

# Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

School of Performance, Visualization and Fine Arts

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>TIMELINE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>PROCESS INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	<i>A. Committee Proceedings (Department and college/school).....</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>B. Reconsideration of a Case.....</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>C. Notifying Candidates of Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendations .....</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>D. Additions or Changes to the CV .....</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>E. Candidate’s Right to Withdraw.....</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>F. Mandatory (Penultimate Year) Review and the Tenure Probationary Period .....</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>G. Non-Reappointment .....</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>H. The “Tenure Clock” (Timing of Reviews) .....</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>I. Extensions to the Probationary Period (“Tenure Clock”) .....</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>J. Reconsideration in the Terminal Year .....</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>K. Negative Promotion Recommendation.....</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>L. Department and College/School Written Guidelines for Promotion &amp; Tenure.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>M. Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments .....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>N. Academic Professional Track Faculty Promotions .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>III.</b>	<b>DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CANDIDATE .....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<i>A. Candidate Impact Statement on Teaching; Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities; Service; and Other Activities (if applicable) (Dossier Item 1) .....</i>	<i>11</i>
	Description.....	11
	RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK .....	13
	TEACHING .....	16
	SERVICE .....	18
	CONSIDERATIONS FOR PROMOTION (ASSOCIATE RANK TO FULL).....	19
	Format & Guidelines .....	21
	<i>B. Candidate’s CV (Dossier Item 2).....</i>	<i>21</i>
	Description.....	21
	Format & Guidelines .....	21
	Signed Statement.....	22
	Additions or changes to the CV .....	22
	<i>C. Grants Summary Chart .....</i>	<i>22</i>
	<i>D. Verification of Contents Statement (Dossier Item 3) .....</i>	<i>22</i>
	Description.....	22
	Format & Guidelines .....	22
	<i>E. Faculty Biography .....</i>	<i>22</i>

	Description.....	22
F.	<i>Faculty Summary Data Table</i> .....	23
G.	<i>Other Materials and Documentation (Dossier Item 13)</i> .....	23
	Description.....	23
<b>IV.</b>	<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS LETTERS (DOSSIER ITEM 8)</b> .....	<b>25</b>
	Description.....	25
	Guidelines .....	25
	Procedures for Requesting and Documenting Outside Letters.....	26
	External Reviewers Chart .....	27
<b>V.</b>	<b>DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE SCHOOL</b> .....	<b>28</b>
A.	<i>Faculty Tenure Table</i> .....	28
	Description.....	28
	Required information: .....	28
B.	<i>School Evaluation of Teaching; Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities; Service; and Other Activities (if applicable)</i> .....	28
	Description.....	28
	Format & Guidelines.....	29
C.	<i>Teaching Report (Dossier Item 4)</i> .....	29
	Guidelines .....	30
D.	<i>Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities Report (Dossier Item 5)</i> .....	31
	Guidelines .....	31
E.	<i>Service Report (Dossier Item 6)</i> .....	32
	Guidelines .....	333
F.	<i>Other Activities Report (Dossier Item 7)</i> .....	33
G.	<i>Department P&amp;T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation* (Dossier Item 9)</i> .....	33
	Format & Guidelines.....	33
<b>VI.</b>	<b>DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY COLLEGE/SCHOOL</b> .....	<b>36</b>
A.	<i>College/School Committee Report and Recommendation (Dossier Item 11)</i> .....	36
B.	<i>Dean Recommendation and Summary (Dossier Item 12)</i> .....	36
	Description.....	36
<b>VII.</b>	<b>DEFINITIONS</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>DOSSIER AND FILE SET ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT</b> .....	<b>40</b>
A.	<i>Required Content of Faculty Dossiers</i> .....	40
B.	<i>Organization and Submission of File Sets</i> .....	41

<b>IX.</b>	<b>RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>42</b>
A.	<i>Questions? .....</i>	42
B.	<i>Appendices.....</i>	42
	Appendix I: Template External Reviewer Request Letter At a minimum, the following language is required: .....	42
	Appendix II: Guidelines on Writing a Tenure and/or Promotion Impact Statement .....	45
	Appendix III: Evidence Supporting Performance in Teaching.....	49
	Appendix IV: Evidence Supporting Performance in Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities ...	55
	Appendix V: Evidence Supporting Performance in Service .....	60

## I. **TIMELINE**

March/April 2022	The Vice President for Faculty Affairs requests that deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings.
November 4, 2022	Deans submit electronic copies of college/school chart ( <u>no need for college/school P&amp;T and Dean's vote at this time</u> ), Faculty Tenure Table, Candidate Dossier Coversheet, External Reviewers Chart and Candidate photos, for all candidates, to the Office of Faculty Affairs.
December 2, 2022	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.
January 2023	Deans meet with the Vice President for Faculty Affairs and review recommendations. The Vice President for Faculty Affairs forwards recommendations to the President.
January/February 2023	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.
April/May 2023	BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases. Congratulatory letters for tenure and promotion will be sent mid-May.
September 1, 2023	Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.

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 Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation, in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#), § 4.6.3, the dean shall inform the P/T Committee and faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The Associate/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs 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 Associate/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs to the dean, a memo explaining the basis for seeking the reconsideration of the case must be uploaded in the Associate/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs 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. The University rule can be found at [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)

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. The Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs who in turn will communicate the decision to the college/school dean. 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 their division head, Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs, 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 Dean 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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

If probationary period is:	Mid-Term Review will occur between:	Mandatory Tenure Review will occur:
7 years	Mar – Dec 2020 (due AY 2019-2020)	2022-2023
6 years	Mar – Dec 2019 (due AY 2019-2020)	2021-2022
5 years	Mar – Dec 2018 (due AY 2018-2019)	2020-2021

The semester of hire does not determine the start of the “Tenure Clock”, the calendar year does.

