
**Guidelines for Review: Mid-term, Tenure & Promotion, and Promotion
Tenure-track Faculty; Tenured Faculty; and Academic Professional Track Faculty**
(revised September 2018)

I. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines serve three purposes: (a) to state the personnel policies and procedures of the College of Liberal Arts, (b) to show how these conform to personnel policies and procedures established by Texas A&M University, and (c) to indicate the kinds of evidence the advisory committees—Dean’s Advisory Committee on Tenure & Promotion (DAC-TP); Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion of Academic Professional Track (DAC-PAPT) — and the Dean require in order to make informed judgments on personnel cases submitted to the College. In serving these purposes we also describe the criteria applied to personnel decisions to promote comparability of substance and procedure relative to College standards, while permitting variation by departments within the framework of their existing statements of policy.

A. Context

Personnel policies for Texas A&M University are governed by The Texas A&M University System policies adopted by the Board of Regents (<http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01.pdf>), and the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 <http://rules.tamu.edu/TAMURulesAndSAPs.aspx#12>). In addition, instructions for implementing the tenure policies are distributed annually by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost <http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>

B. Current University Policy (See University Rule 12.01.99.M2 at <http://rules.tamu.edu/>)

Current University policy for midterm, promotion and tenure, and promotion requires:

- * Peer review at the departmental level by a Promotion and Tenure Committee
- * That departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees consist only of tenured faculty when tenure recommendations are being considered, and only of faculty at a rank higher than the candidate when promotion recommendations are being considered
- * That the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee is advisory to the Head of the Department, who is charged with making an independent recommendation to the Dean of the College
- * Peer review by a college-level advisory committee
- * That the recommendation of the College Advisory Committee is advisory to the Dean of the College, who is charged with making an independent recommendation to the Provost through the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost
- * That promotion of a candidate to the rank of Associate Professor be tied to awarding of tenure and that tenure may not be awarded to candidates whose rank is lower than Associate Professor.
- * Letters of evaluation from outstanding representatives of the candidate's discipline external to Texas A&M University are required in dossiers of all candidates considered for tenure or promotion.
- * That all cases considered for tenure in the mandatory year, whether recommended positively or negatively, be forwarded through channels to the Provost and the President, unless the candidate withdraws the case for consideration and turns in their resignation..
- * That, for cases of discretionary promotion, the department head transmit the recommendations of the promotion and tenure committee and his or her independent recommendation to the College for review, regardless of nature of those recommendations.
- * That at any point candidates for promotion may elect to withdraw their names from further consideration.

- * That, for candidates with joint appointments in two or more units. the department in which a candidate is administratively located is responsible for ensuring that the review process is conducted in accordance with the normal promotion and tenure procedures in the units
- * That, for candidates who also have an appointment with an interdisciplinary program, the ad loc department request a review and evaluations from the chair of the interdisciplinary program.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

General criteria for retention and advancement within the faculty are stated in the University documents referenced earlier. To supplement these, we provide here the expectations for cases brought to the College of Liberal Arts for consideration.

A. Criteria by Rank

1. Assistant Professor. Assistant professors should have the terminal degree, or its equivalent, appropriate to their field. They should be well qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field. Over time an assistant professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure.
2. Tenure and Associate Professor. Since promotion to the rank of associate professor is usually linked to the awarding of tenure, both are discussed here. In rare circumstances a person may be appointed from outside the University to a senior rank without tenure, in which case, subsequently that person will be evaluated for tenure using the required departmental and college criteria and standards.

Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service. The types of evidence discussed under “III. Procedures” will be used to assess meritorious performance in each of these areas.

- (a) Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The College's expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the College also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.
- (b) Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles based on the dissertation should be published as early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate's plans for completing work derived from the dissertation and development of a research program beyond the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer – reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity.
- (c) Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities.

Over time an associate professor should show progress toward meeting the expectations for the rank of professor.

3. Professor. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate continued and outstanding accomplishment in research and teaching, and valuable contributions to leadership and professional service (See Appendix I of Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion University Rule 12.01.99.M2 <http://rules.tamu.edu/TAMURulesAndSAPs.aspx#12>).

- (a) Rather than simply evaluating the total productivity of a faculty member since tenure (e.g., completion of a second book, series of articles, or a specific number of grant awards), the College will assess as grounds for promotion the quality, trajectory, and impact on the field of a candidate's entire body of scholarship, as well as the candidate's national (or international) visibility. More particularly, successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be well established and highly respected figures in their fields, and should demonstrate achievements sufficient to merit such a promotion in any AAU institution aspiring to be a consensus top 10 public university. It is important that a candidate's standing in the field and the impact of the research record be documented by the department through multiple indicators (see the list of possible indicators on pp. 11-12).
- (b) Outstanding teaching is demonstrated by evidence of a strong motivation to engage students in the learning process, by the rigor and scope of the courses taught, by student achievements, and by leadership in programmatic and curricular development. A strong record of undergraduate teaching is essential, as is a commitment to graduate education and the mentoring of graduate students in departments with graduate programs.
- (c) Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in departmental, College, University and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution.

