# Table of Contents

- **Role and Operating Protocol** .................................................................3
- **Peer Review Committee Members** .......................................................5
- **Calendar** ...............................................................................................6

## Forms and Templates

- Reviewer Assignments..............................................................................9
- Committee Report Format and Template ..................................................10
- Rubrics – Why use? ..................................................................................12
  - Example – Rubric Based on Metrics ......................................................13
  - Example – Rubric Based on Expectations ...........................................14
- Voting Ballot Templates
  - College ....................................................................................................15
  - AgriLife Research & AgriLife Extension .................................................16
  - Mid-Term Review ....................................................................................17

## Resources: Policies and Guidelines

- College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee Web Site .........19
- College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee Web Site ........20
- Tenure and Promotion Document Repository .........................................21
- Tenure and Promotion Package Submission Guidelines 2014-2015 ............22
Role and Operating Protocol

College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee

The Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the Directors of Texas A&M AgriLife Research and the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service use the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee to review all requests for promotion/tenure from departments and off-campus research units. The committee reviews all promotion and tenure recommendations and ensures equitable review and evaluation of on- and off-campus promotion candidates, relative to the position description and job expectation for each candidate and the evaluation criteria in teaching, research, service and extension published by the college and agencies guidelines.

The College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be comprised of 16 senior faculty members at the rank of Professor appointed by the Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Dean, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Director, Texas A&M AgriLife Research; and Director, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service. The makeup of the committee will reflect the composition of the faculty within the College, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, and the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, and will be reviewed every three years to ensure it continues to represent the demographics of the faculty. Committee members shall serve two-year terms, with approximately one-half of the committee rotating each year. As with the departmental peer review committees, all members of the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee may vote on promotion and tenure decisions; however, the vote of the tenured faculty on tenure decisions is the vote of record and must be recorded separately for votes on tenure-track or tenured faculty candidates. The results of the committee’s anonymous vote and the overall assessment of the committee relative to each faculty member under consideration shall be explained by the Chair of the Committee in a committee report to the Dean and Vice Chancellor.

The College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee shall review all promotion and tenure Dossiers in accordance with the following:

1. **Review completeness of promotion/tenure candidate’s file.**
   The committee may request additional information, if necessary, particularly if the candidate’s department or unit is not represented on the committee.

2. **Requests for additional information:**
   a. All requests will be made by the Chair directly to the Associate Dean and administrative staff managing the tenure and promotion process.
   b. The Chair and committee members cannot directly approach the candidate, Department Head, Resident Director, departmental faculty, the departmental tenure and promotion committee, or external letter writers.

3. **Review of Dossiers:**
   Each member of the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee will review the complete Dossier of each candidate.
   a. The Committee Chair may appoint sub-committees to carefully review selected Dossiers and prepare a draft report to be presented to the committee of the whole. The sub-committee will re-draft the report to reflect the discussion and opinions of the committee of the whole.
   b. The final report on each candidate will be submitted to the Chair, and the Chair will sign the final report to verify that the vote and comments reflect the opinions of the committee of the whole.
   c. The Committee should focus on nominations of a marginal nature. Specifically:
      1. If the departmental peer review committee and the Head strongly recommend a decision and the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee does not concur, then the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee may request further input prior to
a final recommendation. Detailed comments should accompany all College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee recommendations which are in opposition to the recommendations of the departmental peer review committee or administration.

2. If the departmental peer review committee and the Head are in direct conflict, the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee should carefully review the entire file, including external letters, to determine the merits of the file. If necessary, the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee may invite the appropriate Department Head (and respective Resident Director, as appropriate) and/or the chair of the departmental peer review committee to the meeting to gain further information.

4. **Voting:**
   a. Voting will be conducted in such a way that the individual votes are anonymous and are known only to the person verifying and recording the votes, usually the Chair or the administrative staff assisting with the tenure and promotion process.
   b. The votes of the committee will be reported by:
      a) tenured TAMU members,
      b) non-tenured AgriLife Extension,
      c) non-tenured AgriLife Research members, and
      d) total vote.
   For decisions on tenure-track candidates (promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, tenure only decisions, and tenure upon hire) or tenured candidates (promotion from Associate Professor to Professor), only the vote of the tenured College members are reported on the Dossier cover sheet, but a complete tally of votes should be reported in the text of Committee report.
   c. Abstain, Absent and Recuse Votes: Abstain and absent votes are discouraged. A committee member may recuse themselves from the vote if they feel that have a justifiable reason.
   d. For decisions on tenured or tenure track faculty, each voting member can vote only once. Therefore, the voting member of the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee should recuse themselves from the departmental vote so they can register a vote on the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee.
   e. In order to be eligible to vote, University policy dictates that each committee member reads the material in the Dossier. Subcommittees may review selected Dossiers in detail and prepare a draft report or recommendation to the committee of the whole, but this does not excuse each committee member from personally reviewing the Dossier information.

5. **The Committee Report:**
   The report must contain the vote of committee members along with written explanation and justification. The report should follow all the instructions contained in the University policy on Dossier guidelines. See the Committee Report Format for detailed instructions.

6. **Report to Dean/Directors:**
   The Chair of the College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee will be responsible for transmitting written results of the committee’s deliberations to the Dean and Directors, or the Associate Dean/Director assigned to receive the report.

7. **Improve the Process:**
   At the conclusion of each year’s process, the committee is encouraged to make recommendations regarding changes that could improve the process.

