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# I. TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2022</td>
<td>The Vice President for Faculty Affairs requests that deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2022</td>
<td>Deans submit electronic copies of college/school chart (no need for college/school P&amp;T and Dean’s vote at this time), Faculty Tenure Table, Candidate Dossier Coversheet, External Reviewers Chart and Candidate photos, for all candidates, to the Office of Faculty Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2, 2022</td>
<td>Deans submit recommendations of cases to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs by forwarding complete dossiers of all candidates, through Interfolio, to the Office of Faculty Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2023</td>
<td>Deans meet with the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and review recommendations. The Vice President for Faculty Affairs forwards recommendations to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February 2023</td>
<td>President meets with the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and reviews recommendations. The President forwards recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents (BOR), through the Chancellor. The President makes final decisions on promotion only cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2023</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, 2023</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 Faculty Affairs by December 2, 2022. If unusual circumstances necessitate submission of any materials after the due date, the dean of the college/school must first obtain approval from the Vice President for Faculty Affairs to submit late materials.
II. PROCESS INFORMATION

A. Committee Proceedings (Department and college/school)

Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence.

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/or tenure can do long-term damage to a department and college/school, and certainly a negative decision can do long-term damage to the career of an individual. Those implementing the process must uphold high standards and at the same time observe scrupulous standards of fairness.

Department heads, deans, and committee members should take care to consult:

- University Rule 12.01.99.M1—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
- Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and
- College/School and/or Department Promotion and Tenure specific guidelines

to be thoroughly familiar with procedures, criteria and expectations for promotion and/or tenure by rank in each unit and at the university levels.

college/school 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/school and/or department P&T guidelines). e.g. a department representative presents the case and participates in the discussion and also votes; a department representative votes at the department or college/school level, etc.

B. Reconsideration of a Case

If the dean recommends against promotion and/or tenure and that recommendation is contrary to the department head’s recommendation, in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M1, § 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 with additional information that directly addresses the dean’s concerns. If a case is resubmitted, it shall be re-reviewed by the college/school P&T committee and dean before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded by the final submission deadline to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Please refer to Appendix VIII for step-by-step-instructions regarding how to facilitate response/rebuttals in Interfolio RPT.

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, a memo explaining the basis for seeking the reconsideration of the case must be uploaded in the department head recommendation section (Dossier Item 10). Any other materials supporting the reconsideration request should be included in Dossier Item 13 (Additional Information). Please see Appendix VIII for further instructions.

C. Notifying Candidates of Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations

Candidates must be advised, by the department head or dean, in college/schools without departments, of the recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure at each level of review. In the event of a final negative tenure decision by the President, 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 after the President, through the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, informs the dean of their decision.

At a minimum, notifications will be made by email, as soon as possible, after a recommendation is made at a given level.

D. Additions or Changes to the CV

Additions or changes to the CV after the initial submission may occur at any level, prior to the deadline for submission to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. For this cycle the deadline date is December 2, 2022.

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. Please do not submit a new updated CV.

IMPORTANT: Requests of addition or modifications to the dossier must be submitted through the department head or dean, in college/schools without departments, who will ensure the new information is added to the candidate’s dossier in Interfolio. This memo should be placed in front of the original CV in Interfolio. A department/college/school case administrator will be able to unlock the corresponding CV section within Interfolio to add the updated memo in front of the original CV. Please see Appendix VI for further instructions.

E. Candidate’s Right to Withdraw

At any point in the process, a candidate may elect to withdraw their name from further consideration. This must be a written request. In the case of a mandatory tenure consideration, a request to withdraw a dossier for consideration must also include a written resignation. The request should be submitted to the department head (or directly to the dean in colleges/schools without departments), who in turn will communicate the decision to the college/school dean and Vice President for Faculty Affairs. The withdrawal request and resignation letter, if applicable, will become part of the dossier record in Interfolio.

F. Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Tenure 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 may be appropriate and encouraged for some candidates after consultation with the department head, mentor/s and/or P&T committee members. (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 (mandatory) reviews is illustrated in the Tenure Clock Calculation Table below.
G. 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.M1 and Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review for details regarding required notification procedures for non-reappointment.

H. 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 2017 + 7 years of probation – 2 years =2022. The mandatory review will start in Fall 2022; if successful, the Board of Regents will grant tenure in Spring 2023, and the promotion and/or tenure will become effective on September 1, 2023).

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).

Tenure Clock Calculation Table. For a faculty member hired in calendar year 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If probationary period is:</th>
<th>Mid-Term Review will occur between:</th>
<th>Mandatory Tenure Review will occur:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mar – Dec 2020 (due AY 2019-2020)</td>
<td>2022-2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. 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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

In 2020, tenure-track faculty were encouraged to request a one-year clock extension due to disruptions from COVID-19. Faculty who were approved for this clock extension may opt to return to their normal
tenure clock in the future, as long as they inform their department head prior to the scheduled time that the department typically solicits external review letters.

A faculty member may also receive a clock extension for reasons other than COVID-19 disruptions. Such 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. All tenure clock extensions are to be approved by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

Separate from the COVID-19 clock extensions, a faculty member may petition for an extension in the following cases:

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

The above guidelines for extension were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President of Texas A&M.

**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.

**J. Reconsideration in the Terminal Year**

In exceptional circumstances, a person considered for tenure during their mandatory year, and who was not successful, may be reconsidered during their terminal year, at the discretion of the department head and with the agreement of the dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs that reconsideration is 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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs will discuss procedures should such a case arise. Reconsideration does not entail an additional terminal year.

**K. Negative Promotion Recommendation**

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 2021-22, the earliest they can submit the dossier again is AY 2023-24).

Exception requests can be made to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs only with concurrence of the department head and dean.
L. **Department and College/School Written Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure**

*University Rule 12.01.99.M1—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion* requires that each college/school (including branch campuses) 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/school evaluation committees on an annual basis.**

**Important**

- Department and college/school’s guidelines for promotion and tenure must be reviewed and approved by the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs for compliance with University Rules. A final approved copy must be sent to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (facultyevaluation@tamu.edu), when changes are made and approved, to be posted on the Faculty Affairs website.

M. **Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments**

*University Rule 12.01.99.M1—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 in addition to the department where they are *ad loc*. This should be done in accordance with the guidelines from both departments/units. Each unit must have guidelines governing faculty review, promotion and tenure. For funded joint appointments, both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers. In the case of joint appointments involving more than one college/school, both deans (and both college/school level promotion and tenure committees) provide recommendations to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Please email facultyevaluation@tamu.edu to have the case review steps updated to incorporate both colleges/schools/departments in the routing as appropriate.

For candidates who are members of Interdisciplinary Programs, a letter from the program chair or director must be requested by the department head/dean/P&T committee chair. 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 chair/director of an Interdisciplinary Program 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.

N. **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).

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/schools 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/school 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/school guidelines require internal evaluation letters for academic professional track faculty, departments should ensure that the letter writers are not members of the P&T committee. Letters internal to Texas A&M should resemble external letters, in that, they represent an evaluative professional assessment of the impact demonstrated in the candidate dossier, rather than a letter of recommendation a colleague might write to nominate the candidate for an award.

- 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, or Creative Activities; Service; or other Activities may in fact be changed to more appropriately reflect the individual's responsibilities and to reflect the evaluation guidelines developed by the college/school 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/school may have its own (approved and published) criteria for reviewing academic professional track promotion dossiers. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will be evaluated by department committee, department head, college/school committee and dean. Academic professional track promotion dossiers will then be forwarded to the Vice President for Faculty Affairs, for review and decision by the President.
III. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CANDIDATE

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

The candidate’s statement must address impact in addition to quality and productivity over time (Please see Appendix II for guidelines and suggestions).

Description

Written by the candidate, this is a concise statement which allows the candidate to explain both their productivity over time and the quality and impact of their work within each of their areas of responsibility (e.g. teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities). 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. The candidate should provide their perspective on, and their interpretation of the quality and impact of their efforts, making sure to go beyond simple reiteration of the content of their vita. The statement, in conjunction with the annotated CV (when appropriate) should, for example, provide evidence that good research ideas and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise. Similarly, the statement should examine the candidate’s teaching activities, providing their perspective on both their growth and evolution as an instructor and/or mentor, and their aspirations for their teaching in the future.

