are consistent with evidence of performance as documented in the rest of the dossier.
- The committee discussion report and recommendations should address any negative comments made by the external reviewers. Avoiding such comments calls into question the quality of the analysis by the department P&T committee.
- 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 provided and given a sense of the weighting in 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 department P&T committee acceptance of the conclusions in the analyses described under the individual Teaching, Research and/or other Scholarly or, Creative Activities, and Service reports. If those analyses do not reflect the deliberations of the committee and the committee recommendations, then the committee report must explain this.
- There should be no discrepancy between the vote and description of performance and impact of the candidate’s work; explain discrepancies, if they occur.
- The name and title for each of the committee members should be included in the report.

Voting:
- Abstain votes are not allowed.
- Absent should be used for a committee member with an authorized and justified absence (professional travel, illness, faculty development leave). Absent should not be used for a committee member who does not wish to participate or review the dossier.
- Members with a conflict of interest should recuse themselves.
- All votes across should add to make up the total eligible.
- The vote of the P&T committee must be included in the discussion report, as formatted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</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>
All committee members should review the contents of the committee discussion report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature.

An email agreeing to the content of the report can be used in place of a signature.

Signature pages or email confirmation of agreement should be placed under Item 13.

A table listing the committee members, their titles, and confirmation that they agreed with the content of the letter (must be all those who voted) must be placed immediately after the Discussion report.

D. 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 make an independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. This report should include a discussion of the P&T committee evaluations/recommendations, as well as the outside letters and any further evaluation the department head wishes to make.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s scope (quality, productivity overtime) and IMPACT of the candidate’s performance in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

Department heads should adhere to the process guidelines outlined in Section II of this document, as well as, any appropriate departmental or college guidelines.

Format & Guidelines
- Provide a general basis for the strength and weakness of the case
- Should not merely re-iterate what was said in the department reports or external letters.
- Provide the context for each candidate’s case and their impact within the context of the department goals and expectations.
- Explain special consideration cases (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances…)

Important: Department Head’s Presence at P&T Committee Meetings

- Committee discussions and recommendations regarding candidates should be independent of the recommendation, opinion, or influence of any administrator.
- It is therefore recommended that the department head not attend the meetings during which the committee is processing a case.
- If the committee wishes to have the department head present, and if the department guidelines or bylaws make it clear that this may occur, the department head may attend.
- The department head should be present for meetings on all candidates, not selective ones, and their participation must be limited to answering procedural questions or provide clarifying information not their personal opinion.
• Address any mixed or negative votes, if not explained in the department P&T committee discussion report and recommendations

• Address aspects of P&T Committee reports that need clarification, e.g., a low rate or participation or discrepancies between votes and assessment

• Address any negative comments by external reviewers if not properly addressed by the P&T committee

• Clearly articulate the department head vote, especially if it is contrary to the departmental P&T committee or external reviewer’s recommendations

• 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. Letters from chairs of interdisciplinary programs must be included after the department head letter, in Dossier Item 10.

**Important**

- The department head will have the opportunity to resubmit a case in which the dean votes NO and they vote YES.
VI. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY COLLEGE

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

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. This report must address the candidate’s accomplishments and impact in the context of the college goals and expectations.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific college mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

**Important**

- Make sure that the discussion report correlates with the vote (i.e. positive report will correlate with positive vote; a positive report with some concerns will correlate with mixed vote; a report with significant concerns will correlate with negative vote).
- All faculty participating in the P&T process should adhere to the process guidelines outlined in Section II of this document, as well as, any appropriate departmental or college guidelines.

- The vote of the committee must be included in the college P&T report, as formatted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</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>

- Abstain votes are not allowed.
- Absent should be used for a committee member with an authorized and justified absence (professional travel, illness, faculty development leave). Absent should not be used for a committee member who does not wish to participate or review the dossier.
- Members with a conflict of interest should recuse themselves.
- All votes across should add to make up the total eligible.
- Members should indicate their agreement with what is stated in the report, and that the document reflects their discussion and voting outcome. This should be done by having all voting committee members sign the report.
E. 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, address any mixed or negative votes (if not explained in the College Committee Report), and explain the vote of the dean. If the dean vote is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations that should be clearly and specifically addressed.