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure, or more commonly promotion, may sometimes be warranted. Examples include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. In all cases, performance in the other two dimensions must be at least acceptable. Few faculty members will possess qualities such as these, but those who do, deserve recognitions and advancement.

B. Probationary Period and Early Tenure

1. The probationary period. A candidate appointed to a full-time faculty position in academic rank normally begins service in a probationary period of fixed duration, which may not exceed seven years. Appointments that are temporary and part-time or special appointments that are clearly short-term will ordinarily fall outside the provisions set for the probationary period. Normally, leaves without pay or similar suspensions of academic service do not count toward calculation of the maximum seven-year probationary period. The policies of the Board of Regents, however, permit full-time service in academic rank at another institution of higher education to be counted as part of the probationary period up to a maximum of three years of service. (See System Policy 12.01 Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, Section 4.1 <http://www.tamus.edu/legal/policy/policy-and-regulation-library/>)

The typical case is a candidate who has just been awarded a Ph.D. degree, who has no prior full-time teaching experience, and who will, therefore, be appointed to the rank of assistant professor, eligible for probationary

appointment extending through seven years. At Texas A&M University, probationary appointments are reviewed annually, the effect being a series of one-year term appointments throughout the probationary period. After two full years of service, the University will provide notice of its intent to renew the appointment one full year in advance of its action. Therefore, since the probationary appointment may not extend beyond seven years, a decision is mandated in the sixth year whether the candidate will subsequently be offered a tenured appointment.

Because some candidates arrive with prior academic service that may be credited toward the seven-year limit, these candidates will have a shorter probationary period. Therefore, a decision concerning tenure generally comes earlier than the sixth year for candidates with prior academic service. In all cases, the decision about the length of the probationary period must be made with the full assent of the faculty member, the department, and the dean, preferably at the time of the initial appointment.

A written agreement specifying the dates of the probationary period will be maintained on file in their department and in the Office of the Dean and the Office of the Dean of Faculties for all faculty on probationary appointments. This agreement, signed by the faculty member, department head, dean, and Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, specifies exactly the length of the maximum probationary period for that case, and it also specifies the date by which a decision whether to offer a tenured appointment must be reached. Since the University decides annually whether a term appointment for a successive year will be offered, a candidate is not assured of appointment throughout the probationary period. Therefore, the written agreement does not guarantee employment throughout the probationary period, but rather specifies the limit on the number of annual probationary appointments the University may offer.

2. **Extensions to Probationary Period.** The following guidelines for extensions to the probationary period for tenure-track faculty were developed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President of the University. Liberal Arts faculty should not be reluctant to request an extension of the tenure clock if they experience circumstances such as those described below. Liberal Arts faculty who are granted an extension of the tenure clock will be evaluated according to the normal (not higher) standards when considered for tenure and promotion.

Extensions to the probationary period may be granted upon petition by the faculty member, recommendation by the Department Head and Dean, and approval by the Dean of Faculties.

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

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

3. Early tenure. High-achieving probationary faculty who, in the view of the department, establish a record that merits tenure and promotion in accordance with departmental and college criteria may be proposed for tenure and promotion review before the Mandatory Review (Penultimate year of probationary period). If their case is unsuccessful, their Mandatory Review shall be conducted as originally planned and according to the published standards.

4. Tenure upon arrival. Normally, candidates for senior appointments will be offered tenure on arrival if they hold tenure at a peer institution. A candidate with extraordinary qualifications who does not hold tenure at a peer institution may be offered tenure upon arrival. Each candidate will undergo a rigorous expedited off-cycle review. Each case must be reviewed by the DAC-TP, the Dean, and the Provost. Departments must present a full dossier for such candidates that parallels that which is submitted for internal tenure and promotion candidates. The department head should forward to the DAC-TP, through the Dean, a dossier including evidence of excellence in teaching, research and creative work, and service. The dossier must also include the P&T Committee's vote and its summary report on the candidate's teaching, research and creative work, and service. In addition, the department must submit a biographical table. The DAC-TP will hold the candidate to the same scholarly/creative standards applied to other candidates for tenure in the College of Liberal Arts. Offers to candidates who are reviewed for tenure upon arrival must make clear that tenure decisions are pending and only the Board of Regents can grant tenure. (For more information, see the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Hiring Guidelines.) Additional important information can be found on the Dean of Faculties Website: <http://dof.tamu.edu/Hiring/TENURE-ON-ARRIVAL>

C. Discussion of Criteria

In all instances the criteria reduce to three essential categories: (a) teaching, (b) research or creative work, and (c) university and professional service. Retention or advancement within the faculty depends upon high performance within these categories. Committees deliberating on personnel cases must evaluate performance rigorously in each category by means of explicit evidence and supporting material. Performance must be placed in context and interpreted qualitatively by committees. Although most candidates will show greater strengths in some categories than in others, at least an acceptable level of performance in each category must be demonstrated. Inadequate performance in any category is a sufficient reason for nonrenewal of appointment.