The candidate’s impact statement on Teaching; Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities; Service; and Other Activities 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/school P&T committee, dean, Vice President for Faculty Affairs 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; service; and other activities 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.
**Examples of evidence for excellence in each of the 3 major areas of responsibility.** These non-exhaustive lists summarize indicators of outstanding merit or merit in University Rule 12.01.99.M1 (See link to Appendix I near the end of the rule).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Work</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Publications</td>
<td>Feedback from teaching observations</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 aspirant 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>Patents or commercialization of research, where applicable</td>
<td>Service as a course coordinator</td>
<td>Advising a student organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of graduate committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department, college/school or university service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student placement in industry or academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant self-development activities, such as intensive workshops or Faculty Development Leave that improve research effectiveness</td>
<td>Significant self-development activities that led to demonstrated enhanced teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Format & Guidelines**

- Three 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. (Some 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 separate 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/schools may have specific formatting requirements. Please refer to department and college/school guidelines for detailed information.
➢ Do not include any personal information, i.e., home address, marital status, children, birthday, citizenship, UIN, 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 must be appended at 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 deadline for submission of the final dossier to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs on December 2, 2022. For more information please refer to Section D: “Additions or Changes to the CV” section 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. Be sure to list the grants in reverse order they were obtained (most recent ones first.)
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 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**

- Single pdf file uploaded to the corresponding candidate document section in Interfolio
- In this statement, the candidate should list *all materials* they are submitting for review by the Department P&T 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 bio (word document uploaded to the corresponding candidate document section in Interfolio) of the candidate, which will be published in the spring recognition booklet featuring newly promoted and/or tenured faculty.

*Items to be included 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)
- Notable accomplishments and impact related to other activities (optional, two sentences maximum)
- Other activities awards or honors (if applicable, optional)

F. Faculty Summary Data Table

The Faculty Summary Data Table *should include information since last promotion, or since hire for those being reviewed for their first promotion and/or tenure, with career totals in parenthesis. This table will be used by the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and other Texas A&M University officials to quickly respond to questions and requests for information. The Faculty Summary Data Table is a fillable word file that will be uploaded within the corresponding candidate document section in Interfolio. Entries should be formatted as bulleted lists. Leave form responses blank if they do not apply to you.*

Make sure that information included in the Faculty Summary Data Table is in compliance with the above guidelines and consistent with the candidate’s CV and grants summary chart.
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 optional COVID-19 impact statements, letters from students, peers or collaborators that were not part of a structured evaluation process or letters from TAMU faculty members.

Departments and/or colleges/schools may require that certain documents be included in this section. Please refer to department and college/school guidelines for specific requirements. Student evaluations, copies of publications, teaching portfolio items, etc., should be placed in the appropriate candidate document section in Interfolio.

Appendix IX includes information about what faculty might want to include in an optional COVID-19 impact statement. Candidates may choose whether or not to include their optional COVID-19 impact statement with materials that are sent to external reviewers.

IMPORTANT: Please see Appendix VI on how to submit dossier documents through Interfolio.
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 from nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline who are therefore qualified to speak with authority about the candidate’s accomplishments, future trajectory, and impact to the field. At Texas A&M University, external reviewers are expected to be from peer or aspirational top universities. Examples of peers and aspirational peers include members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) (https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Who-We-Are/AAU-Member-List.pdf) and leading international institutions. Letters may also be sought from scholars at top academic programs from other institutions, and from preeminent experts from non-academic institutions, although a justification in the form of program ranking and expertise credentials is expected in these cases (should be included in the bio of the external reviewer).

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.

Guidelines
- Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, promotion to full professor and promotion for Research faculty MUST include a minimum of FIVE (5) arm’s length letters, although seven (7) is preferred. Some colleges/schools may require more than FIVE (5) arm’s length letters.
- Dossiers of candidates who participate in the ADVANCE Scholars Program may include a letter from their Eminent Scholar, as arm’s length, as long as a minimum of five others are included.
- Requirements for external or internal letters for academic professional track faculty promotions are determined at the department and/or college/school level with the only exception of research track for whom external letters are required.
- Although it is preferred for letters to be from peer or aspirational institutions, letters from top academic programs from other academic institutions and/or preeminent experts from non-academic institutions may be requested, but an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer are appropriate MUST be included in the dossier. The department and college/school should strive to request a balanced number of letters from peer or aspirational programs/universities and other eminent programs and scholars.
- 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. Letters should come from distinguished scholars who are not:
  - the candidate’s thesis advisor (MS or PhD), or postdoctoral advisor;
  - a collaborator (last 5 years)
  - a coworker (last 5 years)
  - a business or professional partner;
  - any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative.

Important
- Candidates should NOT contact potential external reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter.
IMPORTANT: In some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate (e.g. being part of a large research consortium which published together). In such a case, the department head must first consult with and get approval from the dean. If approved by the dean, the justification and approval by the dean must be included in the dossier.

- External letters should be from scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. If the application is for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and if letters are requested from associate professors, a balance of the letters should be from full professors.
- 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.

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 to 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 to 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. NOTE: If the faculty member holds a funded joint appointment, the departments should work together on the selection of external reviewers.
- It is recommended that about equal number of letters be solicited from the candidate and department lists.
- A minimum of three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the department and/or college/school suggested list.
- All solicitation of letters must use the University Standard External Review template (Appendix I).
  - College/schools will have the option to modify the solicitation letter based on the need of their discipline, but must obtain approval from the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs prior to making any changes.
- 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.” Alternatively, departments can use the Interfolio option to request and track external reviewers letter requests.
- It is the responsibility of the unit to ensure receipt of at 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. Alternatively, letters from external reviewers can be submitted via Interfolio.
- Include ONE 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/rank, affiliation, contact information and a half a page (maximum) biography highlighting specific qualifications and credentials for each of the reviewers listed on the chart.

**Important**

- If reviewers decline or do not respond to the request, additional reviewers must be contacted to ensure the minimum required number of five (5) letters is received.
- If needed, the department/college/school 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/school 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 “non-arm’s length” section of the External Reviewers Chart.
- Those who review the candidate’s dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate.

**External Reviewers Chart**

• The External Reviewers Chart must be submitted as an excel file.
• Specify which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which ones were suggested by the department/college/school.
• 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Other Inst</th>
<th>Date/Tenure</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Towards Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John H. Smith</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/1/2021</td>
<td>Ph.D. (2008)</td>
<td>Fa 2015 – Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF XXXX**

**Required information:**

- **a.** Name (Must match name on CV)
- **b.** Terminal degree, year, and institution
- **c.** Experience evaluated towards tenure
  1. Should include only experience that is considered in the evaluation for tenure (i.e., experience while in a tenured, tenure track, or research position). Other 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.

B. Department Evaluation of Teaching; Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities; Service; and Other Activities (if applicable)

Description
These are summary reports on the candidate’s teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities (if applicable). They should reflect the views of the P&T committee 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/school guidelines.

These reports document the analysis/assessment of each area of responsibility assigned to the candidate. They should not repeat information that can be found elsewhere in the dossier. They may refer to the external reviewer letters and other materials without directly quoting them.
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.

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).
- 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/schools 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 each 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 P&T committee. A typed statement at the end of each report such as, “The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee” should indicate this.
- A comprehensive evaluation should be carried out for all areas of responsibility (teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other).

Important

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

- Reports should be a well-substantiated analysis of the scope (quality, productivity over time) and IMPACT of the candidate’s performance.
  - For faculty with joint appointments, committees should have clear understanding of the expectations in their respective department in the areas of teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities.
  - 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.
C. Teaching Report (Dossier Item 4)

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty with teaching responsibilities. Teaching excellence may be demonstrated through course, lab, and clinical instruction and/or 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/school, 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/school, 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.

Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for teaching reports, are available in Appendix III (Teaching) of this document.

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.

   Important

   ➢ Reports from structured classroom observations are helpful, but are not required by the university.
   ➢ If one or more classroom observation report(s) are provided, it should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance.
   ➢ If a department has engaged in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, a synthetic analysis of these evaluations would be a natural addition to the teaching evaluation report.

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 (with the exception of data for 2020 courses in the event that a faculty member opted to exclude these evaluations from the review). (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.

In 2020, faculty were given the option of excluding student evaluations of teaching for Spring 2020 and Fall 2020 from performance evaluations due to the challenges of teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. This exclusion applies to promotion cases. If a faculty member indicates that they want
student evaluations to be excluded for either or both of these semesters, the table below should include basic information about the courses taught that semester (i.e. the white columns). For the blue columns, the word “excluded” can be written in lieu of the data.

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>
</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. The department and the candidate should work together to determine the appropriate comparison for the candidate ratings. It makes no sense to compare the candidate ratings to all courses taught at all levels in the department. Rather, it makes the most sense to compare the candidate ratings to similar courses in the department or the college/school. For example, if the candidate teaches a 200 level core curriculum course to meet the Life and Physical Sciences requirement, which serves both students in the department and students from many other majors, the best comparison might be the average of all 200 level core curriculum Life and Physical Sciences courses offered in the college/school.

3. Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions to the department, such as the direction/mentoring 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, implementation of high impact learning activities, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, 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).

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

Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in research, scholarship and/or other creative activities by demonstrating 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, and 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, sculpture, art installations, etc.