The report from the dean should make an independent determination helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing/quoting other materials in the package.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific college mission, goals, expectations and criteria. This is especially important for cases that have generated strong differences in recommendation during the evaluation process.

Deans should adhere to the process guidelines outlined in Section II of this document, as well as, any appropriate college guidelines.

Important

➢ The dean must identify the most impactful accomplishment by the candidate.
VII. DEFINITIONS

Many words and phrases in this document have specific meanings and are important to different stakeholders (e.g. administrative staff, candidate, reviewers). This section includes definitions and/or descriptive instructions for specific language in this document, refer as needed.

**College chart** - a form listing the name, department, rank, and other information for all candidates. Instructions on how to complete the college chart and an example of a completed chart template can be found on the DOF website.

**Dossier** – An assembled file for a single candidate that includes documents submitted by the candidate, external 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 on DOF website.

**Eligibility to Vote**. The criteria for voting eligibility are:

- 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.

- 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.

- Faculty members have only one vote in the process, i.e. if they are members of both department and college P&T committee, they can only vote in one committee. Department and/or college guidelines must clearly state in which committee the faculty member with membership in both department and college committee will vote.

- Both tenure track and academic professional 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 academic professional 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. For associate professors seeking tenure only, both associate professors and full professors with tenure are eligible to vote. For full professors seeking tenure only, only full professors with tenure 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 every Dossier for the candidates listed on the chart. Departments will be responsible for compiling and organizing the candidate 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 the Tenure and Promotion Forms page on the Office of the Dean of Faculties website.

**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 voting member of the P&T committee. If present during P&T committee evaluation and deliberations of the candidates, their role should be limited to advising about procedural issues or to provide additional information as needed without expressing opinions.

- College and university level administrators cannot participate in P&T committee deliberations, at the department or college level if, as a consequence of their administrative responsibilities, they can influence the department head, dean or provost’s decisions. I.e., if a dean seeks advice from one or more associate
deans as a normal part of the review process, the associate dean/s cannot participate in the department or college P&T committees.

- **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 track and academic professional 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 or other scholarly, creative activities, and service). 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 should fully engage in the review and discussion of each candidate’s dossier, that includes attending the P&T discussion committee meeting.** Attendance to the meeting can be by phone or videoconferencing if a faculty member is unable to attend in person and if the department and/or college guidelines allow it. Department and/or college guidelines may also allow absentee ballots of faculty who are unable to attend the meeting. 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).

- **The department and college P&T guidelines must each explain how the composition of the respective departmental level and college level P&T committees are 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 academic professional track faculty, or include academic professional track faculty in the regular P&T committee, for the evaluation of academic professional track faculty seeking promotion. Only faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying can evaluate the dossier. Academic professional track faculty cannot vote in cases involving tenure-track candidates; however, they can participate and vote on academic professional track promotions for ranks below.
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.

All required forms and templates can be found in the Tenure and Promotion Forms page on the Office of the Dean of Faculties website.

Each electronic candidate dossier must be submitted in the REQUIRED template and include:

Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet
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 reviewer letters (Item 8):
  - External reviewers chart (list reviewers in alphabetic order by last name)
  - Candidate & Department External Reviewer Checklists
  - One example of external reviewer letter request
  - External reviewer biographies (no longer than half a page each)
  - External reviewer letters in alphabetic order (as listed in the external reviewer chart)
  - List of peer departments if different from AAU
Tab 9: Department P&T discussion report (Item 9)
Tab 10: Department head report (Item 10)
Tab 11: College P&T Committee report (Item 11)
Tab 12: Dean report (Item 12)
Tab 13: Other materials and documentation (if applicable) (Item 13)

Important

- For all documents, except for those with signatures, please provide original PDFs. That is, 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.

By November 6, 2019 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 (Word)
- Faculty Tenure Table (Word)
- Faculty Summary Data Table (Word)
• Faculty Grants Chart (Excel)
• Candidate External Reviewer Chart (Excel)
• Candidate Photograph (jpeg)
  o Photographs should be a vertical 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 or photographs embedded in a word document (their quality in the printed booklet will be poor).