The length of the probationary period will be found in the faculty member’s original letter of hire and the “agreement concerning probationary service of new faculty” form.

The Board of Regents will review recommendations in the spring semester of the tenure review (academic) year.

## 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs prior to the scheduled time that the School 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.

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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs and with the agreement of the dean and the Vice President for Faculty Affairs that reconsideration is appropriate. The sole ground on which an Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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) 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.

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](mailto: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/School 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](mailto: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 School recognizes that faculty in some academic professional track appointments do not have external visibility. Those APT faculty with only teaching and service requirements, as stated in their contracts, will not be required to have outside letters as part of the review process; however, these faculty may elect to include outside letters as part of the review process. APT faculty whose

responsibilities include research in their titles and/or assigned responsibilities will be required to include external letters in their dossiers for promotion.

- 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. ○ 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). APT faculty should consult with the P/T committee and/or Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs to address categories of Teaching; Research and/or Scholarly or Creative Activities; or other Activities based upon their assigned responsibilities and titles. APT faculty will be assessed primarily based upon their duties and responsibilities assigned annually by the School/Section/Department.

Academic professional track faculty seeking promotion will submit a dossier for review, organized in the way described in [Section III](#). Committees, 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 a school APT P/T committee of the whole 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

All dossiers must include the common required documents (e.g. impact statement, CV, and various forms and summaries detailed in this section).

Further, department/college/schools should inform the candidates of all the additional documentation expected to be submitted by the candidate (Required: course syllabi, representative assignments and exams, grading methods and sample of students work with instructor feedback; and Optional: classroom observation, continuous improvements to course/teaching, evidence related to other teaching contributions, direction of undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral scholars, other mentoring activities, substantial revision of courses, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in student professional development programs, participation in honors programs, awards for teaching, scholarly approaches to teaching, other activities related to teaching or non-traditional work related to teaching).

- Note that these documents will not be included in the dossier submitted to the readers, Provost and President but will be kept in the Interfolio case submitted, and access if needed.

Deadlines for submission of these documents are determined by individual departments and/or college/Schools.

- Please refer to department and/or college/school guidelines or request for applications for additional information.

#### 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 and include a breakdown of the load by percentage. 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 fulfills expectations 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).

Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Work	Teaching	Service
Quality Publications	Feedback from teaching observations	Officer in a (inter)national professional organization
Editing a scholarly book	Narrative of significant continuous improvement	Serving as a program chair at a (inter)national meeting
Major research or fellowship awards	Student satisfaction	Governmental commission
Citation of publications	Student outcomes	TAMU administrative role
Research or Scholarship Awards	Publication of instructional materials	Editor or member of editorial board for a major journal
Juried works of creative activities	Essential course development	Reviewer journals and grants
Review panel service	Teaching awards	Officer on Faculty Senate
Invited national presentations	Direction of graduate students	Chairing a major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee
Invited international presentations	Invited teaching at peer or aspirant institution	Evidence of professional service to local community or public, including clinical work and extension service
Significant external peer-reviewed research funding	Student professional development and mentoring	
Publications with teaching focus in leading journals	Significant service as an advisor	Committee chair in (inter)national professional organization
Public activity in performing or diverse arts	Teaching grants	
Patents or commercialization of research, where applicable	Service as a course coordinator	Advising a student organization
	Member of graduate committees	Department, college/school or university service
	Graduate student publications	
	Graduate student placement in industry or academia	
Significant self-development activities, such as intensive workshops or Faculty Development Leave that improve research effectiveness	Significant self-development activities that led to demonstrated enhanced teaching effectiveness	Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

## **Additional Examples for Excellence that may be included for consideration**

### **Introduction**

The School of Performance, Visualization & Fine Arts (PVFA) is committed to attracting and retaining faculty of exceptional merit whose contribution to their field is recognized nationally and internationally. For faculty teaching, studio and/or theory courses, the SFAVP considers an MFA or a PhD. terminal degrees. All faculty are hired with the expectation that they will establish themselves as outstanding teachers, artists, researchers, and/or scholars. Candidates for tenure are expected to consistently engage in the following areas: scholarly research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service.

In the evaluation process, the SFAVP recognizes that members of its faculty are involved in diverse areas of specialization in teaching and research. This diversity is viewed as a major strength of the PVFA as it provides students with a wide range of educational experiences. Duties and responsibilities assigned to faculty varies, therefore, various criteria are of different importance in each individual's tenure case.

All candidates understand they will be evaluated in accordance with the general tenure and promotion expectations of Texas A&M University. The following items typify the kinds of activities appropriate for the attainment of tenure and promotion in the SFAPV. The PVFA **does not** require the tenure track faculty to demonstrate all of the activities listed below and recognizes that each faculty member will possess a unique set of talents, interests, and accomplishments.