The standards we discuss here recognize implicitly that qualitative academic judgment will be brought to bear on personnel cases. It should be well understood by all parties that having met a certain technical minimum performance standard in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service may not be a sufficient record for advancement. The quality of the performance in each area is also subjected to searching review in the context of the developmental requirements of the department and the college. In the end a complex judgment is drawn that is intended to strengthen the quality of the faculty.

Renewal, awarding of tenure, or promotion comes about as a consequence of demonstrated achievement; that is, advancement is based on merit and is not automatic. A tenure-track faculty member holds an annual appointment that automatically expires at the conclusion of the academic year unless specifically informed otherwise. Nonrenewal of a probationary appointment is not considered by the University as either dismissal or termination.

If a candidate under consideration for renewal, award of tenure, or promotion believes that criteria are not being fairly applied, or that the personnel case is not being handled in accordance with university policy, the candidate should contact the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost for advice on current avenues of appeal.

III. PROCEDURES

A. Dean's Advisory Committee

The Dean's Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion (DAC-TP) comprises six faculty members at the rank of professor, three of whom must be in the humanities and three of whom must be in the social sciences. Committee members are chosen by the Dean, and serve staggered three-year terms. The Dean appoints a chair or convener of the committee. The Dean's Advisory Committee of Promotion of Academic Professional Track (DAC-PAPT) reviews promotion cases in the Academic Professional Track. This committee comprises a minimum of two academic professional track faculty at the rank of professor (to the extent possible) and a minimum of one tenured faculty member at the rank of professor. Committee members are chosen by the Dean. The names of members to be appointed to both committees will be presented to department heads and the Liberal Arts Council for endorsement.

B. Formal College-Level Reviews For Tenure-track Faculty

Probationary appointments at Texas A&M University are generally for one year only and are renewed on an annual basis. The College of Liberal Arts normally conducts formal college-level personnel reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: once near the end of the candidate's third year of service and again during the candidate's sixth year of service. Candidates who bring three years of service will not have a formal midterm review but will have annual reviews in their respective departments during the fourth and fifth years. Departments may request a midterm review in the fourth year for a faculty member who was hired with credit for three years of service. Aside from these two formal college-level reviews, faculty on probationary status are reviewed annually at the departmental level. Any of these reviews can result in a decision not to renew the probationary appointment.

Of the two formal college-level reviews, the review in the sixth year includes consideration for tenure and is more comprehensive than the midterm review. For example, because evaluation letters from external referees are required in cases of tenure or promotion but not otherwise, a review in the third year would not usually include such letters. The sixth year review also advances beyond the college level to the Dean of Faculties, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Regents.

Dossiers of faculty being considered for the midterm and tenure and/or promotion review are read and discussed by the DAC-TP. DAC-TP members are recused on cases from their own departments and must leave the room while the case is being discussed. Individuals associated in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03) with the faculty being considered for renewal, tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or votes on a case that is covered by the System policy. In accordance with university recommendations, the Dean, or her/his representative, will not attend the meetings of the DAC. The Associate Dean for Faculty will be available for consultation in her/his office at the same times as the meetings.

Annual evaluations of probationary faculty shall include two votes of the tenured faculty or tenured members of the departmental advisory committee: the first vote indicates whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward promotion with tenure; the second vote recommends for or against reappointment of the faculty member. The department head's written annual evaluation of the faculty member shall report the results of the two faculty votes and shall state whether the head concurs with each.

C. Preparation of the Dossier

1. For the midterm review:

Mid-term reviews (normally conducted in the spring semester of the candidate's third year of service) are a very significant step in the evaluation and mentoring of tenure-track faculty, and are also significant in the development of departmental faculty strength. These reviews must be conducted carefully, and faculty members must be provided accurate and constructive reports assessing their progress and the likelihood of their attaining promotion and tenure at the end of the probationary period.