(Compiled from College of Agriculture and Life Sciences/Texas A&M AgriLife Research/Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service Promotion Guidelines)
## 2014-2015 College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee

### Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAMU</th>
<th>On-Campus Departmentalized</th>
<th>Off-Campus Departmentalized</th>
<th>On- or Off-Campus Non Departmentalized</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgriLife Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Rooney, Chair</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Soil and Crops</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 845-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wlr@tamu.edu">wlr@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Williams</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Ag Econominc</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 845-5911</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwwilliams@tamu.edu">gwwilliams@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urs Kreuter</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Ecosystems Sci Mgmt</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 845-5583</td>
<td><a href="mailto:urs@tamu.edu">urs@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Ebbole</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Plant Pathology &amp; Micro</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 845-4831</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d-ebbole@tamu.edu">d-ebbole@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kubena</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Nutrition and Food Scie</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>979 862-3164</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k-kubena@tamu.edu">k-kubena@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Fitzgerald</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Wildlife and Fisheries S</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>979 862-7480</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lfitzgerald@tamu.edu">lfitzgerald@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Park</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>Biochemistry and Biopl</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>979845-8868</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wpark@tamu.edu">wpark@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Isakeit</td>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>Plant Path and Micro</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 842 1340</td>
<td><a href="mailto:t-isakeit@tamu.edu">t-isakeit@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hale</td>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>979 845-2053</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhale@tamu.edu">dhale@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Merchant</td>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>972 952-9204</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m-merchant@tamu.edu">m-merchant@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Paschal</td>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>361-265-6203</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j-paschal@tamu.edu">j-paschal@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy Warren</td>
<td>AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>Fam Dev &amp; Res Mgmt</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>979 845-3850</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j-warren@tamu.edu">j-warren@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael O Way</td>
<td>AgriLife Research</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>409-658-2186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moway@aesrg.tamu.edu">moway@aesrg.tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ray Smith</td>
<td>AgriLife Research</td>
<td>Soil and Crops</td>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>903-834-6191</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g-smith@tamu.edu">g-smith@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Rudd</td>
<td>AgriLife Research</td>
<td>Soil and Crops</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>806-677-5600</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcrudd@tamu.edu">jcrudd@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Muir</td>
<td>AgriLife Research</td>
<td>Soil and Crops</td>
<td>Stephenville</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>254-968-4144</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j-muir@tamu.edu">j-muir@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Wm. Reed</td>
<td>979-458-0710</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwreed@tamu.edu">dwreed@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Wilson</td>
<td>979-845-4766</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdwilson@tamu.edu">jdwilson@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Nemec</td>
<td>979-847-6180</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tinembc@tamu.edu">tinembc@tamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Date Modified: 9/22/14
**Notification and Workshops**

**February-March**

**Department Informs Candidate**: Department informs candidate of upcoming review and instructs them to start putting together packets using 2014-15 Dossier preparation guidelines:


**March 19, AGLS 129, 3-5 PM Understanding the Promotion and Tenure Process**

Orientation to the process for Assistant Professors prior to their mandatory review year, and Associate Professors contemplating submission for Professor

**March 26, AGLS 129, 3-5 PM Candidate Dossier Preparation Workshop** – For candidates preparing their Dossier.

**April 2, AGLS 129, 3-5 PM Administrative Dossier Preparation Workshop**: For Heads, Resident Directors, P&T Chairs and staff involved in preparing Dossiers packets.

**August, place & time TBA Administrative Check-Off List Workshop**: Final workshop to go over check-off list for compliance of in preparation of the final dossier package. For Heads, Resident Directors, P&T Chairs and staff involved in preparing Dossiers packets.

**Anytime**

Mentoring Beyond the Department, one-on-one anytime

**Midterm Review Timelines**

**As per Dept. timeline**

**Candidate submits Dossier components to Department**: The candidate submits their Dossier components to the Head/Resident Director and/or Departmental P&T Committee

**May**

**Departmental Review**: Departmental P&T Committee, then Head and Resident Director review Dossier, and insert reports.

**May 23**

**Department submits final Dossier package to College**: (including candidate’s CV, separate Statements on Teaching, Research and Service, and other material, etc., Dept P&T Committee report, Head/Resident Director report(s), and any internal letters)

**May 26-30**

**College vets Dossiers**: College vets for compliance with 2013-14 Dossier preparation guidelines; Department makes corrections and submitted final version June 1.

**June 2 - August 1**

**College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**: Reviews and prepares reports.

**August 1**

**College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**: Issues report to Dean/Director.

**Early August**

**Dean, Director and Administrative Team**: Review Dossiers

**Mid-August**

**Dean, Director and Administrative Team**: Issue report to each candidate.

**Late August and September**

**Post-Review Mentoring**: College mentors mid-term candidates for College-level perspective.

**Promotion and Tenure (Mandatory) Review Timelines**

**As per Dept. timeline**

**Candidate submits Dossier components to Department**: The candidate submits their Dossier components to the Head/Resident Director and/or Departmental P&T Committee

**Departmental Review**: Departmental P&T Committee, then Head and Resident Director (if applicable) review Dossier, and insert reports.

**September 12**

**Department submits electronic copy of final Dossier to College**: (including candidate’s CV, separate Statements on Teaching, Research, Service, Extension, and other material, Dept. P&T Committee report, Head/Resident Director report(s), and external letters)
September 15-16: **College vets Dossiers**: College vets Dossiers for compliance with 2014-15 Dossier guidelines; return to Department to make corrections.

September 19: **Department returns to College**: Corrected final Dossier – 4 hard copies correctly tabbed and labeled and 1 bookmarked PDF of Dossier.