### **RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK**

In evaluating research or creative work, both quantity and quality are considered. There is no fixed quantity of research or creative work that is required for adequate performance, and there is no quantity of research or creative work that can substitute for quality. Quality can be assessed by the standards of the profession and are typically measured through a rigorous review process. Evidence for rigorous review can be demonstrated through an editorial process, exhibit, jury, performance audience/critique review, art commission, professional award or similar review process by peers. However, there is always merit in a candidate's pursuit of activities in less prominent venues for reasons of establishing professional contacts, gaining exposure, and learning from experiences. Use of such venues can also play an essential role in developing a well-rounded body of work. It is expected that appearing in more prominent venues will typically be balanced against activities in less prominent venues. A high quantity of appearances in less prominent venues may compliment, but not replace a solid record of appearance in prominent venues.

In addition to quantity and quality, research or creative work is evaluated with respect to its intellectual and creative coherence and promise for future development. Indications of growth and development beyond points achieved in the past are desirable, as are indications that the body of work over time amounts to a substantial contribution to the field, as evidenced by citation by other scholars, published reviews of one's work, or public exhibition in respected venues. Creative work should demonstrate a high level of skill obtained through experience, study, observation and collaborations when applicable

Multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary work will be considered equal to discipline-specific work of comparable quality and impact. Research or creative work itself may constitute satisfactory work if it is leading towards, but has not yet culminated in, publication, performance, or exhibition; for example, a faculty member may spend considerable time pursuing scholarly or creative work before publication, performance, or exhibition. Conference presentations, local performances and exhibitions, or similar research steps should be considered part of the research process that lead to a substantial body of work such as a publication, or national/international performance, exhibition, or similar production of a

scholarly product. Candidates may wish to clarify or explain how steps undertaken lead to a culminating product through final publication, performance, or exhibition, which are the result upon which evaluation is based.

Faculty with joint appointment with other academic departments or programs may be evaluated according to review criteria that diverge somewhat from these bylaws, as agreed upon by the heads of the specific units and approved by the Dean's Office. The PVFA encourages and supports faculty collaboration in teaching, research and creative activities. Collaborative projects often require multiple principal investigators and rely on student involvement. These on campus activities set the PVFA apart from other institutions and add to the prestige of the programs in the school. Candidates should clearly state their contributions to the project and the impact their work had on the final product.

Performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. Some additional indicators of success may include, but are not limited to:

- Visual examples of significant work in the form of a video or document, clippings, periodicals, books, games, and other published materials, as well as statistics related to internet downloads and documented impact in the form of online communities can also be included in the final dossier to provide additional information.
- Publication of scholarly monographs, scholarly edition with an author introduction and notes, translations published in rigorously reviewed venues, digital databases, archives, and research tools of scholarly value, edited book from a refereed press, textbooks and educational material (e.g., serious games), original musical compositions, or recordings in refereed academic presses, commercial publishing houses, and recording labels by publishers who uphold a rigorous review process. Publications should demonstrate a rigorous review process through acceptance rates, refereeing processes, readership circulation, or other similar processes to reflect the standards in the discipline. Candidates may wish clarify or explain the review process and discipline standards if other processes are used. PVFA recognizes not all disciplines have publication opportunities.
- Invited papers and/or other scholarly or creative presentations
- Understanding and anticipating user needs and devising solutions for user problems; experimenting with new ideas, innovative techniques, or alternative approaches to library procedures; Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional or procedural materials; Development of innovative organizational methods and materials; Design and development of new resources that support University education or library programs or scholarship, such as development of substantial media or development of computer programs or databases; Creating or developing a computer program of value in education
- The creation and breadth of adoption of software tools by composers, conductors, designers, directors, improvisers, or performers
- Competitively selected presentations, posters, installations, performances, and demonstrations at regional, national or international conferences and/or events, and/or conferences with archived proceedings
- Curated exhibitions in regional, national or international museums and galleries

- Editor-selected publications of artworks in regional, national or international magazines and journals
- Competitively selected games, animations, movies, photography or documentaries in major festivals and events
- Work Purchased by public or private collections
- Donations by private companies or non-profit organizations.
- Securing of internal or external grants, commissions, contracts, awards, writers' residencies or retreats and other evidence of competitive support for research and/or creative activities; all grants are considered valuable but special consideration can be given to highly competitive grants, contracts, etc.
- Research and creative activity that is well received by scholars or other experts who are recognized authorities in the field
- Publication of reviews of scholarly or creative work in well-regarded venues
- Invited appearances/residencies in regional, national or international venues such as, but not limited to work as an actor, choreographer, dancer, rehearsal director, stager, composer, conductor, designer, director, lecturer, playwright, performer, dramaturg
- Invited performances of original musical compositions or works for the stage in regional, national or international venues
- Any acting, composing, conducting, designing, directing, performing, staging, rehearsal director, and writing of/in musical, theatrical, performance, or exhibition activities appropriate to the faculty member's professional pursuits in regional, national, and international venues
- National recognition for lay audiences such as performances on, featured interview on national radio/television broadcasts/streaming services or in documentary films, commentaries on/interviews included in DVD/Blu-ray productions
- Significant self-development activities such as a Faculty Development Leave that led to increased research, creative activities and/or publication effectiveness
- Activities that may not form part of a rigorous review process but help increase recognition of one's work among both the general public and peers and demonstrate impact, may be considered important activities. Evidence of these activities can be included in the dossier to provide greater context and demonstrate the effect of one's work on the discipline and in the general public. Activities that have led to transformations within a field, in which subsequent work by others can evidentially be shown to have derived from exhibition, performance or publication of the candidate's own work even without formal citation or attribution, may be included.
- The PVFA is focused on creating future leaders in their respective fields. Faculty investment in on-campus and community-based performances that involve students enhance the student's

education through knowledge transfer, increases the University's access to the arts, and enriches the community. This type of public activity in performing or diverse arts is encouraged and seen as essential to the role of faculty. When these activities are done as a collaborative effort crossing disciplinary boundaries their merit is increased.