Note: publication of scholarship of teaching and learning in quality peer reviewed 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.

Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for research, scholarship or other creative activities reports, are available in Appendix IV of this document.

- 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, conference proceedings, 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 can also be 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.

E. Service Report (Dossier Item 6)

A commitment to service is an expectation of all faculty in professorial titles. 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/school, 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.
Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for research reports, are available in Appendix V of this document.

**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

**F. 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/school guidelines. This section should be left blank if it does not apply to the candidate.

**G. 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; service; and other activities (as 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/school 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.”

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/school guidelines.

**Format & Guidelines**

- The summative departmental committee discussion report and recommendations should address teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities, as applicable to the candidate.

* Only one report should be submitted and submitting minority reports is discouraged. However, if this is impossible and a committee must submit minority reports, they will only be accepted if the reports indicate the name(s) of those submitting the minority report(s). Unattributed minority reports will not be accepted.
The summary report should not be mere repetition of the synopses of the teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities. They should clearly highlight the impact (or lack thereof) of the work of the candidate in the context of their field.

Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents (although reference to other documents, such as the teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities reports is to be expected).

Explain the votes, specifically, absences and 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; Service; and Other Activities 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 a 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 must recuse themselves (e.g. a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor).
- 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>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>
</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.
- A table listing the committee members, their titles, and confirmation that they agree with the content of the letter (must be all those who voted) must be placed immediately after the discussion report.

### Important

- 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.
- The department head’s input must be limited to answering procedural questions or provide clarifying information, not their personal opinion.

#### H. 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, especially if they disagree with the committee, 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 over time) 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 and/or college/school guidelines.**

**Format & Guidelines**

- Provide a general basis for the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
- Should not merely reiterate 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 Heads Should Not Attend P&T Committee Meeting Discussions

- 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.
- The department head’s input 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 of 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.
VI. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY COLLEGE/SCHOOL

A. College/School 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.

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/school 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/school guidelines.

- The vote of the committee must be included in the college/school 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 a 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 must recuse themselves (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor).
- 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.

**Important: Dean’s Presence at College/School 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 dean and/or their delegates not attend the meetings during which the college/school P&T committee is discussing a case.
- However, if the committee wishes to have the dean and/or their delegates present, and if the college/school guidelines or bylaws make it clear that this may occur, the dean and/or their delegates may attend.
- In this case, the dean and/or their delegates 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.
B. Dean Recommendation and Summary (Dossier Item 12)

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

Important

- If the dean votes NO and the department head voted YES, the department head will have the opportunity to resubmit a case for reconsideration, See “Section B: Reconsideration of a Case” of this document.
- The dean must identify the most impactful accomplishment by the candidate in their recommendation letter.
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/School chart** - a form listing the name, department, rank, and other information for all candidates. Instructions on how to complete the college/school 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/school P&T committee, dean) and other supporting materials. Departments initiate the preparation of the dossiers and then forward them to their college/schools 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/school P&T committee, they can only vote in one committee. Department and/or college/school guidelines must clearly state in which committee the faculty member with membership in both department and college/school 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.
- Committee members with conflicts of interest (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor of the candidate) must recuse themselves from voting on that specific candidate’s case.

**Example 1:** For an instructional assistant professor seeking promotion to instructional associate professor only members holding rank of associate (either tenured or academic professional track) are eligible to vote.

**Example 2:** 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 tenured 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.

**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/School and university level administrators should not participate in P&T committee deliberations, at the department or college/school level if, as a consequence of their administrative responsibilities, they can influence the department head, dean, Vice President for Faculty Affairs or President’s decisions. If a dean seeks advice from one or more associate deans as a normal part of the review process, the associate dean/s should not participate in the department or college/school 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 and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities). However, the organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates. All members of the P&T committee who are eligible to evaluate and vote on any given candidate should be active participants of the evaluation process of that candidate.

• Members of the P&T committee should fully engage in the review and discussion of each candidate’s dossier, including 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/school guidelines allow it. Department and/or college/school 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/school P&T guidelines must each explain how the composition of the respective departmental level and college/school 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. College/Schools 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.

• Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committees, must be composed of a minimum of 5 eligible to vote committee members. If the department/college/school does not have enough eligible faculty members, the department/college/school must develop guidelines on how faculty from other department/college/schools with related expertise will be selected and added to the department/college/school committee. If a department does not have enough eligible committee members because they vote at the college/school level, those committee members should vote at the department level and recuse themselves from voting at the college/school level.
VIII. DOSSIER AND FILE SET ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT

A. Required Content of Faculty Dossiers

Departments initiate the preparation of the faculty dossiers within Interfolio and then forward them to the candidate and ultimately their college/schools 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 Vice President for Faculty Affairs website.

Each electronic candidate dossier must be submitted in INTERFOLIO and include:

1. Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet
2. Candidate statement on teaching, research and service (Item 1)
3. Candidate CV (Item 2)
   a. Signed statement
   b. Candidate grant chart
4. Verification of contents statement (Item 3)
5. Department report of teaching (Item 4)
6. Department report of research (Item 5)
7. Department report of service (Item 7)
8. Department report of other activities (if applicable) (Item 7)
9. External reviewer letters (Item 8):
   a. External reviewers chart (list reviewers in alphabetic order by last name)
   b. Candidate & Department External Reviewer Checklists
   c. One example of external reviewer letter request
   d. External reviewer biographies (no longer than half a page each)
   e. External reviewer letters in alphabetic order (as listed in the external reviewer chart)
   f. List of peer departments if different from AAU
10. Department P&T discussion report (Item 9)
11. Department head report (Item 10)
12. College/School P&T Committee report (Item 11)
13. Dean report (Item 12)
14. 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 4, 2022, college/schools must submit, for each candidate, electronic copies of the following documents to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs (facultyevaluation@tamu.edu):
1. **College/School Chart** *(Excel)* (no need for college/school P&T and Dean’s vote at this time)
2. **Faculty Tenure Table** *(Word)*
3. **Candidate External Reviewer Chart** *(Excel)*
4. **Candidate Dossier Coversheet** *(Word)*
5. **Candidate Photograph** *(jpeg)*
   a. 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). The photographs will be inserted following the formal review process.

**Each file, for each candidate, should be named Last Name, First Name-Item Name** *(e.g. Jane Doe-Faculty Tenure Table)*

Please send a flash drive or zipped file via Filex with six folders (one for each item above: 1-6) with each candidate’s files.

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

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

Each final dossier must be submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs via Interfolio by **December 2, 2022 for all cases.**
IX. RESOURCES

A. Questions?

Contact the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs:

facultyevaluation@tamu.edu
979-845-4274
B. Appendices

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].

Texas A&M University recognizes that the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted faculty workloads and faculty productivity in multiple ways including:

- the closure of research facilities;
- restrictions on travel;
- the challenges of shifting to new teaching modalities (remote & hybrid);
- the necessity of providing additional support to students,
- delays in supplies and equipment

Texas A&M also recognizes that this has had disproportionate impacts on certain categories of faculty, including but not limited to faculty who have significant caregiving responsibilities at home.

Faculty at Texas A&M have been provided with the option of including a COVID-19 impact statement with their promotion materials that are sent to external reviewers. If provided, this statement will be included with other materials. In order to ensure a fair and equitable review process, we ask that you evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate’s work within the context of the pandemic. By this, we mean that you should factor in the constraints (and opportunities) that arose due to the pandemic when evaluating the candidate’s activities and accomplishments.
[ONLY FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEEKING TENURE]: Tenure-track faculty at Texas A&M had the option of taking a one-year tenure clock extension due to disruptions and delays caused by the pandemic. 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 based on 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.] __________ work in your review of her/his scholarly contributions.]

Based on the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of their 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 (if needed), 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/school P&T committee, dean, Vice President for Faculty Affairs 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
  o Emphasize primary areas of strength
  o Avoid excessive detail, explain selected examples well
- Explain critical terms in a simple and clear way
- Be optimistic yet realistic
  o If you cannot be positive about your contributions, few others will think they should be
  o 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
  o 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
  o Imagine your worst critics – use your statement to undermine their case
  o Be honest – acknowledge weaknesses, but demonstrate how you have overcome them
  o Explain gaps in your record – be your own spin doctor, contextualize the strategic choices of your career
  o 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.
  o 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/school, 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.
- Explain 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 you 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, etc.)
  - 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/school, 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/school, 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
  - How has your teaching contributed to the provision of continuing professional development offerings?
How has your research expertise contributed to the work of your professional organization?
How has your research expertise contributed to being an editorial board member for a refereed journal or a Federal grant review committee
How has your research expertise has been of service to, or supported the work of, your program, department, school, college/school, and university

To specifically address service and promotion to full professor:
Explain the ways your service today meets the greater expectations associated with being a senior faculty member
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 holistic review of faculty teaching performance at Texas A&M University. These example questions, as applicable to the faculty member’s department, college/school 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 (link - assessment instrument)</td>
<td>• Is it clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the syllabus represent the course as well organized and well designed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the information, readings, materials described in the syllabus demonstrate the current state of the discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the assignments and assessments well-paced for that stage of the curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the course fulfill expectations of the academic unit for content and process skills needed for subsequent courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there evidence of best practices in inclusive teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>More syllabus assessment questions</strong></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></td>
<td>• Is how the assignment will be assessed clear within the assignment description (e.g. rubric provided)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>• What is your assessment of the exams?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample examinations required
- How do exams compare with best practices in the discipline?
- How innovative are they?
- Do the exams represent rigor appropriate for this level course?
- How well do you expect the exams capture student performance?