September 22 – October 28: **College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**: Reviews TAMU Dossiers and prepares reports to the Dean.

October 10: **Dept submits to Dean’s office**: PDF of CV; Excel file of External Reviewers Chart and Grant Summary Chart; Word file of Biography and Summary Data Table and candidate’s photo.

October 28: **College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee Submits to Dean**: Final report.

November 7: **Dean submits to DOF**: Electronic copies of College chart (no need for College P&T and Dean’s vote at this time), Faculty Biography Table, Faculty Summary Data Table and External Reviewers Chart.

October 29–December 1: **Dean, Executive Associate Dean & Administrative Team**: Reviews TAMU Dossiers.

December 3: **Dean submits to DOF**: Recommendations to the provost by sending electronic and hard copy files of all candidates.

December-January: **College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**: Reviews AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension Dossiers and prepares reports to the Directors.

Late January: **Directors**: Reviews AgriLife Research and AgriLife Research Dossiers and issues report to the Vice-Chancellor.
Forms and Templates
## Reviewer Assignments

**College and Texas AgriLife Peer Review Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texas A&amp;M University</th>
<th>Consider For Promotion to</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location*</th>
<th>Reviewer 1*</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AgriLife Extension</th>
<th>Consider For Promotion to</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location*</th>
<th>Reviewer 1**</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AgriLife Research</th>
<th>Consider For Promotion to</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location*</th>
<th>Reviewer 1**</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List Campus or Location of AREC

**Note**: Reviewer 1 is the primary reviewer, and has an ad loc similar to the candidate.
College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee Report
A separate report is prepared for each Candidate

If the decision to promote and/or grant tenure is unanimous or near unanimous at all levels, then an extensive report IS NOT needed. If there are negative votes, then the major reasons for the negative votes must be pointed out. The overall committee report recommendation must be in balance with the vote of the voting members.

- **Report Vote** at the top of the committee report; record by:
  a) tenured TAMU members,
  b) non-tenured AgriLife Extension,
  c) non-tenured AgriLife Research members
  d) total vote.

- **Official Vote** to be reported on the Cover Sheet
  o For TAMU candidates, the vote of the tenured TAMU members is the official vote reported on the Dossier cover sheet.
  o For AgriLife Extension and AgriLife Research candidates, the official vote is the vote of the whole, which is recorded on the Dossier cover sheet.

- **Committee Report** should contain separate paragraphs that address:
  o Table at top reporting the vote by the categories listed above
  o Possibly, an introductory paragraph summarizing the votes at all levels.
  o A paragraph that addresses Teaching
  o A paragraph that addresses Research
  o A paragraph that addresses Extension (for Extension candidates only)
  o A paragraph that addresses Service.
  o Possibly a paragraph summarizing the comments of outsider reviewers.
  o A bulleted list or paragraph that highlights major areas of strength and major areas of concern, and the overall committee vote and recommendation.
  o FYI, an overall “yes” or “no” by the committee is based on a simple majority.

- “all voting committee members sign the report”

---

**Instructions from the Dean of Faculties 2013-15 Dossier Submission Guidelines.**
(http://dof.tamu.edu/content/tenure-promotion-annual-and-midterm-review)

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

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

Report of the
College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee

Dr. name of candidate  Department or Unit:_____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenured TAMU appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-tenured AgriLife Research appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>non-tenured AgriLife Extension appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft a paragraph that briefly addresses each of the following. Specifically point out in which areas they meet the normal expectations and areas in which they do not. Do NOT restate or summarize accomplishments from the CV; rather present summative/evaluative statements.

- Possibly, an introductory paragraph summarizing the votes at all levels.
- A paragraph that addresses Teaching (1st paragraph for College appointments)
- A paragraph that addresses Research (1st paragraph for AgriLife Research appointments)
- For Extension appointments only, a paragraph that addresses Extension (1st paragraph for AgriLife Extension appointments)
- A paragraph that addresses Service
- Possibly a paragraph summarizing the comments of outsider reviewers, but this could be incorporated into the Teaching, Research or Extension/Service paragraphs.

Areas Strength:
- list
- list

Areas of Concern:
- list
- list

In summary, by a vote of ____ yes, _____ no, _____ absent, _____ abstain and ____ recuse, the Peer Review Committee recommends give overall recommendation.

I verify that this report reflects the discussion and voting outcome of the voting members of the Peer Review Committee.

__________________________, Chair

List voting members, and have each sign.
Rubrics

Why use a Rubric?

It is important to develop a consistent and systematic approach to your evaluation of the promotion and tenure Dossiers. One way to do this is to develop and use a scoring rubric.

Use of a rubric promotes a holistic approach to the decision making process and fosters consistency of evaluation, while still preserving the value of those core attributes necessary for promotion and tenure.

Advantages of using a Rubric

- Allows one to base their decision on the sum of a full range of criteria as opposed to a few key criteria.
- Allows consistency in evaluation of multiple packets.
- Development of your own evaluation rubric allows you to reflect upon which metrics, characteristics and/or accomplishments you place the greatest emphasis.

All of this leads to a fair, consistent and defendable decision.