• Candidate Cover Sheet

For the November submission, please send a flash drive or zipped file via Filex with eight folders (one for each item above) with each candidate’s file. Each file should be named Last Name, First Name-Item Name (as stated above)

Please do not create a folder for each individual faculty member or group by category.

B. Organization and Submission of File Sets

An electronic copy of the file set must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Faculties by December 5, 2019 for all tenure and/or promotion cases.

Supporting materials (such as copies of articles) should not be included in the electronic submission.

The flash drive should contain the electronic folders labeled below:

• College Chart
• Tenure & Promotion
• Tenure-only
• Promotion-Only (Tenured)
• Academic Professional Track Promotion
• CVs (for ALL candidates)

Folder 1 should contain:
• An Excel copy of the college P&T chart.

Folders 2-5 should contain:
• A PDF portfolio of each candidate’s dossier. Labeled as:
  o [Last Name, First Name-Dossier]
• An Excel-file of each candidate grant chart. Labeled as:
  o [Last Name, First Name-Grants Chart]

Folder 6 should contain:
• Separate PDF copies of each candidate’s CV for ALL candidates.
• 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 tenure table. All information presented in the faculty tenure table MUST be in agreement with the information reported in the CV.
• 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.)
IX. RESOURCES

A. For Questions Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization and submission of the dossiers, file sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Harnden, Senior Faculty Affairs Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-845-4274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:csh811@tamu.edu">csh811@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion and tenure evaluation process and rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Lupiani, Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:blupiani@tamu.edu">blupiani@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Wilkinson, Associate Dean of Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:h-wilkinson@tamu.edu">h-wilkinson@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-845-4274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dof@tamu.edu">dof@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Appendixes

Appendix I: Template External Reviewer Request Letter

At a minimum, the following language is required:

[Date]

[Name]
[Title]
[Department]
[Institution]
[Street Address]
[City, State, Zip]

Dear Professor/Dr. [Name]:

The [Unit(s)] at Texas A&M University [is/are] considering [Professor/Dr.] ___________ for promotion from the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure] to the rank of [specify rank; specify with/without tenure]. Faculty at Texas A&M University are tenured and/or promoted on the basis of contributions in three areas: research, scholarly and creative contributions; teaching effectiveness; and service. Recognition of the quality of the candidate’s scholarly work by their peers is a significant factor in the review process. We are contacting you because of your area of expertise and we would value your candid assessment of [Professor/Dr.] ___________’s scholarly accomplishments and future promise, including both areas of particular strength and areas needing improvement. Your scholarly and professional judgment will play an important part in our evaluation of [Professor/Dr.] ___________ for tenure and/or promotion [specify if it is tenure only, tenure and promotion or promotion only].

[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: We wish to note that at Texas A&M University the criteria for the granting of tenure are the same regardless of the length of a candidate’s service as an untenured faculty member).

[ONLY FOR TENURED ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR SEEKING PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR]: We wish to note that at Texas A&M University the promotion from Associate to Full Professor is based on accomplishment and is not time in rank.

[For candidates with interdisciplinary appointments, include this paragraph:

[Candidate Name] is engaged in research that is interdisciplinary in nature. [He/she holds a joint appointment in the departments of [discipline] and [discipline].] We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of [Professor/Dr.] ___________’s work in your review of her/his scholarly contributions.]

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of her/his work or professional accomplishments, we would like your candid evaluation of [Professor/Dr.] ___________’s written and scholarly contributions in relation to others of comparable experience in their field. In particular, we would appreciate your comments on the following issues:
1. How well and in which capacity do you know [Professor/Dr.] ________?

2. What is your critical assessment (both strengths and areas needing improvement) of the originality, quality, and impact of [Professor/Dr.] ________’s scholarship? To facilitate your evaluation of the work in detail, I am enclosing some of [Professor/Dr.] ________’s scholarly work as well as a CV and personal statement.

3. Which, if any, of [Professor/Dr.] ________’s scholarly publications or works do you consider to be outstanding?

4. Please describe the impact the candidate’s scholarly contributions has had and/or is likely to have on the discipline.

5. What is your assessment of [Professor/Dr.] ________’s trajectory? Is this faculty member likely to become one of the leading figures in the discipline?