Candidates' dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines for the tenure and promotion dossier, except that work under review or in progress should be included and external letters are *not* required. The dossier should include:

- a) The candidate's personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced, 12-point font), which explains the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments. Each of these three areas should be addressed separately. (See Appendix H in the DOF guidelines.)
- b) An up-to-date curriculum vitae that clearly distinguishes between refereed and non-refereed publications and identifies whether unpublished manuscripts have been accepted for publication or are under review. **Includes faculty acknowledgment that the CV is correct and up-to-date.**
- c) Copies of all review letters sent by the Department Head to the candidate.
- d) Separate reports on teaching, research or creative activities, and service, and a summary report, written by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. A summary of the numerical teaching evaluations from courses taught at TAMU must be included in the teaching report. Copies of reports of classroom visitation by colleagues may be included with the teaching report (see p. 14 of DOF guidelines). Copies of teaching evaluations from individual course or semesters should be included with the supplemental materials, not placed in the dossier.
- e) Votes of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee on the questions 1) Is the candidate making satisfactory progress toward promotion with tenure? and 2) Should the candidate be reappointed?
- f) Recommendation letter from the Department Head indicating his/her overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.
- g) For more information, see section C below.

2. For the review for promotion and tenure and promotion to professor:

A fair and thorough evaluation of a candidate's tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. Only tenured members of equivalent or higher ranks than the rank for which the candidate is being evaluated are eligible to participate in the review. The Department Head will establish an Evaluation Subcommittee for each candidate under review in accordance with the departmental bylaws. The subcommittees will prepare three separate draft reports on teaching, on research or creative work, and on service. A summary report is also required. The summary report must cover the discussion of the case at the department meeting and include the final vote of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. Therefore, the report cannot be finalized until after the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee meets, but the report may be presented in draft prior to that meeting.

The draft reports prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittee will form the basis for the consideration of a case by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (which consists of all tenured faculty in the department for a tenure and promotion to associate professor case; and only full professors for a promotion to professor case). The Evaluation Subcommittee will forward the reports along with the candidate's dossier to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for review. The committee chair, who is selected according to department bylaws, will moderate the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee discussion of the case. The chair is also responsible for ensuring that the final version of the four reports represents the faculty voice with no input from the head. The final version of the reports must summarize the discussion of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee's meeting and reflect the vote of the committee. The bylaws of each department shall indicate whether absentee balloting is permissible and under what circumstances. If absentee ballots are permitted, the bylaws shall indicate the voting procedure.

Although the Evaluation Subcommittees are charged with preparing a complete dossier, the ultimate responsibility for assuring that all pertinent materials are available lies with the candidate. Candidates should keep relevant materials in anticipation of personnel considerations and make them available to the Evaluation Subcommittee. Relevant materials may include such items as syllabi, examinations, grant proposals, reprints of published work, teaching evaluations or evaluation summaries, copies of reviews, publishing contracts, unsolicited letters, and similar items. This list is not to be taken as a requirement, but as an example. What is relevant for one candidate may not be relevant for another, but in every case appropriate evidence is required.

The candidate may meet with the Evaluation Subcommittee before it begins deliberation of the case to confirm the status of the dossier and to provide or receive any information pertinent to consideration of the case. Thereafter, a candidate for renewal, tenure, or promotion shall not attend any committee meeting at which the candidate's case is being considered, unless invited for a specific purpose.

3. For review for promotion of Academic Professional Track Faculty

All promotions in the Academic Professional Track will follow the same process and timeline as for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. Only members (both tenured and instructional faculty) of equivalent or higher ranks than the one for which the candidate is being evaluated are eligible to participate in the review. Therefore, it is important to note that, while tenured members do review promotion cases of non-tenured, Academic Professional Track faculty, an Evaluation Subcommittee and the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee will be comprised of tenured and instructional faculty who are in equivalent or higher ranks than the one for which the candidate is being reviewed. For more details, see the College of Liberal Arts "Academic Professional Track Faculty Guidelines" (Sect VI Procedures and Criteria for Promotion).

D. Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Interdisciplinary Programs

Note: The procedures outlined below are one possibility for joint appointments between an interdisciplinary program and a department or between two interdisciplinary programs. An appointment that is 100% within a single interdisciplinary program will be governed by the bylaws of that program. Further, specific procedures used for the tenure and promotion process will depend on the specific by-laws of the interdisciplinary program (and disciplinary department, as appropriate) as well as specific procedures negotiated during the hiring process. This template, however, can serve as a guide for such negotiations.

The candidate will prepare one dossier in accordance with College of Liberal Arts Procedures.

The department(s) and program(s) involved will work together to identify a single set of seven external reviewers who will be acceptable to the P&T committee in each unit. The head/director of the units and an additional representative from each unit will meet in the fall or spring of the 5th year to identify specific

steps for soliciting nominations from the candidate and from each department/program. This group will create a final list of individuals to be contacted.

The department or program in which the candidate is administratively located (or, in the case of a joint appointment between two programs, the program in which the candidate holds the majority of his/her appointment) will be responsible for contacting external reviewers, and securing letters, vita, and short biographies from external reviewers.