Develop your own rubric

- Consider developing your own rubric.
- The following are examples of several rubrics that others have developed.
## Example of a Metrics Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Rank</th>
<th>Assistant elsewhere TAMUS</th>
<th>Associate elsewhere TAMUS</th>
<th>Total years in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Check Expectation</strong></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate courses/year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate courses/year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Students Advised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADUATE STUDENT TRAINING
- Chair/Co-Chair: Masters
- Chair/Co-Chair: PhD
- Committee: Masters
- Committee: PhD

### PUBLICATIONS and SCHOLARLY WORK
- Refereed Journal Articles
- Since Last Promotion
- Senior Author
- Graduate Students Authors
- Abstracts
- Non-Refereed/Editor reviewed
- Books/Chapters
- Extension/Industry Publications

### GRANTS AND CONTRACTS (allocated to your program) to nearest $50k
- External Competitive Total $ | |
- Internal Competitive Total $ | |
- Since Last Promotion for Professor
- External Competitive Total $ | |
- Internal Competitive Total $ | |
- Gifts-in-kind $ | |
- Other $ | |

### SIGNIFICANT RECOGNITION
- # Awards and Honors
- Society Officer, Editor, Fellow, etc.

### SIGNIFICANT SERVICE ACTIVITIES
- Department
- College/Agency
- University
- Scientific Society
- Society / Public
## Generic Rubric Based on Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Check Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Undergrad and Grad courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching improvement activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching proportional to appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations improve over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Chair Masters and PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Graduate Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Unique Courses Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Check Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles - peer-reviewed/refereed</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles non-peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts/presentations @ sci. meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-competitive (to maintain program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/Collaborative research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in societies/meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence regional,nat/intnat recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for national recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents, copyrights, releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension and Service</th>
<th>Check Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly extension appropriate publ.</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-competitive (to maintain program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in societies/meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate impact of programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and state recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service activities within TAMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver info based on science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles Peer-reviewed/refereed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate demand for programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement: commodity/industry groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/collaborative relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for national recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VOTING BALLOT

#### College and Texas AgriLife Peer Review Committee

#### TAMU Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider For</th>
<th>VOTE (check only one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Check which applies to you:

- tenure track
- non-tenure track

Check Appointment ad loc:

- TAMU
- AgriLife Research
- AgriLife Extension

---

To Verify as a Member, Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee:

Print Your Name ___________________________ Date __________

Return to: ________ Chair

Address: Ag Life Sciences Building, Rm 515
e-mail: email
## VOTING BALLOT

**College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**

### AgriLife Agency Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Promotion to</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AgriLife Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **AgriLife Extension** | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

---

Check which applies to you:

- [ ] tenure track
- [ ] non-tenure track

Check Appointment adloc:

- [ ] TAMU AgriLife Research
- [ ] AgriLife Extension

---

To Verify as a Member, Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee:

---

Print Your Name

Date

Return to:

______, Chair

Address

email

______, Staff

Ag Life Sciences Building, Rm 515

e-mail
### Confidential

#### MID-TERM VOTING BALLOT

**College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee**

#### Mid-Term Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On track for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td>NOT on track for promotion and/or tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAMU**

|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |

**AgriLife Research**

|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |
|                 |            |        |     |        |         |        |

Check which applies to you:

- [ ] tenure track
- [ ] non-tenure track

Check Appointment adloc:

- [ ] TAMU
- [ ] AgriLife Research
- [ ] AgriLife Extension

(bottom section will be cut and removed once verified)

To Verify as a Member, **Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee**:

- Print Your Name
- Date

- Return to: ______ Chair
- Address
- ______ Staff
- Ag Life Sciences, Bldg. 515
- Email
Resources:

Web Sites

Policies and Guidelines
College and Texas A&M AgriLife Peer Review Committee Web Site

http://aglifesciences.tamu.edu/people/facultystaff/tenure-review/

Below is an image of the web site for the Peer Review Committee. Under the Candidates heading is a link to a password protected web site where the dossiers are posted. Rebecca Binder will supply you with the password.

All other items on this page are not password protected and are to be used by the committee as resources if needed.
Faculty Promotion and Tenure Web Site

http://aglifesciences.tamu.edu/faculty-staff/promotion-tenure/

Below is an image of the web site for the faculty. You can download the Operating Manual and all the files for all the resources.
Promotion and Tenure Document Repository

https://agpeerreview.tamu.edu/index.php
PROMOTION AND TENURE PACKAGES

Submission Guidelines
2014-2015

Office of the Dean of Faculties
108 YMCA Building | 1126 TAMU
Tel. 979.845.4274 | dof@tamu.edu | http://dof.tamu.edu/
I. TIMELINE

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

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

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

II. DEFINITIONS

*College chart* - a form listing candidates’ names, departments, ranks, and other information. Instructions on how to complete the college chart, example of the completed chart and link to template can be found in **Appendix B**.

*Dossier* - A file for a single candidate that includes documents submitted by the candidate, outside peer-review letters, reports prepared by the various voting bodies (departmental P&T committee, department head, college P&T committee, dean) and other supporting materials. Departments initiate
the preparation of the dossiers and then forward them to their colleges for further processing and completion. Example and link to PDF template of candidate dossier can be found in Appendix D.

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CANDIDATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Candidate’s CV (Dossier Item 2)

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

• **IMPORTANT**: Departments and colleges may have specific formatting requirements. Please refer to department/college guidelines for detail information.

• The curriculum vitae should be concise and padding should be avoided.

• List refereed publications (or other types of creative works) separately from those that were not refereed, and caption the lists accordingly. Provide complete documentation for each citation, including the date of publication and inclusive page numbers.

• Items that have been accepted but not yet published should be so labeled. (Most departments ask to see an acceptance letter.) Items that have been submitted but not yet accepted should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list.