### Grading methods
#### Sample of student work with instructor feedback required
- What is your assessment of the grading methods?
- Do the methods reflect best practice?
- Do the grading methods facilitate student learning?

### Structured classroom observation (optional)
- 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?

### Continuous course and teaching improvement
- 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?

### Evidence Related to Other Teaching Contributions
#### Questions for Consideration

### Direction of graduate students
- 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 undergraduate researchers
- 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 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?
| Other mentoring activities | • What sorts of advising or mentoring activities outside of research and scholarship does the candidate do with students, postdocs, staff, colleagues? |
| 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?  
• Has the faculty member received competitive internal grants or fellowships related to these activities? |
| Scholarly approaches to teaching | • Has the faculty member presented his/her teaching approaches in:  
  o the department/college/school? |
- at a campus workshop?
- at a campus teaching conference?
- at a state, national, or international teaching conference?
- in the teaching sessions of a discipline specific conference?

- 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)?

**Evidence Specific to Student Ratings**

**Questions for Consideration**

**Standardized chronological table/Discussion of student evaluation data**

**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.

- How does the data align with student success in the course?
- Does the data align with successful student performance in the next course in sequence?
- Does the data align with things like increase in student minoring or majoring in the discipline?
- What additional data is included for context (e.g. Mid-Semester Feedback, Multiple Sets of Feedback from Individual Class Meetings)?
- What conclusions about teaching performance do you draw from the data?
- What do you learn from the data?

**Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations**

- 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?
- 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 2021-2022, 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/school 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.

### Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>• 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>• What is the quality of the journals, publishers (for books), other venues (for art)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What evidence is there that the research/scholarship is published completely and transparently regardless of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How would you describe the quality and impact of the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>• 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>• In what ways does the SoTL act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to the discipline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How has the grantsmanship of the candidate aligned with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Overall Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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/school, 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?  
- 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? |
| **Degree of risk/reward** | - 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? |
| 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/school, 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/school, university?  

References:

- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2021-2022, 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/school 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership in standing committees</td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership of 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>• Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force</td>
<td>• For committee membership by the candidate: 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>• What service has the candidate done for the department?</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>• For committee membership by the candidate:</td>
<td>• In instances where the candidate leads service efforts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Can you describe the ways the candidate engages and adds value as a member?</td>
<td>o Which of their strengths align well with project success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<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>o Can you elaborate on instances where the candidate contributed high quality work products necessary to accomplish committee/taskforce goals?</td>
<td>• For candidates who perform formal donor or industry partner engagement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In instances where the candidate leads service efforts:</td>
<td>o How do those stakeholders regard the candidate and the communications, interactions, responsibilities the candidate executes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Which of their strengths align well with project success?</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>o How well does the candidate handle the necessary communications and/or meetings with colleagues associated with leading a service effort?</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>• For candidates who perform formal donor or industry partner engagement:</td>
<td>o Describe the value added by their service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o How do those stakeholders regard the candidate and the communications, interactions, responsibilities the candidate executes?</td>
<td>o As possible, include evidence that the service contributes to the goals of the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Related to College/School and University Service</td>
<td>Questions for Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/School</strong></td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the college/school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is this level of college/school service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Was there leadership or innovation involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did the service help advance any college/school level initiative(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University</strong></td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is this level of university service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Was there leadership or innovation involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did the service by the candidate serve to represent the department or college/school well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did the service help advance any university level initiative(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Related to: service to the discipline</th>
<th>Questions for Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Organization</strong></td>
<td>• What service has the candidate done for the professional organization(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is this level of professional organization service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Was there leadership or innovation involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there evidence the candidate served with excellence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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/school, or the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Editor, reviewer, or judge**                  | • What service has the candidate done for journals, publishers, grant review panels, or other entities that judge? |
|                                                | 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/school, or the university.

<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/school, or the university. |

References:

- Promotion and Tenure Packages – Submission Guidelines 2021-2022, TAMU Dean of Faculties.
- University Rule 12.01.99.M2 Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion Appendix I.
Appendix VI: Guidelines For Candidate: How to Add Documents to My "Packet" in Interfolio RPT
Guidelines for Candidate: How to Add Documents to My “Packet” in Interfolio RPT
Important information

• Please review and familiarize yourself with your department and college guidelines as well as the Texas A&M University 2022-2023 P&T Guidelines

• These documents contain important information and guidance for the content, format and expectations for each document
How to access my “Packet” in Interfolio RPT

• Once your department/college has created your “Case”, you will receive an email like the one below.

• Click on “View Case” and you will be taken to the Interfolio website to log in
How to log into Interfolio

1. At any time you can go to: [http://account.interfolio.com](http://account.interfolio.com)

2. Click “Partner Institution” and search for Texas A&M University

3. Once you have selected Texas A&M University, click “Sign In”

4. You will be re-directed to sign in with your CAS credentials
How to add documents to my “Packet”

• After you log into Interfolio you will be taken to a Texas A&M branded Interfolio website with all available modules listed on the left side menu
• Most TAMU faculty have access to Faculty 180; Faculty Search and Review, Tenure and Promotion
• You will also see a section named “Home” at the top of the left side menu
• ”Your Packets” includes the “Case” that has been created for your application
• To see instructions and start uploading documents click on “Your Packets”
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- Your available “Packet” or “Case” will be listed
- Click on “View” to access your Packet
How to add documents to my “Packet”

• The next page will show an overview of the packet requirements including both university and department/college requirements. This page will be updated as you add materials.
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- Under Candidate Instructions “View Instructions” you can see internal department/college deadlines and other important information
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- Under the “Packet” tab you can see the list of required documents and your progress.
- To upload documents, click on the “Open triangle” next to each section.
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- The section will expand and show specific instructions
- To add a document, click on “Add”
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- If you have not added any documents to Interfolio RPT, click of “Add new File”
- A new popup window will allow you to “Upload” documents by drag & drop files, or browse to upload; or add a link to a “Video” or “Website”
How to add documents to my “Packet”

• Once the document has been uploaded it will show at the bottom of the section and top right corner of the section (1 of 1 Required files)

• At the bottom of the section, “Edit” will allow to change the file name and “Remove” a file. Once a file has been removed, a different file can be uploaded
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- **IMPORTANT**: if you click “Submit” this section will be locked and you will not be able to upload a different document unless someone with an “Administrator” role unlocks the document for you.
- Check with your department head or P&T Committee chair regarding final deadline to submit documents which cannot be changed.
- **IMPORTANT**: Updates/changes to the CV are allowed until the decision by the dean. If you need to update you CV, as per the Texas A&M University 2021-2022 P&T Guidelines, contact your department head. They can either unlock the CV section, for you to upload a new document, or someone with an “Administrator” role can upload the document for you.

### 2021-2022 Promotion & Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Packet</th>
<th>View Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand All</td>
<td>Collapse All</td>
<td>Add Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate Statement on Teaching, Research or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities, Service, and/or Other Activities (if applicable)**

  Written by the candidate, this is a concise statement which allows the candidate to explain the candidate to explain both their productivity over time and the quality and impact of their work within each of their areas of responsibility (e.g., teaching research and/or other scholarly or creative activities, service, and other activities). 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. The candidate should provide their perspective on, and their interpretation of the quality and impact of their efforts, making sure to go beyond simple restatement of the content of their vita. The statement, in conjunction with the annotated CV (when appropriate), should, for example, provide evidence that good research ideas and research activities are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise. Similarly, the statement should examine the candidate’s teaching activities, providing their perspective on both their growth and evolution as an instructor and/or mentor, and their aspirations for their teaching in the future.

  The candidate’s impact statement on Teaching; Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities; Service; and Other Activities 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; service; and other activities 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.

- **Candidate Statement 1 required, 1 Added**
  - Three typed pages (maximum), single-spaced. 10 or font minimum. 1-inch margins in pdf format.
  - **Candidate Impact Statement**
    - Added
    - Mar 10, 2021
**IMPORTANT**: If you see the “Add Section” tab on your “Packet” view, your department/college allows you to create additional sections to include in your dossier. Click on the “Add Section” tab and follow the instructions.
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- The “Preview Packet” button on the top right corner allows you to check how your dossier looks as you upload your documents.
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- If you click “Submit” without uploading a required document, you will receive the following error message.