6. What is your overall assessment of [Professor/Dr.] ________’s standing in relation to others in their peer group who are working in the same field?

7. Do you have any other comments that would be relevant to our deliberations, including observations about [Professor/Dr.] ________’s teaching and/or mentorship, leadership, or service?

The following paragraph (word-for-word) must be included in ALL letters soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.

Under Texas A&M University policy, your letter will become part of the official promotion packet for [Professor/Dr.]. Please note that your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state and your review could be requested and relinquished.

It would be most helpful to receive your response by _____________. I would also appreciate it if you would provide us with a short biosketch and current research interests.

We sincerely appreciate the time and effort such evaluation letters take, and thank you in advance for your important contribution to our program at Texas A&M University. If you need further information, please contact [Contact Name] at [Phone/Email].

Sincerely,

[Name]
[Title]

Enclosures
Appendix II: Guidelines on Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Impact Statement

Overview to this guidance: The personal statement should help translate your experience detailed in the CV into a narrative for how the whole body of work has been valuable and impactful. Keep in mind this narrative should be accessible to a broad audience, thus be careful with overly technical or specific details and jargon. In this statement, you make your case while clarifying and putting into context any perceived weaknesses or uncertainties in your CV. The recommendations in the following list are meant to prompt your recognition of evidence for value and impact within your experience to date. Clearly not all of these examples will apply to everyone.

Address your perspective on past, present, and future performance and accomplishments

- Your statement, in conjunction with the annotated CV, should make the case that good research ideas are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.

Ensure the statement is well-reasoned, well-elaborated, and well-written

- Write 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.
- Advocate for yourself, but be factual; confident but not boastful, intelligent but not stuffy.
- Make this your best writing. It is not uncommon for outside evaluators to use your comments in their written evaluations.
- DON’T make it a chore to read your personal statement
  - Emphasize primary areas of strength
  - Avoid excessive detail, explain selected examples well
- Explain critical terms in a simple and clear way
- 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

Provide a narrative that puts your accomplishments in context, avoid simply reiterating facts from your CV

- Convey what is exciting about your research, teaching, and service activities
  - Describe the innovative approaches or cutting-edge aspects of your work
- Emphasize the broadest implications of your work
- Highlight potentially hidden strengths
- Address perceived weaknesses
  - Imagine your worst critics – use your statement to undermine their case
  - Be honest – acknowledge weaknesses, but demonstrate how you have overcome them
  - Explain gaps in your record – be your own spin doctor, contextualize the strategic choices of your career
  - 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?

Make the case for contributing to the overall stature of your academic unit

- Describe evidence that you are widely perceived as outstanding among peers
- Explain the ways you are instrumental in advancing the academic needs of your unit
- Explicitly address your contribution to strategic initiatives for your unit, college, and the university

Focus on value and impact of your efforts in all areas of responsibility

Research Statement

- Describe how your strategy for conducting research or your approach to original creative work contributes to the quality of your efforts
- Explain how your research is relevant to issues that relate to your field(s) of study
- Elaborate about the ways your scholarship breaks new ground or how is it innovative
- Make clear how your individual research projects contributed to your program of research, or how individual projects contributed to the focus of your original creative work.
- Expound upon how your research shows promise for ongoing publication and external research funding (as applicable) = TRAJECTORY!
- Reflect upon how the strategic decisions you made on publishing and presenting your work furthered your program of research/focus or original creative efforts
- Specify the contributions you make within collaborative or team research projects, especially indicating ways in which you provide leadership and/or unique expertise and demonstrate your independence as investigator
- That your research was featured or widely discussed in popular media may be documented in the dossier, but in itself may not be useful evidence of impact.
- Show integration between your research and other areas of responsibility
  - Explain the ways your class discussions or projects have been used to explore potential questions for your own research/original creative work (or vice versa)
  - Discuss how your service to professional associations has provided opportunities to further your program of research/focus of original creative work (or vice versa)
- To specifically address research and Promotion to Full Professor:
  - Recognize years in rank do not change the expectations of what is required; however, it is reasonable to expect there may be a shift in emphasis between criteria to reflect the many different individual professional careers
  - Describe the experiences that played a key role in your tenure case, if/when the experiences are of historical interest and can be used to document impact (citations, reviews...)
  - Highlight evidence of an enhanced international/national reputation over time
  - Emphasize the ways in which you play leadership roles in your research discipline
    - Conference organization vs. presentation
    - Panel leader vs. member
    - Professional society board position vs. membership
  - Describe your leadership in research in the department, college, and university
Mentoring junior faculty about the research enterprise (e.g. reading manuscripts, grant-writing, networking within the discipline)