• It is strongly encouraged that if any coauthors are the candidate’s undergraduate or graduate students (past or present) they are delineated in a manner so that this relationship is discernible.

Signed Statement

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

Additions or changes to the CV

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

C. Grants Summary Chart

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

D. Verification of Contents Statement (Dossier Item 3)

Description

This is a statement by the candidate verifying what materials he/she has submitted for departmental review for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure consideration. The list of materials might include such things as: philosophy statement(s), curriculum vitae, articles, books, portfolios (teaching, research, service, other), student evaluations, list of external reviewers, do not contact external reviewers list, and other materials submitted by the candidate.

Format & Guidelines

• A dated statement signed by the candidate.

• In the statement, the candidate should list *all materials* he or she is submitting to the departmental review committee.
This list should not include departmental reports, outside letters, or other materials not submitted by the candidate.

E. Faculty Biography Table

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

Instructions

Faculty Biography Table

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

Terminal Degree (Year) | Institution

Experience evaluated towards tenure or promotion. Dates (Include semester and year beginning and ending) (See section c. below for explanation and example)

| Institution (Include previous and current institution) (See section c. below for explanation and example) | Title (Include “Tenured” and “Year” if tenure was awarded at other institution) (See section c. below for explanation and example) |

Accomplishments (See section d. below for explanation)

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

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

Required information:

a. Name, department, Present Rank and Effective Date (9/1/2015 for all candidates)

b. Terminal degree, year, and institution

c. Experience evaluated towards tenure or promotion.
   (a) Faculty being considered for tenure or promotion (tenured faculty). Should include only experience that is considered in the evaluation for tenure or promotion (i.e., experience while in a tenured or tenure track position). Non-tenure track positions such as graduate assistant, teaching assistant, lecturer, post-doc and adjunct faculty positions are usually not considered as part of the tenure decision and should not be included. Positions such as those for System agencies or other post terminal degree experiences in which partial credit is considered should be included with years of credit indicated.
Include semester and year the faculty joined Texas A&M University in this section.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do not include pre-terminal degree experience in summation unless experience provides better insight into effectiveness of current faculty effort or fills in gaps of professional career such as an Ed.D. and serving as school superintendent.

Include awards, honors, and special recognitions for work as well. A listing of memberships in professional organizations should be avoided unless it also includes contributions made to organization such as presentations at professional meetings or leadership positions an organization.
e. **Statement on Teaching**: should include reference to teaching evaluation and effectiveness (do not use numerical description of student evaluations: i.e. 4.5 on a 5 scale; instead, use adjectives: e.g.: solid, outstanding, excellent, good, adequate, at departmental average..., and put in context to the department averages for the course level) and any notable honors or awards received.

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

**EXAMPLE of Faculty Biography Table**

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

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

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

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

**New this Year**

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

**F. Faculty Summary Data Table**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Teaching Philosophy</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses Frequently Taught</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Graduate Students Chaired or Co-Chaired</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Other Teaching Accomplishments**

- Accomplishment one
- Accomplishment two, etc.

**Teaching Recognitions and Awards**

- List award/recognition(s) and year(s) given

**Peer-reviewed Journal Articles**

- Number

**Peer-reviewed Proceedings**

- Number

**Books/Monographs**

- Number

**Book Chapters**

- Number

**Conference Presentations**

- Invited—number
- National—number
- International—number

**External Research Funding (Entire career)**

- Total awards—dollar amount *
- Awards to candidate—dollar amount †

**Other Research, Scholarship, or Creativity Accomplishments**

- Accomplishment one
- Accomplishment two, etc.

**Research/Scholarship/Creativity Recognitions and Awards**

- List award/recognition(s) and year(s) given

---

**EXAMPLE of Faculty Summary Data Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching philosophy</th>
<th>Includes as much hands-on learning in the courses as possible, with the overarching goal of creating a link between the textbook and the real world.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses Frequently Taught</td>
<td>BAEN 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduate Students</td>
<td>MS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaired or Co-Chaired</td>
<td>PhD 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teaching Accomplishments</td>
<td>Developed 2 new undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Recognitions and Awards</td>
<td>Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department Excellence in Teaching Award, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Teaching Scholar in the Texas A&amp;M University Center for Teaching Excellence, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Journal Articles</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed Proceedings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Monographs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td>Invited: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Give the total sum of all grants awarded to the prospective faculty member and his/her collaborators
† Of the total sum, give the amount corresponding to the individual faculty member. If unknown, divide each award(s) by the number of PIs and CoPIs authoring each grant and then sum.
New this Year

- Do not change the format of the Faculty Summary Data Table template
- Departments are expected to review all Faculty Summary Data Tables to ensure they are in compliance with the above guidelines

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

Description
This section is for any materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process or letters from TAMU faculty members. Annual performance evaluation by department head and mid-term review report to candidate may be included in this section. **IMPORTANT:** departments and/or colleges may require that certain documents be included in this section. Please refer to department/college guidelines for specific requirements.

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

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

IV. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS LETTERS (DOSSIER ITEM 8)

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

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

- **IMPORTANT:** The department should aim to include 5 to 7 letters from external reviews (which may require asking for more than the desired number). The minimum number of letters required is 3.
- Letters may be received on official letterhead but emailed letters are also acceptable if that is the preference of the reviewer.
- Most outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better, but letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable. In some cases, the preeminence of institutions is obvious. Where the stature of an institution, program, or individual is not obvious, include an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer is appropriate. For example, an institution of lower reputation than Texas A&M may have one of the strongest programs in the candidate’s field. Although letters may be requested from outstanding individuals outside the academy, the file should still include at least three letters from individuals in peer programs/universities.