![Submission Confirmation]

The section Candidate CV cannot be submitted because there are issues with the requirements listed below. You can submit the section once you have corrected any issues and added materials to meet the requirements for the section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Name</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Missing the minimum number required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close
How to add documents to my “Packet”

- To see the progress of your submissions, you can go back to the Overview tab.
Appendix VII: How to Create a Promotion and/or Tenure "Case" in Interfolio RPT
How to create a Promotion and/or Tenure "Case" In Interfolio RPT
How to log into Interfolio

1. Go to Interfolio: [http://account.interfolio.com](http://account.interfolio.com)

2. Click “Partner Institution” and search for Texas A&M University

3. Once you have selected Texas A&M University, click “Sign In”

4. You will be re-directed to sign in with your CAS credentials
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• **Administrators** (department/college level Support Staff, Department Head, Dean) are the only individuals who can create a case!

• Once logged into Interfolio, the left side of the dashboard will have a list of Modules (Faculty 180; Faculty Search; Review, Promotion and Tenure) the Administrator has access to

• Under Review, Promotion and Tenure click on “Cases”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Under “Create Case” you can create individual cases (one by one) by clicking on the main body of the button.

- Under “Create Case” you can “Create Multiple Cases” at once by clicking on the down arrow within the button.

- Multiple cases should be created at once when the P&T Committee members are going to be the same for all candidates in a group. E.g. all Promotion and Tenure candidates will have the same P&T Committee members which may be different for Promotion to Full Professor or APT promotions. If the Department has candidates in all three categories and 3 different committees, use create multiple cases with care, to ensure they follow the proper workflow.
To start creating a case for a new Candidate type their last name in the “Search for a Candidate” box.
If the candidate is already in the list of Texas A&M University “Users” their name will appear.
Click on the “Candidate’s name”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- If the candidate is NOT in the list of Texas A&M University “Users” in this example “XYZ” you will see the message below.
- Click on “Create User”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Click on “Add User”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Enter the “User” information as in the screenshot below
• Click “Save”
• The new “User” will be created, and an email notification sent
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- A popup message will indicate that the “User” has been added
- Click “Save”
The new “User” will receive a message like the one below.
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Once the candidate’s name is entered, under “Will the candidate be involved in the evaluation?” section select:
  • Yes, the candidate will be involved during the case (this requires the candidate to upload documents assigned to them)
  OR
  • No (this requires and “Administrator” to upload documents on behalf of the candidate)
• IMPORTANT: This setting cannot be changed after this step, unless you create a new “Case” for the candidate
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Under “Unit for Case” search for the department/college under which the candidate will be reviewed by typing the name of the department in the “Browse by Unit” search box. Please note that all departments have been mapped to their colleges and are listed under the search box

• Select the “Department” by clicking on it (it will be highlighted in blue) and click “Confirm”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Next step is to select a “Template” from the list under “New Case”
• Please select “2021-2022 Promotion & Tenure”. IMPORTANT: The same template will be used for all actions being sought: Tenure and Promotion; Tenure only; Tenured, Promotion only; APT Promotion
• Do not select any other template!
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Once the “2021-2022 Promotion & Tenure” Template has been selected you will be taken to the next screen

• “Case Information”
  • Fields in this section are already populated

• IMPORTANT: Please do not change the field “Type” The Office of the Dean of Faculties has selected “Promotion as a default for all cases, regardless of type (APT promotion; tenure only; Tenured, promotion only; Tenure and Promotion)
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Under “Case Data Forms” you will see “Candidate Information Form”, click on “Answer”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Fill out all the fields in the form and click “Save”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• After the “Case Data Form” has been submitted, a green check mark will appear to the left of “Candidate Information Form”

• Click “Save & Continue”
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• “Candidate Requirements”
  • “Candidate’s Packet Due”: A deadline can be set for the candidate to submit the required documents
  • To add a due date, click on the “Calendar icon”

[Image of Interfolio RPT interface with annotations and instructions for creating a case]
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Each “Packet Requirement” item listed includes guidelines for the section
• To access the guidelines, click on the “Open triangle” next to the item
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Under "Packet Requirements" you will see the list of documents required to be submitted by the candidate.

• Other sections have been created for department/college to list documents required from the candidates for department/college review but will not be part of the final dossier. E.g. under “Other Teaching related Materials” the department could require the candidate to upload a teaching portfolio, class syllabi, examples of exams...

• TAB 13: Candidate OTHER Materials and Documents is meant for materials that cannot be included in Tabs 1-12 but will be included in the final dossier; please refer to the “Texas A&M University 2022-2023 P&T Guidelines” for additional information.
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Example for how to add department/college specific “Packet Requirements”
• Under “Other Teaching Materials” click on “Add Requirements”
• In the popup window fill in the required information and click “Save”
• If the candidate can add sections to the packet, click the “check box”
• Click “Continue” at the end of the page to go to the next step
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• “Internal Case Sections”
• IMPORTANT: do not change any thing in the “Settings” or “Sections” elements of the Case they are part of the University level template set up by the Office of the Dean of Faculties
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• “Case Review Steps”

• IMPORTANT: do not add or change any of the “Steps” they are part of the University level template set up by the Office of the Dean of Faculties

• IMPORTANT: If your department/college has a candidate with a true joint appointment, please contact the Office of the Vice President for Faculty Affairs at facultyevaluation@tamu.edu to create a different template, with the correct workflow for that candidate

• Click “Continue” to go to the next step
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- “Case Summary”
- Lists all the elements of the “Template” for the Case created for an specific Candidate, no action is needed here
- Click on “Return to Case” to continue
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- To send the “Case” to the Candidate click “Send Case”
- Select “Candidate: Notify Candidate” from the pulldown menu
- We recommend that a personal message be included with the email
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Example Notification email to the Candidate indicating that their “Case” has been created and is available for them to upload documents.
How to create a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Example Notification email received by the Candidate
Appendix VIII: How To Facilitate Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT
How to facilitate reconsideration of a ”Case” In Interfolio RPT
How to log into Interfolio

1. Go to Interfolio: [http://account.interfolio.com](http://account.interfolio.com)

2. Click “Partner Institution” and search for Texas A&M University

3. Once you have selected Texas A&M University, click “Sign In”

4. You will be re-directed to sign in with your CAS credentials
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- **Deans** are the only individuals who can initiate the reconsideration a case!

- Once logged into Interfolio, the left side of the dashboard will have a list of Modules (Faculty 180; Faculty Search; Review, Promotion and Tenure) the Dean has access to.

- Under Review, Promotion and Tenure click on “Cases”.

Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• On the Case list, click the name of the case for which reconsideration is needed.
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- On the Case Materials tab of the Case page, select the Dean’s recommendation to send to the Department Head.
- You can also select any other materials from the case to add as supporting documentation to the Dean’s recommendation.
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

• Selecting materials will open the blue action bar.
• Click “Share”.

Please refer to the University P&T Guidelines at: [http://dof.famu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure](http://dof.famu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure)

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.
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Select “With Committee Members”.
- Next, you will be able to indicate who should receive the shared files.
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- Select “User”.
- Indicate who should receive the shared files by searching for the Department Head and clicking “Add User”.

- Type your custom message.
- Select files from the case as needed.
Reconsideration of a “Case” in Interfolio RPT

- On the upper right-hand side of your message, click "Enable File Response" so that the Department Head will be able to respond.

- Enter a message reason, and a deadline.

- Select the internal case section “Department Head Recommendation” as the section for the response to be uploaded to.

- When the response comes in, the file will appear in the section indicated.
Once the response has been received, the case can be sent to the College P&T committee for re-review.

Upon re-review by the College P&T committee, the case would be sent forward to the Dean to upload their final recommendation.
Appendix IX: Guidelines on Writing and Evaluating COVID-19 Impact Statements

Purpose: Faculty may include an optional COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion dossier that provides a context for evaluating performance for each of their primary job responsibilities. For most faculty, this would include a combination of research & creative activities, teaching activities, and service activities. For some faculty, this might also include clinical and extension responsibilities. This guidance provides further information on what to include in a COVID-19 statement and how to include this contextual information in the review process. The guidance includes a few sample impact statements, as well as templates which can be used by faculty writing and evaluating these statements.

Frequently Asked Questions about COVID-19 Impact Statement

What is a COVID-19 impact statement?
A COVID-19 impact statement is a short narrative statement that a faculty member writes to provide contextual information for understanding how the pandemic has impacted their professional workload and responsibilities. The statements can be included with standard materials for any of the following faculty performance reviews: annual reviews (including merit reviews), midterm reviews, promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews.