**Teaching Statement**

- Address how your philosophy of, methods of, or assumptions about teaching is/are congruent with the typical needs of your students
- Explain how you foster student achievement by balancing high standards for performance with appropriate levels of support
- Discuss the ways in which your course content has contributed to the attainment of knowledge and skills needed by your students
- Elaborate on how your course content, including instructional resources that you have developed, is congruent with current knowledge and professional practice
- Address your involvement in course and curriculum development, as well as development of specializations, majors, distance learning programs, certificate programs, or degree programs. Specifically, how have these efforts contributed to the attainment of the knowledge and skills needed by our students. Further, how have these efforts advanced the academic needs of the unit
- Elaborate on the ways your work in mentoring and academic advising contribute to the professional identities of your students and the development of their skills in research and practice
- Show integration between your teaching and other areas of responsibility
  - How you have used your research to improve your instruction (courses, directed individual study, and supervised research)
  - How you have involved students in your research
  - How you used your professional association work to keep your courses up-to-date with current knowledge and practice
- To specifically address teaching and Promotion to Full Professor:
  - Provide evidence of “next level” high-quality performance
  - Explain the ways you have invested significantly in improving and/or innovating within your teaching via any variety of technological improvements or cutting-edge pedagogical approaches
  - Describe your leadership in teaching in the department, college, and university
    - Discuss any mentorship of junior faculty about teaching best practices
      - Highlight student committee service
      - Elaborate how you have led within your department for course/curriculum conceptualization, design
      - Acknowledge speaking engagements to participate in a culture of teaching excellence

**Service Statement**

- Relate how your service contributions relate to ongoing or emerging needs of the institution
- Describe how your service contributions relate to ongoing or emerging needs of the profession
- Address the ways your service work contributed to meeting needs identified in your community, state, nation, and other countries
- Explain integration of your service with other areas of responsibility
o How has your teaching contributed to the provision of continuing professional development offerings?

o How has your research expertise contributed to the work of your professional organization?

o How has your research expertise contributed to being an editorial board member for a refereed journal or a Federal grant review committee

o How has your research expertise has been of service to, or supported the work of, your program, department, school, college, and university

• To specifically address service and Promotion to Full Professor:

  o Explain the ways your service today meets the greater expectations associated with being a senior faculty member

  o Emphasize how you have taken leadership roles with service

    ▪ Committee chair vs. member
    ▪ Conference organization vs. presentation
    ▪ Panel leader vs. member
    ▪ Professional society board position vs. membership

    ● Officer in shared governance bodies at TAMU
Appendix III: Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching

Purpose: This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for evaluation of faculty teaching performance at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the teaching report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure and post-tenure reviews. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Use only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Course Teaching</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record of all courses taught</td>
<td>• How many courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taught how often?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To how many students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How does the average course load for this candidate over the period under consideration correspond to unit expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi</td>
<td>• What is the quality of the syllabus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi required</td>
<td>o Is it clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi required (link - assessment instrument)</td>
<td>o Does the syllabus represent the course as well organized and well designed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does the information, readings, materials described in the syllabus demonstrate the current state of the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Are the assignments and assessments well-paced for that stage of the curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does the course fulfill expectations of the academic unit for content and process skills needed for subsequent courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is there evidence of best practices in inclusive teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o More syllabus assessment questions <a href="#">at this link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does student feedback indicate anything about the syllabus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>• Do you view assignments as effective pedagogical methods and materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample assignments required</td>
<td>• What does student performance on the assignment indicate about its effectiveness, their satisfaction with the learning environment, and/or student success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examinations</strong></td>
<td>• Is how the assignment will be assessed clear within the assignment description (e.g. rubric provided)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sample examinations required** | • What is your assessment of the exams?  
  o How do exams compare with best practices in the discipline?  
  o How innovative are they?  
  o Do the exams represent rigor appropriate for this level course?  
  • How well do you expect the exams capture student performance? |
| **Grading methods** | • What is your assessment of the grading methods?  
  • Do the methods reflect best practice?  
  • Do the grading methods facilitate student learning? |
| **Sample of student work with instructor feedback required** | • Were course observations done?  
  • Were course observations based on specific standards? (e.g. [link – Classroom Observation Feedback Form](#))  
  • What was the frequency of the observations?  
  • How has the teaching quality changed across observations of the candidate? |
| **Structured classroom observation (optional)** | • How have courses and teaching evolved?  
  • How has the instructor engaged in reflection and continuous improvement of teaching to enhance teaching effectiveness?  
  • What, if any evidence, is there that the candidate pursued professional development to identify and implement appropriate and innovative pedagogy? |
| **Continuous course and teaching improvement** | • Are the graduate students supervised by the candidate progressing in a timely manner?  
  • Are there productivity measures for the graduate students (e.g. publications, awards, postdoctoral or professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member? |
| **Direction of graduate students** | • Are undergraduate projects and experiences with this candidate consistent with expectations in the department?  
  • Are there productivity measures for the undergraduate student (e.g. publications, awards, graduate school or professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member? |
| **Direction of undergraduate researchers** | Questions for Consideration |
| **Evidence Related to Other Teaching Contributions** | **Questions for Consideration** |
| Direction of Postdoctoral Scholars | • Are the post docs supervised by the candidate progressing in a timely manner?  
• Are there productivity measures for the post docs (e.g. publications, awards, professional placement) that relate directly to the mentoring effectiveness of the faculty member? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other mentoring activities</td>
<td>• What sorts of advising or mentoring activities outside of research and scholarship does the candidate do with students, postdocs, staff, colleagues?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Curriculum & course development | • To which extent has this faculty member contributed to the unit by creating new courses, revising existing courses, coordinating multi-section courses, and/or contributing to program review/redesign?  
• Has the faculty member participated in design and/or implementation of the curriculum assessment?  
• Has the faculty member improved the curriculum by adopting or improving implementation of high-impact practices? |
| Substantial revision of existing courses | • How is the faculty member assuring courses are current and employ best practices? |
| Textbooks, & other instructional materials | • How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the unit?  
• How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the field?  
• Are the materials state-of-the-art?  
• Are the approaches described innovative? |
| Participation in student professional development programs | • How is the faculty member contributing to the professional development of students?  
• What are the ways that student performance in interviews or other interactions with the profession have been impacted? |
| Participation honors programs | • What distinguishes the instruction the faculty member designed for honors students? |
| Awards of recognition for distinguished teaching | • How has the faculty member been recognized with awards for the commitment to and achievement in teaching?  
• How exclusive are the awards, how are the winners selected? |
| Continuous improvement of other contributions | • How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of mentoring effectiveness?  
• How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of curriculum design or assessment associated effectiveness? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Specific to Student Ratings</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly approaches to teaching</strong></td>
<td>• Has the faculty member received competitive internal grants or fellowships related to these activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the faculty member presented his/her teaching approaches in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the department/college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o at a campus workshop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o at a campus teaching conference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o at a state, national, or international teaching conference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o in the teaching sessions of a discipline specific conference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the teaching expertise of the faculty member served to improve the quality of the teaching of others in the unit (e.g. bringing innovative approaches or technologies to the program such that colleagues adopt them as well, or in a collaborative way dependent on participation of the faculty member)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Specific to Student Ratings</strong></td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized chronological table/Peer review of student evaluation data</strong></td>
<td>Note: The candidate dossier should include all the student evaluation data appropriate for the period of time under evaluation. The department should provide the table as well as the appropriate data for comparison (e.g. average of other sections of that course; average of other courses at that level in the curriculum). The student evaluation questions used for this purpose is a department-level determination, which should be standardly applied across all candidates. (Departments not utilizing numerical ratings should provide a careful summary and analysis of the verbal responses over a multi-year period). The candidate may choose to address other questions as well in their statement, CV, and other materials provided and of course their perspective should be taken into account in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does the data align with student success in the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the data align with successful student performance in the next course in sequence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the data align with things like increase in student minoring or majoring in the discipline?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What additional data is included for context (e.g. Mid-Semester Feedback, Multiple Sets of Feedback from Individual Class Meetings)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What conclusions about teaching performance do you draw from the data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do you learn from the data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations</strong></td>
<td>• How has the faculty member engaged in reflection and continuous improvement of the student experience as indicated by changes in responses and comments over time for a given course or across courses?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What, if any, evidence is there that the faculty member sought professional development to address issues associated with data from the course evaluations or their reflection about the course evaluation?