### **On Campus Creative Activities**

The development of the PVFA was based on expanding the arts at TAMU and in the community. To encourage faculty to engage in on-campus performances and exhibitions it is critical that tenure and promotion guidelines reward this type of activity. These activities often engage students in performances and are seen as high-impact educational experiences essential to the students' growth and development in the arts.

Because creative endeavors and research go hand-in-hand in the arts, creative endeavors conducted as a part of the PVFA production program and outreach efforts shall be considered a significant activity counted toward tenure and promotion.

Every production or exhibition demands considerable research on the part of its director, choreographer, designers, playwrights, dramaturgs and performers. Likewise, contributions to the creative process required of those in the areas of administration/management are as valued and equivalent to those of directors, choreographers, designers, painters, playwrights, dramaturgs, and performers. This type of research/creative endeavor should demonstrate that faculty members continue to contribute to their discipline and to the school/university/community and beyond. Directing, choreography, design, fabrication, visual arts, performance, playwriting, dramaturgy, and administration/management creative endeavors increase the faculty members' knowledge and application of principles and practices which can later be used in classes as case studies or as demonstration of best practices and continuing accomplishment in the field. These types of creative endeavors reflect practical application and may or may not be published; however they do adhere to discipline specific national accreditation standards, which are equally valued within the School. Evidence of these activities demonstrate a sustained research and review process that culminates in a larger body of work.

The PVFA recognizes the significant work off campus performances require due to time commitments and other logistics.

### **TEACHING**

Teaching includes (1) classroom performance in all of its aspects, as well as (2) various types of more individualized instruction and activities. The first category includes participation in team-teaching, revising current courses, developing new courses, developing new teaching techniques, and serving as a guest - instructor. The second category includes such activities as individual tutoring, directing "problems courses," participating in thesis and dissertation direction, advising students, supervising internships, or independent study programs, directing Honors Program projects, and leading Honors Program group

The nature of each course taught should be considered in determining competence in teaching. A large section presents particular challenges, especially when taught without the assistance of graduate students or student workers, as does any course with a high percentage of non-majors taking the course to satisfy a requirement. Consideration is given to the level of course (100, 200, 300, and 400), whether the course is designated specifically for Honors students, has writing intensive designation or includes a capstone project.

Regarding student course evaluations, consideration should be given to the fact that teaching styles vary

greatly from individual to individual and that some subjects are more popular with or controversial for students than others.

Performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. Some additional indicators of success may include, but are not limited to:

- Significant contributions to the professional development of students, including study abroad, field trips, conference attendance/presentations, rehearsals, participation/mentoring in research, construction of costumes.
- Significant contributions to teaching through non-credit instruction, including study abroad, field trips, conference attendance/presentations, rehearsals, participation/mentoring in research, construction of costumes, set design/construction, lighting design and implementation.
- Effective direction of graduate and/or undergraduate research or creative activity such as dissertation, honors theses, independent study courses, etc.
- Student achievements, including progress in subsequent courses
- Membership in multiple undergraduate/graduate advisory committees.
- Receipt of awards for research/creative activities or academic performance by the faculty member's students.
- Placement of multiple graduate students or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly and related positions, placement of undergraduate students into significant industry positions or graduate/professional schools
- Written testimony from current or former students
- Development and implementation of new courses or course materials and significant revision of existing courses or course materials
- Grants for pedagogy: teaching, curriculum development, etc.
- Division or school-funded grants for teaching, curriculum development, etc.
- Leadership in program curriculum re-design or other long-term, sustainable curricular/programmatic change
- Leadership in teaching initiatives in the school with impact
- Multiple participation in and delivery of teaching workshops and other such activities, participation in other programs (e.g. CTE).
- Pedagogical presentations resulting from invited or peer reviewed teaching presentations by conferences, universities or museums
- Documented impact of published pedagogical books, articles, texts, workbooks, software, or

other instructional materials

- Publication of texts, workbooks, software, or other instructional materials

### **SERVICE**

Service includes service to the University, the School, the Division, the Program, the discipline, as well as the community, the city, the state, the nation, and the world. Activities may include the development of services having a significant effect on the institutional program of TAMU, participation in campus-level appropriate representative groups; the creation of initiatives that significantly advance the school's strategic planning goals in tangible ways, and the creation and oversight of sustainable diversity/inclusion related programs. The PVFA recognizes the extraordinary effort undertaken by administrators, faculty, and staff in the creation, strategic planning, and management of a new PVFA with new programs and institutional processes during the first few years of implementation.

Supporting and initiating internal and external collaboration is also a valued aspect of service. Less obvious but still important indicators of service include establishment of professional ties to colleagues in other departments, colleges, universities, and other professional institutions and organizations. This is especially important if such ties are related to activity germane to the goals of the Department (for example, the goal of furthering interdisciplinary work involving both the Department and other academic entities). Emphasis is given to service efforts which promote internationalization and/or campus diversity and which demonstrate recognition in national and international venues

Performance and their respective indicators will vary over time for any individual at different career stages. Some additional indicators of success may include, but are not limited to:

- Participation as an adjudicator on panels/committees for outside funding agencies, performance organizations, tenure, and promotion reviews of faculty at other universities, etc.
- Active participation in development of community-based educational initiatives with significant impact and visibility
- Service as an adjudicator of professional musical, theatrical, dance, performance or other creative works at competitions, festivals, and exhibitions
- Advising undergraduate and graduate students
- Adjudicating student musical, theatrical, dance, performance or other creative works at competitions, festivals, or exhibitions
- Public sector service such as production of recordings, archival work, and the development of local, regional, or national public sector music, theatre, dance, performance or other creative works programs including but not limited to artist-in-residence programs, music, theatre, dance, and performance festivals, exhibitions, etc.
- Invited speeches and other presentations in public, non-academic settings utilizing professional expertise
- Community service in, or applying one's areas of, expertise to the local community or public at large.