The dossier will be reviewed by the respective department/program in the same manner as would occur for any other faculty member. Each department/program will prepare draft reports of the research, teaching, and service subcommittee. Following preparation of these draft reports, a joint meeting of the P&T committees from the department(s) and program(s) will be convened. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the dossier and share information regarding the candidate's evaluation from the perspective of the respective department(s) and program(s).

Following the joint meeting, the T&P committee from each department and program will meet for further discussion, to approve the department or program reports regarding research, teaching, and service, and to vote regarding tenure and promotion. A summary report of the discussion and vote at the T&P meeting is required. Following these meetings, the completed file (including final subcommittee reports of research, teaching, and service summary report of the T&P committee, letter from the head/director of the department/program) will be forward to the Dean's office for evaluation by the Dean's Advisory Committee and the Dean.

- E. Materials to be Included in the promotion/tenure dossier. Refer to the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost "Promotion and Tenure Packages Submission Guidelines 2018-2019"
<http://dof.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>

Item 1. Candidate's personal statement and acknowledgment. Candidates must submit a personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced; 10 or 12 pt font; 1 inch margins) that explains the quality, productivity over time, and impact of teaching, research/scholarly work, and service accomplishments. Each of these three areas should be addressed separately. (See Appendix H in the DOF guidelines.)

Item 2. The curriculum vitae. The basic descriptive document forming a dossier is a complete curriculum vita which should include at least the information listed below. The CV should not include any personal information such as home address, home telephone, social security number, personal e-mail address.

- (a) Degrees received, including dates, institutions, and fields of study;
- (b) History of prior academic and related employment, including time (ex Fa 2010-Su 2017) and various ranks;
- (c) Fields one is qualified to teach, including areas of special interest;
- (d) Record as:
 - (i) supervisor of independent work of undergraduate or graduate students and
 - (ii) principal adviser of graduate students working on advanced degrees, distinguishing between completed and uncompleted degrees;
- (e) Record of publications with complete citations making clear the distinction among the following categories:
 - (i) books and monographs,
 - (ii) articles, indicating which are refereed,
 - (iii) notes and comments,
 - (iv) chapters in books,
 - (v) fellowship and research grants received,
 - (vi) papers presented at professional meetings, and

(vii) abstracts and book reviews.

Creative products and performances such as poems, novels, dramatic productions outside of normal teaching responsibilities, or musical performances, should be listed in an appropriate analogous form. Beginning and concluding page numbers should be included for each article or essay cited; co-authors should be acknowledged in the order in which they appear on the publication; and the date of publication, the press, and the total number of pages should be cited with each book or monograph. Only materials that are actually in print or for which a final written acceptance has been received should be listed, unless a separate In-Review section is shown. Creative activity such as exhibitions or reviews of performances should be cited with similar specificity;

- (f) Professional and service activity, both intramural and extramural, such as committee or other assignments, membership or leadership in scholarly societies, editorial services to scholarly publications, consulting activity, honors and special recognition received, and public service related to professional expertise.
- (g) A signed statement indicating that the curriculum vitae being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature. NOTE: This is different from the Verification of Contents sheet. See item 3 below.
- (h) The TAMU Grants Summary Chart that lists candidate's complete grant information (see Forms here: <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)

Item 3. *Verification of Contents sheet.* This consists of a detailed, specific list of ALL materials submitted by the candidate (not including outside letters) to the departmental review committee as well as a signed and dated (on the date on which materials are submitted to the department) statement by the candidate acknowledging the contents of the dossier.

Item 4. *The teaching report.* The teaching report must be based on multiple indicators of the quality and effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. The Evaluation Subcommittee must undertake a thorough examination of all materials turned in by the candidate in support of teaching. These should include syllabi for courses, assignments, exams and handouts. If available, course websites prepared by the candidate should also be examined.

All teaching reports must be accompanied by a table reporting course evaluation scores for the candidate for the length of the probationary period (for midterm reviews or promotion and tenure; for the period since receiving tenure or for the last five years [whichever is shorter] for promotion to full professor). To contextualize these scores, additional information must be provided: mean grade for the course, number of students enrolled, number of students responding to the evaluation, and departmental means for comparable courses (i.e., compare lower-division courses to all lower-division courses, upper-division courses to all upper-division courses, graduate courses to all graduate courses). Additional context may be offered as appropriate (e.g., if a candidate's teaching load consists principally of generally unpopular required courses or if a particularly significant event in a given semester might have influenced the course evaluations). A template for this table is appended to this document and will be provided electronically to all departments.