References:
- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2019-2020, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
- Framework of Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation – Annotated to include teaching statement reflection questions and sources of evidence options, 11/2018, TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence.
Appendix IV: Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

Purpose: This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for faculty performance evaluations in research, scholarship or creative activities at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the research, scholarship or other creative activities report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Use only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and quantity of publications or creative works</td>
<td>• In what way do the publications/creative work represent a cohesive body of work building toward a unique expertise or perspective contributing to the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of selected publications/work expected</td>
<td>• Describe the authorship protocols within the discipline, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor. In that context, describe whether the candidate publication record is congruent with a productive and independent research program for that career stage. (This analysis should take into account, not only the numbers of publications, the quality of the journals, and the citation indexes for each, but also, the contribution by the candidate, and the degree of difficulty, or complexity of the work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching and learning</td>
<td>• What is the quality of the journals, publishers (for books), other venues (for art)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What evidence is there that the research/scholarship is published completely and transparently regardless of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How would you describe the quality and impact of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the research seem congruent with the quality and impact of journal? E.g. some types of work are more impactful if published in a subdiscipline journal with lower impact factor than in a broader audience journal with higher impact factor because it reaches the proper audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In cases where the candidate publishes scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), does the work advance understanding in a primary discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In what ways does the SoTL act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to the discipline)</td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Consistency and Trajectory**                               | • Does the candidate have a funding record consistent with the capacity necessary to support students and personnel for a productive research program in this discipline?  
• How has the grantsmanship of the candidate aligned with departmental expectations?  
• Have there been extenuating circumstances outside the candidate’s control associated with the period under consideration?  
• Has funding improved with recognition of the candidate in the field?  
• Has the candidate been successful garnering grant renewals? |
| **Granting agencies**                                         | • Has the candidate secured funds from the premier funding sources in that discipline?  
• Describe the quality of funding sources, and address whether or not the sources are congruent with department and disciplinary expectations. |
| **Variety of funding sources**                                | • In what ways has the candidate secured funding from a variety of sources (if appropriate to the discipline)? |
| **Evidence of Overall Impact**                                | **Questions for Consideration** |
| **Contribution to societal need**                             | • On the whole, in which ways does the scholarship/creative work benefit society?  
• What is the evidence for broader significance of the work, either now or in the near future wherein the candidate pursues plans described within their statement?  
• How well does the scholarship contribute to the vision, mission, and strategic initiatives for the unit, college, and university? |
| **Appropriate dissemination of results**                      | • What is the evidence that the candidate shares the research/scholarship results and expertise appropriately, e.g.  
  o datasets  
  o software  
  o research tools and approaches developed  
  o indicators of openness and transparency conducive to advancing the field and cultivating an excellent reputation within the scholarship community |
| **Collaboration**                                             | • If the bulk of the candidate’s research/scholarship is done jointly (especially if it is done with senior and more established scholars), does the record provide evidence of the candidate’s important original contributions to the work?  
• Explain whether authorship consistent is with the contribution? |
### Degree of risk/reward
- In what ways do others value the quality of the candidate’s expertise as indicated by a clear record of collaboration?
- What impact has involvement in collaborations had on the productivity of the candidate?
- Do you expect collaborations will improve the productivity of candidate in the long run?
- What evidence is there that the candidate is a creative scholar and/or an intellectual risk-taker?
- In which ways might this approach be beneficial within their field?
- How might this strength, nonetheless, be responsible for the rate or stage of advancement of the research, scholarship or creative activities relative to adopting a purely “safe” approach?
- Are there aspects of the research, scholarship or creative activities portfolio that demonstrate originality?