- Service on multiple external peer committees for tenure and promotion cases
- Service as a proposal reviewer for scholarly awards or on a governmental task force, commission or board.
- Participation on review panels for major institutional grants or national funding agencies.
- Omnibus reviews or article-length reviews.
- Serving in Steering and Program Committees and chairing of specialized and/or national conferences, exhibitions, festivals, and competitions
- Serving in leadership positions in professional organizations

### **CONSIDERATIONS FOR PROMOTION (ASSOCIATE RANK TO FULL)**

#### **Evaluation Criteria for Professor:**

Typically an Associate Professor is considered for evaluation to Professor after four years of service and experience at the rank of Associate Professor, although there is no years in rank requirement. The promotion, however, is not a function of the number of years of service, but of clearly demonstrated achievement and distinction in research, teaching, and service. Professors should be nationally and internationally visible, and recognized as leading scholars in one or more fields in which they have made an impact on the profession.

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 PVFA 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 and recognition as a leader in their discipline. 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 their record be documented by the department through multiple indicators.

The overall record of research must be recognized as a significant scholarly contribution by the profession. Such recognition may be established through published reviews, citation lists, editorship(s) of and/or membership(s) on the editorial board(s) of a major journal(s), and related or similar professional criteria.

A professor is expected to be a leader in teaching, service and professional involvement. The rank Professor bestows a special responsibility for the overall progress of the school, and for the relations with other University entities, faculty and students. While scholarly achievement is normally the deciding factor for this promotion, true eminence in other areas may carry considerable weight. The PVFA recognizes that during initial stages of creation and development of new programs and institutional processes involved with the construction of a new PVFA and facility, administrators, faculty, and staff will provide an extraordinary level of service.

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.

Outstanding service and leadership are demonstrated by engagement in division, College, University, and professional activities that further the intellectual and pedagogical profile of the institution

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor:

- Accomplishment in research for full professor is measured against the contributions of others in the field and the realized impact of the individual's scholarly or artistic research on the field, and there should be evidence of growth beyond the level attained upon promotion to associate professor, candidates should have a rating of at least "effective" in the other two areas of teaching and service.
- Evidence of continuing growth as a teacher and researcher beyond the level attained upon promotion to associate professor should be provided, and for some candidates, evidence of impactful scholarship on teaching and learning may demonstrate leadership in the field and serve as a measure their impact in the discipline.
- Evidence of continued growth to full professor in addition of meritorious performance, evidence of national and international impact is expected.
- Originality of contributions to the field; innovative or outstanding publications, exhibition, or performances
- Quality, significance, and impact of publications, exhibitions, performance, or archived products of scholarship
- Continuing accomplishment and some measure of national or international recognition or impact as a disciplinary leader in research or another form of creative activity
- Evidence of academic leadership through provision of valuable professional service. In some cases, impact may be demonstrated through extraordinary service when such leadership makes a major contribution to the field through the creation of nationally recognized programs, fields of study, or other institutional contributions that elevate the university and its mission in ways that are recognized as exemplary by peer and peer aspirant institutions.
- Scholarly or artistic work which is perceived as outstanding in the field
- A strong reputation in the candidate's field of study
- Effective teaching and recognized service sections
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member (university rule 12.01.99.M2, p. 14).
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University

#### **Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track )**

Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track) For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (non-tenure track), faculty members should be evaluated in their assigned areas of faculty performance. Faculty with Research in their title will be evaluated with a

primary emphasis on the quality and impact of their research/scholarly/creative work activities. For promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is expected for Academic Professional Track Faculty.

Clinical faculty members make a unique contribution to the education and training mission in the School. Clinical faculty are generally full-time faculty who are not only engaged in teaching, but also are engaged in clinical training, supervision, service activities, program development, and/or other areas of practical application. In addition, clinical faculty can participate in grant activities, thesis and/or dissertation committees, and other professional and/or scholarly activities, as appropriate. There is a 10% FTE expectation in research for clinical faculty.

#### **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 impact 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.

There is not a mandated University CV template.

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. 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.

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

### Guidelines

- Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, 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.
- 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 letters for academic professional track faculty promotions are required only for those on the research track.
- 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 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;
  - 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:** 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 chair of the P/T committee 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 P&T committee provides a list of possible reviewers. With the list of possible reviewers, the chair of the P/T committee 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 P&T committee chair. NOTE: If the faculty member holds a funded joint appointment, the department/division should work together on the selection of external reviewers.
- It is recommended that about equal number of letters be solicited from the candidate and the P&T committee lists.
- A minimum of three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the P&T committee 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, the P&T committee can use the Interfolio option to request and track external reviewers letter requests.
- It is the responsibility of the P&T committee chair to ensure receipt of at least five (5) letters, they are responsible for requesting and tracking the external reviewer letters and 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.