- **IMPORTANT:** Include a list of the department’s peer and aspiring institutions if other than AAU-level institutions, and the basis for the selection.
- Include a copy of the letters requesting outside reviews, as well as all letters received in response. (If a form letter is used for all reviewers, a single copy may be included, with a notation added to this effect.) Letters should be essentially uniform.
- It is recommended that an equal number of letters be solicited for all candidates.
- It should be understood that a lack of response from a reviewer who has been asked to send a letter should not be interpreted as a negative statement against the candidate.

**Procedures for Requesting Outside Letters**

1. The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers. The candidate may also provide a list of those who should not be consulted.
2. The department head or P&T committee provides a list of possible reviewers.
3. From the two lists, a group of at least seven are selected and contacted by the department head or P&T committee chair.
4. Take care to select outside referees:
   A. whose objectivity is not open to challenge (i.e., avoid coauthors, longtime personal friends, former students, or former mentors unless more than the minimum of three letters are presented).
   B. whose rank at their institution is equivalent to or better than the one for which the candidate is being considered.
   C. who do not appear on the candidate’s “do not contact” list.
5. Ensure that a mix of letters is solicited- some suggested by the candidate and some by the department. Clearly indicate in the External Reviewers Chart who suggested which reviewers, which requested letters were or were not received. All requested letters that are received must be included in the dossier.
6. **IMPORTANT:** It is not recommended that the solicitation letter asks if the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion at their institution but instead asks to evaluate the candidate’s work and its current and potential national and/or international prominence.
7. The solicitation letter should request specific examples of the candidate’s current and potential quality, impact, and independence of their scholarship (for all tenured and tenure track faculty,
and for non-tenure-track faculty if applicable). The letter may request an opinion regarding teaching and/or service.

8. The solicitation letter must contain the following statement:

   Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state and your review could be requested and relinquished.

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

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

V. DEPARTMENT REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teaching Report
The category of “teaching” includes, among other things:

- Classroom and laboratory instruction
- Development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods
- Publication of instructional materials including textbooks
- Supervision of graduate students

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Description
The P&T Committee Discussion Report and Recommendations is advisory in nature. The main purpose of this report is to convey the essence of the departmental committee’s discussion and vote regarding the candidate’s performance as it relates to his or her suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure. The report should make it clear that adequate consideration was given to teaching, research and/or other scholarly, creative activities and service (or relevant categories for the particular faculty member appointment), and that the recommendation was based on a set of written and widely circulated promotion and tenure guidelines promulgated by the college and/or department (which are reviewed and updated regularly). A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities and the committee’s concerns.

The report should reflect the essence of the evaluative concerns and support regarding the candidate’s case, and the committee’s recommended action. For example, “the majority thought the quantity of publications was good, but questioned the quality,” or “a minority was concerned about the rate of productivity,” or “the research and scholarly publications were excellent but a few committee members expressed concerns about the quality of the teaching.” Do not include direct quotes of committee members or minutes of the meeting. Make sure that the discussion report correlates with the vote.

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

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

‡ 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.
• **IMPORTANT**: The names of all the committee members voting in each case should be included in the report.
• **The vote** (i.e. number of yes, no, abstain, absent, recused, total eligible) of the P&T committee must be included in a table format in the discussion report.

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

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

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

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

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

**Description**

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

**Format & Guidelines**

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

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

Description

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

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

Dean Presence at College P&T Committee Meetings

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

B. Dean Recommendation and Summary (Dossier Item 12)

Description

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

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

Reconsideration of a case

If the dean recommends against tenure and/or promotion and that recommendation is contrary to the department head’s recommendation, in accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Section 4.6.3, the dean shall inform the department head and faculty member of the reasons for the recommendation. The department head may then resubmit the case for further consideration to the dean. If a case is resubmitted, it shall be re-reviewed by the college-wide promotion and tenure committee and dean before a final recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion is forwarded to the provost.
Any petition for reconsideration must be based upon either (a) new evidence that is not already contained within the dossier or (b) substantial new arguments that were not made in the first presentation.

In the case of reconsideration requests by the department head to the dean, the basis for seeking the reconsideration of the case and any supporting materials are considered additions to the dossier and should be included in Dossier Item 13 (Additional Information).

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

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

VII. PROCESS INFORMATION

A. Committee Proceedings (Department and College)

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

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

The following chart outlines the notification process. Notification should be made as soon as possible after a recommendation is made at a given level.

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

C. Candidate’s Right to Withdraw

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

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

Note: Guidelines on annual and mid-term (3-year) reviews are a separate document that is available on the Dean of Faculties web site
Mandatory Review (Penultimate Year)

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines focus primarily on procedures for the Mandatory (penultimate year) Review. This thorough review in the penultimate year of probationary service is required; however, conducting the review earlier is often appropriate and encouraged. *(If an early review does not result in a favorable decision for tenure, a review is conducted again at the mandatory time).*

The department head should initiate the mandatory review process, if they do not, any faculty member who is in their next-to-last year of probationary service should notify the department head that the year for a tenure judgment has been reached. This communication should be made in writing in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the matter by any party.