### Upward trajectory for research progress
- Does the research quality improve over time?
- In what way is the scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding?
- Does the candidate have a strong reputation in his or her field?

### Invitations, Honors, Awards
- What noteworthy aspects of the candidate’s service record indicate they are recognized in their field of scholarship?
- Do invitations (e.g. speaking, consulting, appearances, or participation in committees, taskforces, or advisory bodies) indicate the candidate is recognized in their field of scholarship?
- Has the candidate received honors or awards for their scholarship?
- How exclusive are the awards?
- How are the winners selected?

### Overall research, scholarship or creative activities
- Based on their overall research, scholarship or creative activities, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university?
- Based on management of their research program and collaborations, has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader or influencer within the discipline, unit, college, university?

### References:
- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2018-2019, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
**Appendix V: Evidence Supporting Performance in Service**

**Purpose:** This guidance suggests a variety of elements appropriate for consideration for evaluation of faculty performance in service at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college and or discipline, are appropriate for use in annual evaluations and in the service report for mid-term review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure reviews. This resource is meant to prompt evidence-based analysis during the evaluation of dossiers rather than require a specific prescription for those reports.

Pick only those bullets that apply, or develop your own lists of evidence and questions to prompt relevant evaluation within your discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to Departmental Service</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Service Roles:</strong></td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership in standing committees</td>
<td>o Taking into account their research and teaching activities, is the service contribution by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership of standing committees</td>
<td>• For committee membership by the candidate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force</td>
<td>Can you describe the ways the candidate engages and adds value as a member?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liaison activities with donors or industry partners</td>
<td>o How has the reliability of the candidate as member allowed for an important accomplishment of the committee/taskforce or substantial progress for the committee/taskforce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Can you elaborate on instances where the candidate contributed high quality work products necessary to accomplish committee/taskforce goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Service Roles:</strong></td>
<td>• In instances where the candidate leads service efforts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring or peer-review of colleagues</td>
<td>o Which of their strengths align well with project success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing expertise for a department need</td>
<td>o How well does the candidate handle the necessary communications and/or meetings with colleagues associated with leading a service effort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For candidates who perform formal donor or industry partner engagement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o How do those stakeholders regard the candidate and the communications, interactions, responsibilities the candidate executes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the candidate assist colleagues by providing feedback on ideas, manuscripts, creative works, and grants? Are there particular ways the candidate markedly improved the department climate or culture via a concerted effort to establish a needed element?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In cases where the candidate provides a particular expertise to the department (e.g. running a piece of equipment; managing a process, actively curating a collection, etc):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to</td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| College and University Service | o Describe the value added by their service  
o As possible, include evidence that the service contributes to the goals of the department. |

**College**
- What service has the candidate done for the college?
  - Is this level of college service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?
  - Was there leadership or innovation involved?
- Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?
- What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?
- Did the service help advance any college level initiative(s)?

**University**
- What service has the candidate done for the university?
  - Is this level of university service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?
  - Was there leadership or innovation involved?
- Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?
- What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?
- Did the service by the candidate serve to represent the department or college well?
- Did the service help advance any university level initiative(s)?

**Evidence Related to:**
**service to the discipline**

**Professional Organization**
- What service has the candidate done for the professional organization(s)?
  - Is this level of professional organization service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?
  - Was there leadership or innovation involved?
- Is there evidence the candidate served with excellence?
- Elaborate on the extent to which the service to professional organizations by this candidate has or will contribute to the reputation of the candidate, the department, the college, or the university.

**Editor, reviewer, or judge**
- What service has the candidate done for journals, publishers, grant review panels, or other entities that judge?
  - Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to: service to society</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community, state, nation, international | • What service has the candidate done for the community, state, nation, or internationally?  
  o Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?  
  o Was there leadership or innovation involved?  
  • Elaborate on the extent to which this service by the candidate has or will contribute to the reputation of the candidate, the department, the college, or the university. |

**References:**
- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2019-2020, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.