All teaching reports must also include assessments of teaching capability based on peer observation. At least two members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee (i.e., the tenured faculty for cases of promotion and tenure, full professors for cases of promotion to full) should observe the candidate's teaching on separate occasions (i.e., two members of the committee should attend different classes. Both observers may attend the same course on different days or observers may attend two different courses). The report should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance. Observations may be done in the semester in which the department considers the candidate's promotion or the previous academic year. Observations from earlier in the candidate's career may be included if available, but the teaching report should not assess teaching solely on observations that were made several years prior to the time at which the candidate is being considered for tenure and promotion. The responsibility for arranging classroom visits rests with the Evaluation Subcommittee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, or the Department Head, not with the candidate.

Other indicators of teaching may include, but are not limited to:

- Development of new modes of instruction
- Development of new courses
- Publication of textbooks or other instructional materials
- Successful curriculum development grants
- Receipt of awards for outstanding teaching
- Number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the university by the candidate
- Research success by the candidate's students (e.g., publication of seminar papers, conference presentations of undergraduate research, research awards received by students)
- Placement of candidate's graduate students
- Participation in any workshop or program designed to improve teaching (if possible, identify outcomes or impact on candidate's instructional effectiveness)

Item 5. *The research/creative activities report.* The research/creative activities report should include an evidence-based assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's body of work. A few works of high quality are more important than numerous insignificant works. Emphasis on the quality of work requires attention to the candidate's contribution to works that are not single authored and the quality of the journals or presses in which the work appears.

In the evaluation of publications and other creative and professional accomplishments, interpretations by the most qualified members of the discipline as well as by outside referees of national reputation in the discipline are extremely valuable, but research reports must be based on tangible evidence as well as individual judgments. Reviews and citations and appraisals in the publications of others constitute particularly significant testimony. Use of bibliographic citation indices is often helpful. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships applied for and awarded should be examined and interpreted. A positive pattern of professional development as scholar or creative artist should be demonstrated.

Creative work in such areas as theater, music, or creative writing should be evaluated by the testimony of persons eminent in their fields. Not only the number, but the place and quality of exhibitions, readings, or performances should be taken into account, as well as reviews. Just as in areas in which research is being evaluated, creative work should be clearly distinct from teaching activities.

Reports on candidates for promotion to associate professor should consider works that have been published, exhibited, or performed as well as work that is scheduled for publication or performance. Written evidence of acceptance for publication, exhibition or performance must be provided.

Reports on candidates for promotion to professor should consider only works that are in print or that have been exhibited or performed. Instances of scholarly or creative works that have increased in stature and importance after initial publication should be documented through such evidence as reviews, republication in anthologies, and significant citations.

Reports for all candidates should address the following questions:

- Are the individual works an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program?
- How is the work regarded by scholars in the field?
- Does the record offer evidence of an ongoing research agenda?

For a candidate being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure the report in addition should address:

- Does the work show promise of impact?

- Does the work reveal evidence of significant post-dissertation research?

For a candidate being considered for promotion to professor the report in addition should address:

- The actual impact of the candidate's body of scholarship on the discipline
- The national or international reputation of the candidate

Indicators of quality and impact may include, but are not limited to:

- Journal impact factors
- H-indices in those disciplines where appropriate
- Citation counts
- Citations that especially appraise the value of the work and its distinctive contributions
- Published reviews of books or creative works
- Funded research grant proposals
- Competitive external fellowships received
- Awards for scholarship or scholarly achievements
- Keynote addresses or other invited presentations in prestigious venues
- Appearance of the candidate's work on graduate syllabi for courses in highly regarded programs
- Contextual information regarding presses or series in which books are published if the press is not universally recognized as a leading one (e.g., other authors who have published in the same venue, composition of the press' editorial board, impact on the discipline of other books in same venue)
- Information on the quality of venues for exhibitions or performance of creative works

Members of both the Evaluation Subcommittee and the Departmental (or Program) Promotion and Tenure Committee should personally examine publications and other examples of creative work that are listed in the dossier. Copies of publications, or selected examples of publications, should be made available (either in the departmental or program office or in a secure online location) to all members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee while the case is under consideration.

The standards and status of scholarly presses and journals vary considerably. Therefore, each dossier should contain a discussion of the quality of the press or journals in which the scholarly work appears, e.g., standing in the discipline or subdiscipline, acceptance rates, critical standards, and readership.

Item 6. *Service Report.* Service is expected of all faculty as part of the normal performance of duties and should be taken into account in making an overall assessment of an individual's qualifications for advancement.

Some examples of service to be considered are effective academic advising of students; discipline, college, or university committee work, particularly involving authorship of reports that subsequently are adopted as policy; special assignments undertaken at the request of the administration such as curriculum development projects; chairpersonships; work with student organizations or initiatives of students; professional consulting activity; honorific membership or leadership in scholarly societies; leadership in national professional associations; professional editorial assignment for national refereed journals or for scholarly publishers; and honors and special recognition awarded. Work on supradisciplinary grant proposals may be considered under teaching, research, or service, as appropriate, at the discretion of the Evaluation Subcommittee. Administration of grant awards, when not clearly a case of research or teaching, is properly considered an instance of university service.