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 P&T committee 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 P&T committee 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 P&T committee.
- 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 THE SCHOOL

### 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.

**Present Rank Yrs. Towards Tenure\* Effective Employment**

**Name Department Univ. Other Inst. Date/Tenure Education Towards Tenure COLLEGE OF XXXXX**

Dr. John H. Smith  
Associate Professor  
Construction Science

a. Name (Must  
match name on  
CV)

b. tenure

Terminal degree,  
year, and  
institution

6 0 9/1/2021 Ph.D.  
(2008) University of  
Michigan

c. Experience  
evaluated towards

Fa 2015 – Present  
Associate Professor  
Texas A&M  
University

#### Required information:

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. School 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.

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 a subset of faculty members of the school's P&T committee. If needed, due to the lack of expertise in the committee 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 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).

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 (for jointly-appointed faculty), 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.

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 Program Coordinators for academic programs must provide these data to the candidates (candidates do not have access to the School’s program 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:

\*the dean in consultation with the dean’s advisory council decides 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 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 or creative activities. 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 school’s 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 P&T 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 are not an appropriate measure of impact, candidates may want to include alternative metrics for success.
- 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, 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 school 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.) This report is not required for the SFAPV and candidates are not required to submit materials for this report. If a special need arises, the candidate should consult the Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs and chair of the P/T committee on whether an Other Activities Report is necessary. This section should be left blank if it does not apply to the candidate.

### G. 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 P&T 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 school. 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 discussion report and recommendations should emphasize a case based on the evidence that supports the recommendation, an explanation of contrary statements in the departmental (for jointly appointed faculty )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 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.

Committee discussions and recommendations regarding candidates should be independent of the recommendation, opinion, or influence of any administrator.

It is therefore recommended that the Associate/ Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs not attend the meetings during which the committee is processing a case.

The Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs input must be limited to answering procedural questions or provide clarifying information, not their personal opinion.

- 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

If the dean votes NO and the P/T Committee YES, the P/T committee in consultation with the Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs will have the opportunity to resubmit a case for reconsideration, See [“Section B: Reconsideration of a Case”](#) of this document.

- 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.
- 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.

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:
- 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.

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 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 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.

If the dean votes NO and the P/T committee voted YES, the P/T Committee 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 (P&T committee, department head (for faculty with joint appointments), school P&T committee, dean) and other supporting materials. The P/Committee initiates the preparation of the dossiers and then forwards 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.
- 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 Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs 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. The P/T will form a committee of the whole made up of all faculty from eligible ranks to evaluate tenure-track faculty, and a separate committee of the whole will be formed by all APT faculty from eligible ranks to evaluate APT faculty
- 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 (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. 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 P/T committee will form a committee of the whole made up of all faculty from eligible ranks to evaluate tenure-track faculty, and a separate committee of the whole will be formed by all APT faculty from eligible ranks to evaluate APT faculty.
- 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. The Chair of the P/T Committee is an ex-officio member and does not vote. If the school does not have enough eligible faculty members, the Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty Affairs, and Chair of the P/T committee will determine which faculty from other
- department/college/schools with related expertise will be selected and added to the department/college/school committee. These outside faculty members will only have responsibilities in the department that directly relate to the P/T committee and can only vote in that capacity.

## VIII. DOSSIER AND FILE SET ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT

### A. Required Content of Faculty Dossiers

The school initiates the preparation of the faculty dossiers within Interfolio and then forward them to the candidate 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. P/T committee report of teaching (Item 4) 6.P/T committee report of research (Item 5)
7. P/T committee 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. P&T discussion report (Item 9)
12. College/School P&T Committee report (Item 11)
13. Dean report (Item 12)
14. Other materials and documentation (if applicable) (Item 13)

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](mailto: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](mailto: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.] \_\_\_\_\_ 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. APT faculty may have different assignments and responsibilities.

*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
  - Emphasize primary areas of strength
  - Avoid excessive detail, explain selected examples well
- Explain critical terms in a simple and clear way
- Be optimistic yet realistic
  - If you cannot be positive about your contributions, few others will think they should be
  - Portray things in their best light, but don't over-reach – readers may call your bluff

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

- Convey what is exciting about your research, scholarly, and/or creative work, teaching, and service activities
  - Describe the innovative approaches or cutting-edge aspects of your work
- Emphasize the broadest implications of your work
- Highlight potentially hidden strengths
- Address perceived weaknesses
  - Imagine your worst critics – use your statement to undermine their case
  - Be honest – acknowledge weaknesses, but demonstrate how you have overcome them
  - Explain gaps in your record – be your own spin doctor, contextualize the strategic choices of your career
  - Demonstrate that you recognize the issue, you have learned from it, and you have moved forward in an appropriate and professional way. A narrative reflection on success and

challenges can help reviewers understand inconsistencies in your record.

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

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

- Describe evidence that you are widely perceived as outstanding among peers
- Explain the ways you are instrumental in advancing the academic needs of your unit
- Explicitly address your contribution to strategic initiatives for your unit, college/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, scholarly and/or creative work 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, presenting, exhibiting, or performing 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, scholarly, and/or creative work 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, scholarly, and/or creative work to improve your instruction (courses, directed individual study, and supervised research)
  - How you have involved students in your research, scholarly, and/or creative work
  - 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, scholarly, and/or creative expertise contributed to the work of your professional organization?
- How has your research, scholarly, or creative 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.