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

Non-Reappointment

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


The “Tenure Clock” (Timing of Reviews)

The start of a tenure-track faculty member’s mandatory consideration year (academic year) can be calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Calendar year hired} + \text{Probationary period} – 2 \text{ years} = \text{Fall semester of Tenure Consideration Year}\]

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

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

For example--For a faculty member hired in calendar year 2009:
If probationary period is: | Mid-Term Review will occur between: | Mandatory Tenure Review (at all levels) will occur:
--- | --- | ---
7 years | Mar – Dec 2012 (due 2012/2013) | 2014/2015
6 years | Mar – Dec 2011 (due 2011/2012) | 2013/2014
4 years | Mar – Dec 2010 (but usually not done) | 2011/2012
3 years | N/A | 2010/2011

**IMPORTANT:**
1. The semester of hire does not determine the start of the “Tenure Clock”, the calendar year does.
2. The length of the probationary period will be found in the faculty member’s original letter of hire and the “agreement concerning probationary service of new faculty” form.
3. The Board of Regents will review recommendations in the spring semester of the tenure review (academic) year.

**Extensions to the Probationary Period**

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

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

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

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

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

E. Department and College Written Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure

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

A copy of each department and college’s guidelines for promotion and tenure should be forwarded electronically, on an annual basis, to:

Megan Smith (megan.h.smith@tamu.edu)

F. Early Promotion and Tenure

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

G. Reviewing Faculty with Joint Appointments

University Rule 12.01.99.M2–University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion, sections 4.6.2.1. and 4.6.2.2., indicate that faculty members having joint appointments (if funded) or having appointments with interdisciplinary (intercollegiate) faculties are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the secondary unit as well as the ADLOC department. This should be done in accordance with the guidelines from both departments/units. Each unit must have guidelines governing faculty review, promotion and tenure (and these guidelines must be approved by the Office of the Dean of Faculties, and reviewed by that office whenever significant changes are made to them).

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

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

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

- Outside letters are not required (although they may be included if desired). It is recognized that some of those in non-tenure track appointments do not have external visibility. However, departments and/or colleges may require external letters in their units. Please refer to department and/or college promotion guidelines for specific requirements.
- The weighting of teaching, research, and service may differ significantly from what is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty. The categories of Teaching, Research and/or other Scholarly, Creative Activities and Service may in fact be changed to more appropriately reflect the individual’s responsibilities and to reflect the evaluation guidelines developed by the college and/or department (regarding those positions).
- Request for promotion of Research Faculty must be routed through the Vice President for Research prior to submission to the Office of the Dean of Faculties.

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

I. Faculty Members Hired Before Terminal Degree Has Been Issued

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

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

VIII. DOSSIER AND FILE SET ORGANIZATION

A. Organization of Faculty Dossiers

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

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

- Candidate Dossier Cover Sheet (See Appendix A)
- Tab 1: Candidate statement on teaching, research and service (Item 1)
Tab 2: Candidate CV (Item 2)
- Candidate CV
- Signed statement
- Candidate grant chart

Tab 3: Verification of contents statement (Item 3)

Tab 4: Department report of teaching (Item 4)

Tab 5: Department report of research (Item 5)

Tab 6: Department report of service (Item 7)

Tab 7: Department report of other activities (if applicable) (Item 7)

Tab 8: External reviewers letters (Item 8):
- External reviewers chart
- External reviewer letter request
- External reviewers biography
- External reviewer letters
- List of peer departments if different from AAU

Tab 9: Department P&T discussion report (Item 9)

Tab 10: Department head report (Item 10)

Tab 11: College P&T Committee report (Item 11)

Tab 12: Dean report (Item 12)

Tab 13: Other materials and documentation (if applicable) (Item 13)

For each candidate’s dossier please do the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Organization and Submission of File Sets

File Set Hard Copies

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

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

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

Example of manila folder label

Smith, John – Associate Professor with Tenure
Nutritional Sciences/Agriculture and Life Sciences– 2014-2015

- For the hard copy dossiers, Tabs with numbered dividers (1-13) must be used in order to assist the reviewers in locating Dossier Items 1-13. Avery 11142/3 dividers (or similar) are recommended.

File Set Organization

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

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

**IMPORTANT:** The manila folders must be organized in the following order:

1. Category
   - A. Promotion with tenure candidates
   - B. Tenure-only candidates
   - C. Tenured, promotion-only candidates
   - D. Non-tenure track, promotion candidates
2. Department
3. Last name (alphabetically, from A to Z)

**Example of hard copy file set organization:**

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

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

A single copy of the college chart must be submitted with each hard copy set.
Banker Boxes
Banker boxes are preferred for transporting your documents to the Office of the Dean of Faculties. Each box should be intact and should contain a secure lid and should weigh no more than 35 pounds.

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

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

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

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

Folders 2-5 should contain:
- Folders labeled as [Department name]. Each department folder should contain:
  - A PDF portfolio of each candidate’s dossier. Labeled as:
    - [Last Name, First Name]
  - An Excel-file of each candidate grant chart. Labeled as:
    - [Last Name, First Name Grants Chart]
  - An Excel-file of each candidate external reviewers chart. Labeled as:
    - [Last Name, First Name Reviewers Chart]

Folder 6 should contain: Separate PDF copies of each candidate’s CV only for those seeking Tenure with Promotion and Tenure-only (required by the BOR).
- Name individual CV files as [Last Name, First Name CV].
- The System requests that the candidate’s name on the CV appear exactly as it appears on the faculty biography table.
- CVs may not contain personal contact information such as home address, home phone number, social security number, or personal email address. (Please remove before sending.)