Item 7. *Other Activities Report.* Report on any activities that do not obviously fit into any of the other three categories. It may be omitted if it is not relevant to the candidate.

Item 8. Outside letters of evaluation of research or creative work. Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the university are required in all cases of tenure or promotion. The preponderance of outside letters should be from peer institutions or better. In cases where the stature of a particular program or the letter writer is not obvious, the reason for soliciting a particular reference needs to be stated. A minimum of five letters must be included. The Dean of Faculties requires five letters but prefers seven letters to be included in the dossier. Each discipline is different and the number of letters requested should be based on expected response rate. The candidate may submit a list of persons to be considered as referees, and may also submit a second list of persons who should not be consulted. The Evaluation Subcommittee should select referees using its own independent judgment of propriety and qualification, subject to one constraint: about equal number of letters requested must be from a referee on the candidate's preferred list if such a list has been submitted. Whenever lists are submitted by a candidate, they must become part of the official dossier that is forwarded.

The first item in this section should be the **TAMU External Reviewers Chart** that lists all reviewers to whom a solicitation letter was sent, even if the reviewer subsequently declined or failed to send a review (template available here: <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)

All letters that have been requested and received must be included.

The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to study it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources and would not count towards the minimum requirement of five letters. External reviewers should be arm's length from the candidate with no conflict of interest. Copies of outside letters and an evaluation of the credentials of the referees prepared by the chairperson of the Evaluation Subcommittee should accompany the dossier. Further, a copy of the letter soliciting the external evaluation should be included as part of the dossier. To request external evaluation, you must use the required External Reviewer Solicitation Letter Template which can be found at <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>

The following conventions should be followed in arranging for outside reviews:

- (a) The candidate is to be informed what materials (e.g., manuscripts, proposals, publications) are being sent out for review. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work, but should not exclude material the candidate judges indispensable to the assessment of his or her case.
- (b) Most outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better. Letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable but the file should still include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities.
- (c) An external reviewer's rank at their institution should be equivalent or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. If circumstances necessitate letters from out-of-rank outside reviewers, these circumstances should be explained and approval sought from the college before an invitation to review is extended.
- (d) The external reviewer is to be provided
 - (i) a copy of the candidate's statement, curriculum vitae and the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based; and
 - (ii) sufficient time for a complete and conscientious assessment, as a rule not less than one month.

Item 9. Departmental (T&P) Committee Summary Report and Recommendation. The P&T Committee discussion report and recommendation to the head is advisory in nature. The report must include the vote of the full P&T Committee, the number of committee members absent, and the number of committee members eligible to vote.

Item 10. Department Head's Recommendation. The department head's letter should report the process used in assembling the dossier and his/her recommendation. The report may also include vote of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (include the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the tenure and promotion decision). Either the department head or the Evaluation Subcommittee should establish clearly the professional standing of the outside reviewers. As much as possible, most of the letters should be from scholars with national reputations at leading institutions or noted departments. The department head's report should also provide an explanatory context by describing the department with respect to such matters as its size, discrete teaching fields or subfields represented, and disciplinary norms or special circumstances affecting decisions in that department.

Items 11 & 12. College Committee's Report and Recommendation and Dean's Recommendation and Summary. Please make tabs in the dossier for each of these items.

Item 13. Annual Reviews (for candidates for tenure & promotion to associate professor). All the candidate's annual reviews by department head and midterm review from dean should be included in the section labeled "Other Materials".

Candidate Biography and Summary Data Table: These items are not placed in the dossier and are due to the College approximately two weeks before the dossier. Please email to the College as WORD documents, using Dean of Faculties templates, by the date specified below. The templates are available at <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>

Photo: Digital photographs of candidates should be head or upper body shots in which the head is 1" high. Minimum of 300 dpi. Please e-mail to the College as an image file.

DUE DATES TO THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS for 2019-2020:

Wed., October 2, 2019 Departments submit the following items to the Dean's Office:

- College Chart
- Faculty Biography Table
- Faculty Summary Data Table
- Tenure Table (only for those going up for tenure)
- External Reviewers Chart
- Grant Charts
- CV
- Photo

Tues., October 22, 2019 Departments submit electronic and hard copy files of all candidates' dossiers to the Dean's Office.

TBD - March 2020 Departments submit one hard copy and one electronic copy of files for all candidates for midterm review to the Dean's Office

IV. SUMMARY

These guidelines are intended to be used by individual faculty, department heads, departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees, evaluation committees, and others in the College of Liberal Arts charged with preparing personnel recommendations for consideration by the Dean's Advisory Committee and by the Dean. Judgmental evaluations of one's colleagues are among the most difficult, but most important, functions required of any faculty member. The quality of the College depends upon the quality of these judgments. The procedures and guidelines presented here are meant to assure that evaluative judgments within the College are reached equitably and with a reasonable degree of comparability of substance and procedure, for all faculty.