Evidence Related to Course Teaching	Questions for Consideration
Record of all courses taught	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many courses?</li> <li>• Taught how often?</li> <li>• To how many students?</li> <li>• How does the average course load for this candidate over the period under consideration correspond to unit expectations?</li> </ul>
Course syllabi Sample syllabi required <a href="#">(link - assessment instrument)</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the quality of the syllabus?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is it clear?</li> <li>○ Does the syllabus represent the course as well organized and well designed?</li> <li>○ Does the information, readings, materials described in the syllabus demonstrate the current state of the discipline?</li> <li>○ Are the assignments and assessments well-paced for that stage of the curriculum?</li> <li>○ Does the course fulfill expectations of the academic unit for content and process skills needed for subsequent courses?</li> <li>○ Is there evidence of best practices in inclusive teaching?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <a href="#">More syllabus assessment questions</a></li> <li>• Does student feedback indicate anything about the syllabus?</li> </ul>
Assignments Sample assignments required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you view assignments as effective pedagogical methods and materials?</li> <li>• What does student performance on the assignment indicate about its effectiveness, their satisfaction with the learning environment, and/or student success?</li> <li>• Is how the assignment will be assessed clear within the assignment description (e.g. rubric provided)?</li> </ul>
Examinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your assessment of the exams?</li> </ul>
Sample examinations required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How do exams compare with best practices in the discipline?</li> <li>○ How innovative are they?</li> <li>○ Do the exams represent rigor appropriate for this level course?</li> <li>• How well do you expect the exams capture student performance?</li> </ul>

<p>Grading methods Sample of student work with instructor feedback required</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your assessment of the grading methods?</li> <li>• Do the methods reflect best practice?</li> <li>• Do the grading methods facilitate student learning?</li> </ul>
<p>Structured classroom observation (optional)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were course observations done?</li> <li>• Were course observations based on specific standards? (e.g. <a href="#">link – Classroom Observation Feedback Form</a>)</li> <li>• What was the frequency of the observations?</li> <li>• How has the teaching quality changed across observations of the candidate?</li> </ul>
<p>Continuous course and teaching improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have courses and teaching evolved?</li> <li>• How has the instructor engaged in reflection and continuous improvement of teaching to enhance teaching effectiveness?</li> <li>• What, if any evidence, is there that the candidate pursued professional development to identify and implement appropriate and innovative pedagogy?</li> </ul>
<p>Evidence Related to Other Teaching Contributions</p>	<p>Questions for Consideration</p>
<p>Direction of graduate students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the graduate students supervised by the candidate progressing in a timely manner?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
<p>Direction of undergraduate researchers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are undergraduate projects and experiences with this candidate consistent with expectations in the department?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
<p>Direction of Postdoctoral Scholars</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
<p>Other mentoring activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What sorts of advising or mentoring activities outside of research and scholarship does the candidate do with students, postdocs, staff, colleagues?</li> </ul>

Curriculum & course development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the faculty member participated in design and/or implementation of the curriculum assessment?</li> <li>• Has the faculty member improved the curriculum by adopting or improving implementation of high impact practices?</li> </ul>
Substantial revision of existing courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the faculty member assuring courses are current and employ best practices?</li> </ul>
Textbooks, & other instructional materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the unit?</li> <li>• How is faculty member contributing to educational materials in the field?</li> <li>• Are the materials state-of-the-art?</li> <li>• Are the approaches described innovative?</li> </ul>
Participation in student professional development programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
Participation honors programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What distinguishes the instruction the faculty member designed for honors students?</li> </ul>
Awards of recognition for distinguished teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the faculty member been recognized with awards for the commitment to and achievement in teaching?</li> <li>• How exclusive are the awards, how are the winners selected?</li> </ul>
Continuous improvement of other contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of mentoring effectiveness?</li> <li>• How has the faculty member engaged in professional development, reflection and/or continuous improvement of curriculum design or assessment associated effectiveness?</li> <li>• Has the faculty member received competitive internal grants or fellowships related to these activities?</li> </ul>
Scholarly approaches to teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the faculty member presented his/her teaching approaches in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the department/college/school?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ at a campus workshop?</li> <li>○ at a campus teaching conference?</li> <li>○ at a state, national, or international teaching conference?</li> <li>○ in the teaching sessions of a discipline specific conference?</li> <li>• 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)?</li> </ul>
<p>Evidence Specific to Student Ratings</p>	<p>Questions for Consideration</p>
<p>Standardized chronological table/Discussion of student evaluation data</p>	<p>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 dean-level determination in consultation with the dean’s advisory council, 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the data align with student success in the course?</li> <li>• 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)?</li> <li>• What conclusions about teaching performance do you draw from the data?</li> <li>• What do you learn from the data?</li> </ul>
<p>Continuous improvement of factors identified in student evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>