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

Example of electronic file set organization:
IX. RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

Michael Benedik, Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost, or
Blanca Lupiani, Associate Dean of Faculties
979-845-4274
dof@tamu.edu

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

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

TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF FACULTIES

CANDIDATE DOSSIER COVER SHEET FOR PROMOTION & TENURE
2014-2015

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

DOSSIER ITEMS

1. Candidate's statement on teaching, research, service and or other scholarly, creative activities
2. Candidate's curriculum vitae (with signed acknowledgement of correct, up-to-date content)
3. Candidate's list and signed verification of what he/she has submitted to the departmental review committee
4. Departmental evaluation of quality of teaching (or librarianship)
5. Departmental evaluation of quality of research or other scholarly, creative activities
6. Departmental evaluation of quality of service
7. Departmental evaluation of quality of other relevant activities
8. Statement on qualifications of outside reviewers; All letters received (indicate candidate selection or department selection); Copy of solicitation letter
9. Departmental committee summary report and recommendation
10. Recommendation of Department Head
11. College Committee summary report and recommendation
12. Recommendation of Dean
13. Other materials and documentation

VOTES & RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action By</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Recused</th>
<th>Total Eligible</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/1/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: College Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)

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

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

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE**

*For chart template, please visit: [http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms](http://dof.tamu.edu/PT_Forms)*
### Appendix C: External Reviewers Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY DEPARTMENT**

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

---

#### EXTERNAL REVIEWERS CHART 2014-2015

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY THE DEPARTMENT**

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

---
Appendix D: PDF Dossier Template

TO BE ASSEMBLED BY DEPARTMENT AND/OR COLLEGE

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

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

To add each required document to this PDF under the bookmarked Title Pages follow these steps:

1. Save the documents to be added as a PDF. To make a PDF from Word or Excel:
   a. Go to File
   b. Save as
   c. From the Format pull down menu select PDF

2. Open the “Candidate PDF P&T Dossier Template”

3. Click the “Thumbnail” view on the left side of the document

4. This will display the Thumbnails of the bookmarked Title Pages

5. Drag the PDF file of the document you want to insert under the Title Page for that specific document (Shown as a blue arrow)

6. All the pages of that document will appear under the Title Page in the Thumbnails
Appendix E: Grants Summary Chart (Submit as Excel file not as PDF)

TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE

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

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

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

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE**

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

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

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

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

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

**TO BE FILLED OUT BY CANDIDATE**

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

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

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

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

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

- The personal statement allows you to explain the value and impact of your teaching, research/scholarly work and service accomplishments.
- The candidate’s statement should report on the past accomplishments, present activities, and future plans of the candidate across three areas: research, teaching, and service. It should provide the candidate’s perspective on and interpretation of these matters and go beyond simple reiteration of the content of the vita. Your statement, in conjunction with the CV should provide evidence that good research ideas are coming to fruition and that there is evidence of future promise.
- The statement should be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership including college P&T committee, dean, provost and president and by a professional readership comprised of the departmental and external reviewers. Write in language that is understandable to readers from diverse disciplines. Make it jargon free, enlightening and exciting.
- Writing a statement helps you understand what your contributions have been, and what impact you have had. Understanding these, in turn, can help you see where you want to go, and think better about how to get there.
- **KEY ELEMENTS** of the statement are: quality of work, productivity over time, and impact.
- Advocate for yourself, but be factual; confident but not boastful, intelligent but not stuffy.
- Blending of categories is inevitable – e.g., mentoring undergraduates in a research laboratory can (and presumable should) be considered both teaching and research, and can be addressed in either (or both) section(s).
- Make this your best writing. It is not uncommon for outside evaluators to draw upon your own comments in their written evaluations.
- Convey the excitement of your research and teaching
- Emphasize the broadest implications of your work
- Highlight potentially hidden strengths
- Explain gaps in your record – be your own spin doctor, contextualize the strategic choices of your career
- Simplify, integrate, summarize!
DON’T make it a chore to read your personal statement
- Emphasize primary areas of strength
- Avoid excessive detail, explain selected examples well

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

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

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

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

The Research Statement
- Quality of your Research/Original Creative Work
  - How your strategy for conducting research or your approach to original creative work contributes to the quality of your efforts.
- Relevance of your Research/Original Creative Work
  - How your research is relevant to issues that relate to your field(s) of study
- Impact of your Research/Original Creative Work
  - How does your work break new ground or how is it innovative
- Programmatic Nature of your Research/Original Creative Work
  - How your individual research projects contributed to your program of research, or how individual projects contributed to the focus of your original creative work.
- Sustainability of your Research/Original Creative Work
How your research shows promise for ongoing publication and external research funding (as applicable) = **TRAJECTORY!**

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

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

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

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

- **TRAJECTORY!**

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

**Promotion to Full Professor**

- Years in rank beyond six do not change the expectations of what is required; there may be a shift in emphasis between criteria to reflect the many differences individual professional careers

- If it played a key role in your tenure case, it is of historical interest and can be used to document impact (citations, reviews…)

- **Evidence of an enhanced international/national reputation**

- **Leadership roles**
  - Conference organization vs. presentation
  - Panel leader vs. member
  - Professional society board position vs. membership

**The Teaching Statement**

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

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

- **Course Development**
  - **Impact**: How your development of courses has contributed to the attainment of knowledge and skills needed by your students

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

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

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

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

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

- **Impact**: How your work contributed to meeting needs identified in your community, state, nation, and other countries

Using Teaching and Research to Enhance Service

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

**Promotion to Full Professor**

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

**In Summary**

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

**References/Resources**

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


http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2010/11/10/narrative#ixzz2wcu6d8Zl

Examples of tenure and or promotion statements:

https://provost.asu.edu/promotion_tenure/exemplars