What is the objective of a COVID-19 impact statement?
During the pandemic, faculty work has looked different than it did in the past. The specific impacts on research, teaching and service, however, have varied from one faculty member to the next. Consider these examples of professional impacts:

- One faculty member, for example, might have shifted time and effort into teaching due to the challenges of adapting their course material to remote delivery.
- Another faculty member might have been unable to complete research project due to COVID-19 travel restrictions and/or social distancing requirements within the lab.
- Another faculty member may have spent more time on service as the leader of a scholarly organization that had to transition its conference from in person to online.

Although the COVID-19 impact statements should focus on the professional impacts of the pandemic, it is important to understand that any of these situations might have been exacerbated by personal circumstances, such as increased caregiving responsibilities of children or elderly dependents, or medical conditions impacted by or related to COVID-19.

Impact statements are intended to provide contextual information so that reviewers can review a scholar’s work in the context of the pandemic. All reviewers (e.g. external reviewers, department and college/school committees, department heads, deans, Vice President for Faculty Affairs, etc.) need guidance on how to evaluate COVID-19 impact statements in a fair and equitable way.

Who can write a COVID-19 impact statement?
Any Texas A&M faculty member, regardless of rank or job title, can prepare a COVID-19 impact statement. Faculty who plan to come up for promotion in the near future are strongly encouraged to write a COVID-19 impact statement.

Are all faculty required to submit a COVID-19 impact statement?
No. It is entirely optional to write a COVID-19 impact statement.
Can a tenure-track faculty member who received a clock extension also write a COVID-19 impact statement?

Yes, faculty who received a clock extension may also choose to write a COVID-19 impact statement. These are two different methods to address the impact of the pandemic. The COVID-19 tenure clock extension provides extra time for a faculty member to meet the expectations for promotion and tenure. These extensions are comparable to existing opportunity for a faculty member to receive a clock extension in the event that they encounter circumstances that might impede progress towards promotion and tenure. It is standard practice for the personal circumstances behind the clock extension to be excluded from the review process. In contrast, the COVID-19 impact statement captures the professional circumstances, and this information should be considered during the review of faculty performance.

Given the cycle of tenure reviews, the extra time is allocated as a one-year block. For some faculty, the temporal impact of the pandemic, however, may not correspond to exactly one year of “lost time” for research. For example, a junior faculty member who was in the process of building a new lab for their research may have experienced a 1.5 year delay in the construction of that lab due to a combination of the COVID-19 shutdown, supply chain disruptions that relate to the pandemic, and local shortage of contractors.

For many faculty, the pandemic’s impacts extend to disruptions and challenges that cannot be resolved by simply adding more time to the tenure clock. For example, a faculty member who was scheduled to conduct interview-based research in an international setting may have had to adapt to Zoom-based interviews, may have postponed that project to focus on projects that don’t rely on travel, and/or may have developed a new research project that would be more feasible. The COVID-19 impact statement would capture the original plan, the dilemma introduced by the pandemic, and the solution. That information would then be integrated into any evaluation of that faculty member’s performance.

Should a faculty member write a COVID-19 impact statement if the impacts were relatively minor?

Everybody has been impacted in one way or another, and it is okay for a faculty member to have a statement that just touches upon a few “minor” impacts. No faculty are required to write a COVID-19 impact statement, but a faculty member who experienced relatively minor impacts may want to document those impacts. For example, a faculty member may have similar levels of productivity, but they experienced some impacts that affect their overall performance. For example, they were not able to attend as many conferences as usual due to cancellations; they shifted some time away from research to learn how to use teaching technologies for a remote class; etc.

What should be included in a COVID-19 impact statement?

The ideal impact statement includes (a) a description of a faculty member’s normal workload and planned activities, (b) a description of any disruptions to the normal workload and planned activities due to the pandemic, and (c) a description of any new and unexpected tasks or responsibilities in response to the crisis (Clark et al. 2020; Malisch et al. 2020). The items below include things that a faculty member may want to include in their COVID-19 impact statement. Faculty may choose to use the template for writing a COVID-19 impact statement.

Examples of Things that a Faculty Member May Want to Document for Research/Scholarly Activities/Creative Activities

- Less time for research/creative activities due to teaching/service workload increase
- Lack of access to research (labs, archives, human subjects, field site, etc.)
• Loss of longitudinal research projects due to disruptions
• Loss of resources spent on parts of a project that can’t be used
• Additional costs for conducting research (i.e. purchasing PPE for a lab, inflated prices for supplies, etc.)
• Time spent pivoting research agenda to a feasible project during the pandemic
• Travel/visa restrictions affecting collaborative projects
• Disruptions to Faculty Development Leave, or other forms of leave
• Longer waits for manuscript reviews
• Inability to present research at conferences
• Fewer opportunities to meet with mentors

*Examples of Things that a Faculty Member May Want to Document for Teaching*
• Time spent converting a course to online/hybrid/remote, learning new technologies, attending trainings, etc.
• Teaching challenges that required creative problem-solving (such as converting internship or clinical learning experience to new circumstances)
• Additional hours per week focused on mentoring and advising students

*Examples of Things that a Faculty Member May Want to Document for Service*
• Meetings attended or led that would not have regularly occurred (such as meetings that provided information about the university’s response to the pandemic)
• Time and effort spent moving meetings or events online
• Contributions to pandemic or racial justice initiatives for the department, the university, the discipline, and/or the local community

---

*Do faculty members need to describe impacts in each of the three primary areas of responsibility – research & creative activities, teaching and service?*
No. A faculty member should limit their statement to relevant areas of concern. Those impacts may or may not include all three areas. Some faculty may have other areas of responsibility including clinical work, extension work, etc.

*Should a faculty member include “positive” impacts in their COVID-19 impact statements?*
Yes. The COVID-19 impact statement can include a mix of “negative” and “positive” impacts on research, teaching, and service. Some of the pandemic effects may contain elements of both. For example, a faculty member who had to reduce the time and effort spent on research one semester in order to convert their class to a remote delivery mode may have learned a lot about new technologies that they can continue to use in the future. The same faculty member may have also spent more time than usual mentoring undergraduate and graduate students who were anxious and uncertain about the pandemic’s impacts on their careers. Through these experiences, the faculty member may have developed new outlooks and perspectives for understanding their students’ needs. In another example, a faculty member might have “wasted” a significant amount of time organizing a conference that had to be rescheduled, but they were able to use some of the time that would have been spent on conference travel to finish an important writing project. The COVID-19 impact statement should highlight both the challenges and the opportunities.

*What are the benefits of writing a COVID-19 impact statement?*
The pandemic was a challenging time for all faculty, but the impacts vary from one person to the next. In
order to develop an equitable approach to promotion evaluations, it is important to understand that individual faculty members have been impacted in unique and complex ways. The COVID-19 impact statement is an opportunity for faculty to document pandemic impacts on workload and professional opportunities. The statement provides a written narrative for understanding how a faculty member responded to professional challenges introduced by the pandemic. The impact statement will be shared with reviewers, including external reviewers choose to include in their statement, along with instructions to review the promotion dossier in the context of the pandemic. This will allow reviewers to understand what circumstances were beyond a faculty member’s control due to the pandemic.

Should faculty include personal circumstances in their COVID-19 impact statement? Wouldn’t that introduce bias into the review process?
There is no doubt that the professional lives of many faculty have been impacted by personal circumstances and events beyond their control. The impact statements, however, are not intended to be a place for faculty to document personal circumstances. In other words, faculty do not need to (and should not) provide information about (a) increased caregiving responsibilities, (b) personal health issues or risks, (c) health issues/risks of household members, (d) impacts from long-term COVID, and/or (e) the loss of loved ones in their COVID-19 impact statement. Instead of providing personal details, a faculty member can simply indicate that they had “additional family responsibilities due to the pandemic that affected their workload” or “personal circumstances that affected their workload.”

Are there other limitations to the content of the COVID-19 impact statement?
Yes. The impact statement should be limited to impacts that are directly or indirectly connected to the pandemic. This would include impacts associated with the transition to remote learning, the temporary closures of lab spaces, temporar

Do faculty members have any control over who may review the COVID-19 impact statement is used?
Yes. Faculty should note their preferred option at the bottom of their COVID-19 impact statement:

• **Personnel file only.** In this case, a faculty member indicates that the COVID-19 statement should be added to their personnel file. In this case, the COVID-19 impact statement would be on file, if necessary, but it would not be used in any review without the explicit permission of the faculty member.

• **Internal reviewers only.** In this case, a faculty member indicates that the COVID-19 impact statement should be included in internal reviews of faculty performance (e.g. annual reviews, midterm reviews, promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews).

• **External reviewers only.** In this case, a faculty member indicates that the COVID-19 impact statement should be included with other materials that are sent to external reviewers. (This only applies in the case of promotion reviews that require external letters.)