V. APPENDIX A: Midterm Review

List of Responsibilities

Candidate:

1. Submit curriculum vitae, verification of contents, and TAMU Grants Chart (template available at <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)
2. Prepare statement on teaching, research and service (maximum 3-pages, single spaced, 12-point).
3. Submit all relevant supporting materials (i.e., reprints, books, syllabi, teaching evaluations).

Department Head:

1. Inform candidate of impending review and of his or her responsibilities.
2. Designate a Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee.
3. Submit an independent personal recommendation.
4. Review and transmit dossier to the Dean's Office (**supporting documents should be kept in department**).
5. Inform the candidate of the vote of Dean's Advisory Committee and of the Dean.
Include the vote of Dean's Advisory Committee and the written report of the Dean in candidate's merit review, or revision of or amendment to same.
6. Share the vote of Dean's Advisory Committee and written report of the Dean with departmental promotion and tenure committee at the time it is received, and attach written report of the Dean to the candidate's subsequent year review materials.
7. In cases in which the majority vote of the DAC differs from the majority vote of the P&T Committee on a candidate's progress toward tenure at mid-term review, arrange meeting with representatives of departmental promotion and tenure committee and representatives of the DAC if requested by the candidate, department head, departmental promotion and tenure committee, the DAC, and/or the Dean.

Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee:

1. Prepare draft report on teaching
2. Prepare draft report on research.
3. Prepare draft report on service.
4. Include supporting materials for above.
5. Prepare a short statement on the quality of the presses or journals in which candidate's scholarly work appears.
6. Transmit draft reports, dossier, and supporting materials to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Head.
7. Finalize and sign reports following the meeting of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee:

1. Review all primary materials relating to the case.
2. Review the draft Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee reports and recommend revisions to the Evaluation Subcommittee.
3. Deliberate and vote on the case (two vote: on progress toward tenure and renewal of annual contract).
4. Prepare and sign report on the meeting that summarizes discussion and includes the vote of the P&T Committee in tabular form.

Dean's Advisory Committee:

1. Review all materials in each dossier.
2. Deliberate and vote.
3. Submit to the Dean a report and recommendation on each candidate.

Dean:

1. Review all materials in each dossier.
2. Provide Department Head with written recommendation of the DAC and Dean.

VI. APPENDIX B: 6th-Year Review and Reviews for Promotion to Professor

List of Responsibilities

Candidate:

1. Submit curriculum vitae, verification of contents, and TAMU Grants Chart (template available at <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)
2. Prepare statement on teaching, research and service (maximum 3-pages, single spaced).
3. Submit all relevant supporting materials (i.e., reprints, books, syllabi, teaching evaluations).
4. Submit Faculty Biography Table and Summary Data Table in WORD (**Must use templates** at <http://dof.tamu.edu/DOF-FORMS#0-Tenure%26PromotionForms>)
5. Submit photo for university tenure and promotion recognition booklet

Department Head:

1. Inform candidate of impending review and of his or her responsibilities.
2. Designate a Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee.
3. Submit an independent personal recommendation.
4. Review and transmit dossier to the Dean's Office (**supporting documents should be kept in department**).
5. Review candidate's Summary Data Table and Candidate Biography and submit to Dean's Office in hard copy and as WORD files.

Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee:

1. Prepare draft report on teaching.
2. Prepare draft report on research.
3. Prepare External Reviews Chart (unless done by Department Head). Template available at http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms
4. Include at least three outside letters of evaluation (usually only tenure and promotion).
5. Prepare statement on credentials of outside referees (when outside letters are present).
5. Prepare list of department's peers and aspirant peers, and the basis for selection (unless done by the Department Head).
7. Prepare draft report on service.
8. Include supporting materials for above.
9. Prepare a short statement on the quality of the presses or journals in which candidate's scholarly work appears.
10. Transmit draft reports, dossier, and supporting materials to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Head.
11. Finalize and sign reports following the meeting of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee:

1. Review all primary materials relating to the case.
2. Review the draft Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee reports.
3. Deliberate and vote on the case.
4. Prepare and sign report on the meeting that summarizes discussion and includes the vote of the P&T Committee in tabular form.

Dean's Advisory Committee:

1. Review all materials in each dossier.
2. Deliberate and vote.
3. Submit to the Dean a report and recommendation on each candidate.

Dean:

1. Transmit College and University forms.
2. Submit additional outside letters of evaluation, when appropriate.
3. Review all materials in each dossier.
4. Submit recommendation and supporting materials to Executive Vice President and Provost.