**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.

<p>Evidence Related to Publications/Creative work</p>	<p>• Questions for Consideration</p>
<p>Quality and quantity of publications or creative works</p> <p>Review of selected publications/work expected</p> <p>Scholarship of teaching and learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• What is the quality of the journals, publishers (for books), other venues (for art)? • What evidence is there that the research/scholarship is published completely and transparently regardless of results?</li> <li>• How would you describe the quality and impact of the research, scholarly or creative work ?</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• In cases where the candidate publishes scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), does the work advance understanding in a primary discipline?</li> <li>• In what ways does the SoTL act to translate the specifics of a discipline to a broader audience?</li> </ul>
<p>Evidence Related to Funding (as appropriate to the discipline)</p>	<p>Questions for Consideration</p>
<p>Consistency and Trajectory</p>	<p>The School recognizes that not all research, scholarship or creative activities require grants/funding, that some fields have far fewer grants/funding opportunities than others, and that internal funding might be the most appropriate indicators in some fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• How has the grantsmanship of the candidate aligned with departmental expectations?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have there been extenuating circumstances outside the candidate’s control associated with the period under consideration?</li> <li>• Has funding improved with recognition of the candidate in the field?</li> <li>• Has the candidate been successful garnering grant renewals?</li> </ul>
Granting agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the candidate secured funds from the premier funding sources in that discipline? • Describe the quality of funding sources, and address whether or not the sources are congruent with department and disciplinary expectations.</li> </ul>
Variety of funding sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In what ways has the candidate secured funding from a variety of sources (if appropriate to the discipline)?</li> </ul>
Evidence of Overall Impact	Questions for Consideration
Contribution to societal need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• How well does the scholarship contribute to the vision, mission, and strategic initiatives for the unit, college/school, and university?</li> </ul>
Appropriate dissemination of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the evidence that the candidate shares the research/scholarship results and expertise appropriately, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ datasets</li> <li>○ software</li> <li>○ research tools and approaches developed</li> <li>○ indicators of openness and transparency conducive to advancing the field and cultivating an excellent reputation within the scholarship community</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Exhibitions</li> <li>● Performance</li> </ul>

<p>Collaboration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Explain whether authorship consistent is with the contribution?</li> <li>• In what ways do others value the quality of the candidate’s expertise as indicated by a clear record of collaboration?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
<p>Degree of risk/reward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How might this strength, nonetheless, be responsible for the rate or stage of advancement of the research, scholarship or creative activities relative to adopting a purely “safe” approach? • Are there aspects of the research, scholarship or creative activities portfolio that demonstrate originality?</li> </ul>
<p>Upward trajectory for research progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the research, scholarly or creative work quality improve over time?</li> <li>• In what way is the scholarly or artistic work perceived as outstanding?</li> <li>• Does the candidate have a strong reputation in his or her field?</li> </ul>
<p>Invitations, Honors, Awards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What noteworthy aspects of the candidate’s service record indicate they are recognized in their field of scholarship?</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the candidate received honors or awards for their scholarship?</li> <li>• How exclusive are the awards?</li> <li>• How are the winners selected?</li> </ul>
<p>Overall research, scholarship or creative activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the candidate distinguished themselves as a leader in local, national, and/or international settings</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**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. • Moher D, Naudet F, Cristea IA, Miedema F, Ioannidis JPA, Goodman SN (2018) [Assessing scientists for hiring, promotion, and tenure](#).

### **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.

Evidence Related to Departmental Service	Questions for Consideration
<p><b>Formal Service Roles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in standing committees</li> <li>• Leadership of standing committees</li> <li>• Participation in or leadership of a temporary subcommittee or task force</li> <li>• Liaison activities with donors or industry partners</li> </ul> <p><b>Informal Service Roles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentoring or peer-review of colleagues</li> <li>• Providing expertise for a department need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for the department? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Taking into account their research and teaching activities (APT faculty may have different assignments and weights for activities), is the service contribution by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For committee membership by the candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can you describe the ways the candidate engages and adds value as a member?</li> <li>○ 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?</li> <li>○ Can you elaborate on instances where the candidate contributed high quality work products necessary to accomplish committee/taskforce goals?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In instances where the candidate leads service efforts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which of their strengths align well with project success?</li> <li>○ How well does the candidate handle the necessary communications and/or meetings with colleagues associated with leading a service effort?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For candidates who perform formal donor or industry partner engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How do those stakeholders regard the candidate and the communications, interactions, responsibilities the candidate executes?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does the candidate assist colleagues by providing feedback on ideas, manuscripts, creative works, and grants? Are there particular ways the candidate markedly improved the School's climate or culture via a concerted effort to establish a needed element?</li> <li>• Does the candidate contribute to initiatives that improve the School's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion for all? The School recognizes that minoritized faculty and staff are often particularly impacted by advising and mentoring in DEI capacities.</li> <li>• 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Describe the value added by their service</li> <li>○ As possible, include evidence that the service contributes to the goals of the department.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Evidence Related to College/School and University Service	Questions for Consideration

College/School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for the college/school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this level of college/school service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> <li>○ Was there leadership or innovation involved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?</li> <li>• What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?</li> <li>• Did the service help advance any college/school level initiative(s)?</li> </ul>
University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for the university? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this level of university service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> <li>○ Was there leadership or innovation involved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does the service they are providing coincide with a particular expertise?</li> <li>• What specific contributions did the candidate make during this service?</li> <li>• Did the service by the candidate serve to represent the department or college/school well? • Did the service help advance any university level initiative(s)?</li> </ul>
Evidence Related to: service to the discipline	Questions for Consideration
Professional Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for the professional organization(s)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this level of professional organization service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> <li>○ Was there leadership or innovation involved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is there evidence the candidate served with excellence?</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Editor, reviewer, or judge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for journals, publishers, grant review panels, or other entities that judge? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> <li>○ Was there leadership or innovation involved?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Evidence Related to: service to society	Questions for Consideration
Community, state, nation, international	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What service has the candidate done for the community, state, nation, or internationally? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is this level of this type of service by the candidate in alignment with departmental expectations?</li> <li>○ Was there leadership or innovation involved?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

**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.