• **Both internal and external reviewers.**

Should the impacts of the pandemic included in the COVID-19 impact statement be limited to a specific window of time?
Yes. The COVID-19 impact statement should focus on impacts that affected faculty performance during calendar years 2020 and 2021. For some faculty, the impacts of the pandemic may be limited to 2020. For other faculty, the pandemic may have had impacts that carry over a longer period of time, although the intensity of those impacts might have decreased over time. (Given the uncertainty of the pandemic, it is possible that the university may need to reassess the window of time at a future point in time.)
How does one submit a COVID-19 impact statement? Where do COVID-19 impact statements go after they have been prepared?
COVID-19 statements can be placed in a faculty member’s personnel file, and/or submitted with other documents to a department administrator for the purpose of annual reviews, merit reviews, midterm reviews, and post-tenure reviews. In the case of promotion reviews, COVID-19 impact statements can be added to Interfolio in the “Other Materials” section.

Are there page limitations for the COVID-19 impact statement?
Yes. The COVID-19 impact statement should be no longer than one page, single-spaced, 12 point font. Statements do not need to be a full page.

Is there a deadline for submitting COVID-19 impact statements?
Faculty are encouraged to write their impact statement as soon as possible while the impacts are still fresh in their memory. There is no specific deadline. However, faculty should submit the COVID-19 impact statements prior to the deadline for any relevant review. For example, if a department has a mid-March deadline for midterm review materials and a faculty member wants to include the COVID-19 impact statement with their review materials, they should submit the COVID-19 impact statement by that deadline.

Can faculty who started their employment in 2020, 2021 or 2022 prepare a COVID-19 impact statement?
Yes, but faculty should limit their narrative statement to periods of time in which they were employed by Texas A&M. In other words, an employee who started to work at Texas A&M in the Fall of 2021 should limit their impact statement to the period of employment with Texas A&M.

How long should COVID-19 impact statements be employed in performance evaluations? Is there a point in time in which they are no longer relevant?
This will vary from one faculty member to the next. The option to include COVID-19 impact statements will continue until the point at which the timeframe for a given review no longer includes the years that are covered by the COVID-19 impact statement. For a tenured full professor, the COVID-19 impact statement may only be relevant for one or two years. For a tenure-track assistant professor whose tenure window includes years impacted by the pandemic, the COVID-19 impact statement would be relevant until the faculty member has completed the promotion process. This would also be true for APT and associate professors who go through the promotion process.
Sample COVID-19 Impact Statement
Here are two sample COVID-19 impact statements:

Sample Number One

Research. My research involves fieldwork and lab-based research. During a normal year, I travel to conduct international fieldwork during the summer breaks, and I rely on student assistance to process samples in a lab during the academic semesters. Prior to the pandemic, I also planned to complete the construction of a second, more specialized lab during 2020. In terms of writing and publication, I typically aim to submit two peer-reviewed journal manuscripts for publication each year. When the pandemic first started, everything stopped. I was unable to process samples in my existing lab because I did not have the same level of student involvement. I was unable to conduct fieldwork during either summer due to travel restrictions and concerns about coronavirus. It took just over a year longer than planned to complete the construction of my second lab due to university restrictions and equipment delays. This has impacted my ability to start research projects that depended on that lab. I have continued to work on publications that were in progress and near completion prior to the pandemic, but I have not been able to make progress on planned publications based on data that I have been unable to collect and process.

Teaching. I regularly teach two courses per semester, including an internship course. During the past two years, I have spent more time on my teaching than I typically do. Several of my students have been dealing with personal crises, and they needed more emotional support to get through class and the rest of the semester. I spent a lot of time just listening and talking to students, and referring them to appropriate support offices. I also spent more time than usual responding to emails about their projects (given that they could not ask for assistance in person). I also spent more time than usual preparing for class, because I had to change the method of delivery, the materials I was presenting, and how I discussed those materials.

Service. Within the department, I regularly coordinate the department lecture series. For my discipline, I typically review several manuscripts and grant applications each year. My department’s lecture series was cancelled during 2020, and converted to remote in 2021. That did not add any additional time. When the pandemic started, I did take on a new informal service role assisting faculty who were not comfortable using Zoom.

Tenure Clock Extension. I received a one-year tenure clock extension due to COVID-19 impacts. I believe that the clock extension will help address the impacts of COVID-19, but some of the impacts described above go beyond time that was lost due to the pandemic.

Use of the COVID-19 Impact Statement. I would like for this COVID-19 impact statement to be shared with internal and external reviewers.

Sample Number Two

Research. My research is based on existing datasets, and does not require travel or lab-based research. During 2020 and 2021, I was planning to write and submit five journal manuscripts to top-tier peer-reviewed journals in my field. I regularly attend two national conferences in my area of specialty, and use these opportunities to get feedback on my papers and to develop my professional network.
My ability to make progress on research goals was impacted by personal circumstances, in addition to delayed responses from co-authors for some of my publications. In the end, I was only able to submit three journal manuscripts during 2020 and 2021. I also had to cancel plans to attend conferences in both years; conferences in 2020 were cancelled altogether and conferences in 2021 were remote. My startup funds that were designated for conference travel have not been used, and unfortunately will not carry over to future years.

**Teaching.** My regular teaching load involves teaching three courses during the spring 2020 semester. I do not teach in the fall semester as that time is devoted to research. When the pandemic started during the spring 2020 semester, I made the decision to teach all of my classes asynchronously. I think I spent the same amount of time teaching as I had before, but the nature of the work changed. I spent more time answering student emails and learning new platforms for remote teaching. In the spring 2021 semester, I taught all of my standard courses synchronously online. I also received supplemental pay to teach one course overload to help out a colleague who was unable to teach in person. Due to the course overload, I spent more time teaching that semester than usual.

**Service.** My service load stayed the same on paper, but I did spend more time than usual on service. First, as one of the board members of my sub-disciplinary organization, I spent extra hours coming up with a plan for our annual conference and helped develop guidelines for remote conference presentation. My informal service increased. As a junior faculty member, many of the PhD students in my department approached me to discuss their concerns about the job market.

**Tenure Clock Extensions.** I received a one-year extension to my tenure clock due to COVID-19 impacts. I am confident that the clock extension will give me sufficient time to catch up with my publication target prior to coming up for tenure.

**Use of the COVID-19 Impact Statement.** I would like for this COVID-19 impact statement to be shared with internal reviewers. I do not want this statement to be shared with external reviewers.

---

**Template Statements for Writing a COVID-19 Impact Statement**

When preparing a COVID-19 impact statement, faculty may find these template statements to be useful. These templates are based on a model developed by the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. These templates are fictional statements based on interviews for the Texas A&M ADVANCE COVID-19 research project.

**Teaching and Mentoring Templates**

During 2020 and 2021, I taught XX courses remotely, XX hybrid courses, and XX traditional in person courses. The remote courses required new pedagogical approaches and technologies. I spent time learning several new technologies (XX and XX) to deliver courses remotely. The hybrid course required time and effort to ensure that students who were participating remotely and who were unable to attend class received the course materials and understood the materials. The traditional in person courses required more time to address health and safety concerns, and to accommodate students who were unable to attend class due to isolation and quarantine requirements.

During XX semesters, I was the instructor of record for our department’s internship/service learning/clinical course. Students normally XXX. Due to the pandemic, I had to help students develop alternate plans to complete this course.

During 2020 and 2021, I had multiple undergraduate and graduate students in crisis related to the pandemic (i.e. concerns about future jobs, anxiety about their health and well-being, coping with the loss of loved ones, etc.) Advising and mentoring students required additional time each week.
During 2020 and 2021, I had to spend a lot of time helping my graduate students redesign their research projects into something that would be feasible during a pandemic.

**Research and Creative Activities Templates**
As a result of increased time spent on teaching and service, I necessarily spent less time on my research. I had to cancel plans to travel abroad to conduct research. This will impact my ability to meet some of my writing goals.

I had to use grant funds to employ PhD students and postdocs who were unable to complete scheduled lab experiments. I do not have sufficient grant funds or IDC funds to replicate the work that was not completed. This affects me, as well as my graduate students who were relying on those experiments for their dissertation project. Given the expense of doing XX research, my department is unable to provide funds. I am applying for additional funds to complete this research project.

I typically recruit international students who help with my lab work. I was unable to recruit international students during the 2020-21 admissions cycle due to travel and visa restrictions. This will impact my ability to complete projects in my lab.

I am in a “book” discipline, and need to have a book published prior to coming up for promotion. I submitted revisions of my book manuscript to a university publisher in early 2000. The publisher promised to send the manuscript to reviewers within a few months. Then, the pandemic started. I have been in regular contact with my publisher. It took nine months longer than expected to receive feedback from all three reviewers. My manuscript has now been accepted with minor revisions, but the publication date will delay my promotion to full professor (unless the P&T committee is willing to consider a manuscript that is accepted, but not yet in press).

I was on Faculty Development Leave during the Fall 2020 semester. My proposed research project involved four months of international research travel. Due to the pandemic, I was unable to leave the country, and shifted my focus to working on other writing projects. Due to personal circumstances, I was not able to make as much progress as I would have liked on those projects. I will not be eligible for leave for another six years.

I was invited to give my first keynote lecture in April 2020. The event had to be postponed indefinitely. I had plans to travel to University X in the summer of 2020 in order to use their XXX lab facilities. Due to travel restrictions, I was unable to participate in this activity. My research focuses on XXX. The pandemic provided me with the opportunity to shift my research to look at how the pandemic intersects with XXX. In 2021, I received a grant from XXX to study this topic.

**Service Templates**
I am the Director of Graduate Studies in my department, and I am responsible for discipline-specific professional development for our department’s graduate students. I have spent much more time than usual assisting PhD students as they try to develop feasible plans for shifting their research activities, navigate teaching during a pandemic, and undergo a job searches during a pandemic.

I was the program coordinator for my discipline’s annual conference in the fall of 2020. By the summer, it was clear that we would probably have to cancel the conference or convert it to a fully online conference. We decided to convert it to an online conference. I spent countless hours working with the
program committee to select speakers for a reduced schedule of presentations and to develop guidelines for presentations.

I am a member of the Faculty Senate, and I agreed to serve on a committee that would advise the provost and president on COVID-19 response. During 2020, I spent a lot of uncompensated time in committee discussions about the university’s COVID-19 response.

**Guidance for Evaluating Optional COVID-19 Impact Statements**

COVID-19 impact statements are intended to be incorporated into all types of performance evaluation – annual reviews, midterm reviews (of tenure-track faculty), promotion reviews, post-tenure-reviews. The principles and methods below would apply equally to all types of review.

**Basic Principles for Factoring COVID-19 Impact Statements into the Review of Faculty**

1. Faculty and administrators who review faculty performance should understand that the objective of the COVID-19 impact statement is to provide contextual information for understanding a faculty member’s record of achievement.

2. The objective is not to lower standards for excellence or to provide an explanation for why a candidate did not meet expectations. In other words, faculty do not receive a “free pass” due to the disruptions of the pandemic. Reviewers, however, do need to acknowledge how the pandemic has impacted a scholar’s planned activities and trajectory, and if necessary, add additional context for understanding the discipline and the department.

3. The use of COVID-19 impact statements into the review process should focus exclusively on professional impacts from the pandemic. Any personal information included in the impact statement should not be incorporated into review documents, such as annual review letters written by the department head or promotion review letters written by the department’s P&T committee.

4. The COVID-19 impact statement should not be devalued in cases where a tenure-track faculty member also received a tenure clock extension. These extensions are comparable to existing opportunity for a faculty member to receive a clock extension in the event that they encounter personal or special circumstances that might impede progress towards promotion and tenure (i.e. arrival of a new child OR challenges in setting up a new lab). In contrast, the COVID-19 impact statement provides a narrative account of professional impacts. These should be regarded as two different things.

5. COVID-19 impact statements can and should be used to conduct a holistic review of a faculty member’s work. It is possible, and even likely, that a faculty member has shifted time and effort from one category (e.g. research) to other categories (e.g. teaching and service). Although the category for research and scholarly activities should remain high for tenure-track/tenured faculty, it should be considered acceptable for a temporary increase in the time and effort that goes into other categories due to the conditions of the pandemic.
6. Impact statements should not be used to determine who has been “more” or “less” impacted by the pandemic. An individual impact statement should only be used for evaluating that particular faculty member’s performance.

7. Reviewers at the department level can add additional context that describes how their discipline as a whole has been impacted by the pandemic.

8. Information from the COVID-19 impact statement should be incorporated into review letters. See examples below.

Templates for Factoring COVID-19 Impact Statements into the Review of Faculty
The following templates provide examples of how a review committee can incorporate information from the COVID-19 impact statement into an annual review letter or a promotion review letter.

**Research, Scholarly & Creative Activities Template**
In the discipline of XX, candidates typically base their publications on field-based research. The pandemic has made it challenging for faculty in our discipline to conduct fieldwork, especially in international settings. As a result, many scholars have had to pivot their research to rely on existing collections that do not require travel, or to design field-based projects closer to home. As XX notes in his COVID-19 impact statement, she cancelled her fieldwork plans for 2020 and 2021, and started a new research project that involves a re-examination of previously collected XXX materials. This is a feasible project during the pandemic, and the committee agrees with XXX that the findings have the potential to XXX.

In the department of XX, all tenure-track/tenured faculty operate labs, and supervise a team of postdocs and graduate students. Faculty are expected to receive external grants to fund these lab-based activities. On a national level, the pandemic has disrupted lab-based research in multiple ways. As Dr. XX indicates in his COVID-19 impact statement, his lab has experienced similar challenges. Lab activities were suspended for XX weeks when the university shut down, and his lab activities were not able to return to normal operating until the Fall of 2021. These circumstances have delayed his completion of experiments. One experiment had to be started over because the cell lines were destroyed when the lab was shut down. Approximately $XX in research funds were “wasted” when one experiment that was underway in March 2020 had to be repeated after the lab reopened. Although the department provided IDC funds to help cover these costs, the project was delayed for several months as a result. Dr. XX’s work was also impacted by the national decline in international student admissions during the pandemic. He accepted one student from China who was unable to accept the admissions offer due to visa restrictions.

Dr. XX’s publication record includes XX peer-reviewed journal articles. In her COVID-19 impact statement, Dr. XX notes that she had plans to submit one additional manuscript to Journal XXX, but was unable to complete that project due to the pandemic. In addition, one of her manuscripts (which is currently under review) was delayed by circumstances beyond her control, as two reviewers took over eight months to submit their reviews. The department guidelines for promotion to full professor indicate that candidates for promotion to full professor should have a publication record that “XX.” The guidelines prioritize the quality and impact of a scholar’s work, while noting that the quantity of publications will also be considered. During our discussion of this case, faculty on the P&T committee
agreed that the quantity of publications is within the acceptable range for a promotion to full professor, and the overall quality and impact of Dr. XX’s work meet the expectations for this promotion. Letters from the external reviewers concur with this assessment. As Dr. XX from XXX University notes, her article on XX is “XX.”

**Teaching Template**
In the department of XX, instructional assistant professors like Dr. XX typically teach three courses and supervise activities in one of the department’s teaching labs. Dr. XX is the supervisor for 3 PhD GATs. As she indicates in her COVID-19 impact statement, she had to spend approximately five extra hours per week during the Spring 2020 semester helping the PhD students convert their lab sessions to a remote delivery that was effective and engaging. Some of these methods were able to be replicated in subsequent semesters for students who were unable to attend class due to quarantine or isolation. Based on comments from undergraduate students in teaching evaluations, the students appreciated these efforts. The department is thankful for the extra hours of work that she put into this class during this challenging time.

In the department of XX, tenure-track/tenured faculty typically teach XX courses per semester. During the pandemic, Dr. XX was one of XX faculty in the department who had to assist students who were enrolled in clinical courses. This work took a considerable amount of time and effort, as Dr. XX indicates in her COVID-19 impact statement. As a result, she was not able to spend as much time as usual on her research activities.

**Service Template**
In the department of XX, tenure-track faculty members are expected to serve on at least one departmental committee and be visible with disciplinary service prior to coming up for promotion. As Dr. XX indicates in his COVID-19 impact statement, his service responsibilities increased significantly due to the pandemic. He was serving on the XX committee, and that committee was enlisted to help the department address special teaching challenges with the conversion to remote learning. As a result, Dr. XX was not able to spend as much time on his research that semester.
Appendix X: Guidelines For Faculty Affected by Academic Realignment – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines 2022-2023

These guidelines will apply to faculty impacted by the MGT report and the President’s Path Forward document for the 2022-2023 Tenure and Promotion Cycle with the exception of Libraries. The faculty who are not impacted by the MGT report and the President’s Path Forward will follow their respective departmental, college, and Faculty Affairs (formerly Dean of Faculties) Guidelines.

The faculty member’s primary appointment will be referred to as the “home department”.

The time-line for impacted faculty should follow the home department guidelines in terms of preparing the dossier, requesting external letters, and the evaluation process. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committees (DTPC) and Department Heads are strongly encouraged to complete their reports and recommendations, prior to August 31, 2022. To compensate faculty to work on tenure promotion matters, the university and colleges will compensate a portion their summer salary, as determined by the department head and the dean, but not to exceed three weeks of summer salary.

These are general guidelines to govern the tenure and promotion process for impacted faculty due to the academic realignment, for the 2022-2023 Tenure and Promotion Cycle only.