

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES (2009)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Dean's Advisory Committee intends for these procedures to serve three purposes: (a) to state clearly the personnel policies and procedures of the College of Liberal Arts, (b) to show how these conform to personnel policies and procedures established by Texas A&M University, and (c) to indicate the kinds of evidence the Advisory Committee and the Dean require in order to make informed judgments on personnel cases submitted to them. In serving these purposes we also describe the criteria applied to personnel decisions. We seek to promote comparability of substance and procedure relative to College standards, while permitting variation by departments within the framework of their existing statements of policy.

A. **Context**

Personnel policies for Texas A&M University are governed by The Texas A&M University System policies adopted by the Board of Regents on February 27, 1995 (most recently revised September 26, 2008), and the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 dated June 20, 1997 and revised July 27, 2001). In addition, instructions for implementing the tenure policies are distributed annually by the Associate Provost and Dean of Faculties (<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/>)

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

Here are some features of University policy as currently interpreted:

- * Peer review at the departmental level, in the form of a Promotion and Tenure Committee of some kind, is prescribed.
- * Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees must consist only of tenured faculty when tenure recommendations are being considered, and only of faculty at a rank higher than the candidate when promotion recommendations are being considered.
- * Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee advises the Head of the Department, who is charged with making an independent administrative recommendation to the Dean of the College.
- * Peer review at the college level, in the form of an Advisory Committee of some kind, is prescribed.
- * College Advisory Committee advises the Dean of the College, who is charged with making an independent administrative recommendation to the Provost through the Dean of Faculties.
- * For persons currently on appointment at the University, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is tied to award of tenure; similarly, tenure may not be awarded to candidates whose rank is less than Associate Professor.
- * Letters of evaluation from outstanding representatives of the candidate's discipline external to Texas A&M University are required in dossiers of all candidates considered for tenure or promotion.

- * All cases considered for tenure in the mandatory year, whether recommended positively or negatively, must be forwarded through channels to the Provost and the President.
- * In the case of promotion to full professor, when the departmental review has been completed, the department head will transmit the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of both the head and the faculty committee to the dean of the college for review. (The default practice should be that the file in a non-mandatory promotion case goes forward as far as the dean level).
- * At any point, candidates for promotion may elect to withdraw their names from further consideration.
- * If the faculty member being considered has a joint appointment funded in two or more departments, the department in which the faculty member is administratively located (ad loc) has the responsibility to ensure that the review process is conducted in accordance with the regular Promotion and Tenure procedures of the relevant departments.
- * If the faculty member being considered has an appointment with an intercollegiate faculty in addition to a departmental appointment, then the ad loc department must request a review and evaluation from the intercollegiate faculty.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

General criteria for retention and advancement within the faculty are stated in the University documents referenced earlier. To supplement these, we provide here the expectations we have in mind in evaluating cases brought before us for consideration.

A. Criteria By Rank

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

Associate professors with tenure should demonstrate meritorious performance in teaching, research or creative work, and service. The kinds of evidence discussed under "III. Procedures" provide an opportunity for assessing meritorious performance in each of these areas.

- (a) Teaching must be shown to be consistently competent, and the evidence presented should be both substantial and sufficiently thorough to make a strong case. The College's expectation is that the evidence in successful tenure cases will show a genuine commitment to undergraduate and, where appropriate, graduate teaching. Moreover, the College also expects that the record will indicate that the courses taught by the successful applicant will be characterized by diligent preparation, careful organization, clarity of presentation, intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the students being taught, and fair and appropriate evaluation of students' tests and assignments. Finally, it is expected that any master's theses and dissertations that an applicant supervises will be of high quality.

- (b) Research and creative work must show evidence of both accomplishment and promise, and must be consonant with the aims of a major research university. A first book or series of articles based on the dissertation should be published as early as is consistent with practices in nationally visible departments. Third year reviews will evaluate a candidate's plans for completing work derived from the dissertation and development of a research program beyond the dissertation. In all cases for tenure and promotion to associate professor, there must be evidence of a significant and sustainable research program that is beyond any book or series of articles derived from the dissertation and that is demonstrated in thematically or theoretically related externally peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, research grants or fellowships, or other evidence of research activity.
- (c) Service must show signs of developing citizenship in the University and scholarly communities.

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

3. Professor. Professors should demonstrate outstanding accomplishment in both teaching and research, and valuable professional service contributions. Their research or creative work should show continuing accomplishment and should have achieved national recognition. Candidates for full professor must indicate on their vita all work that was published or accepted for publication and considered during their review for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

In accordance with University Rule 12.01.99.M2, 4.5.4, exceptions to the normal requirements for promotion to full professor may be warranted. Few faculty will possess the qualities that will warrant such exceptions, however, and in such cases the candidate most likely will be a faculty member with a lengthy term of employment at Texas A&M University. The burden of proof rests with the candidate to demonstrate that he or she meets the criteria outlined in the University Rule.

B. Probationary Period and Early Tenure

1. The probationary period. A candidate appointed to a full-time faculty position in academic rank normally begins service in a probationary period of fixed duration, which may not exceed seven years. Appointments that are temporary and part-time or special appointments that are clearly short-term will ordinarily fall outside the provisions set for the probationary period. Normally, leaves without pay or similar suspensions of academic service do not count toward calculation of the maximum seven-year probationary period. The policies of the Board of Regents, however, permit full-time service in academic rank at another institution of higher education to be counted as part of the probationary period up to a maximum of three years of service.

The typical case is a candidate who has just been awarded a Ph.D. degree, who has no prior full-time teaching experience, and who will, therefore, be appointed to the rank of assistant professor, eligible for probationary appointment extending through seven years. At Texas A&M University, probationary appointments are reviewed annually, the effect being a series of one-year term appointments throughout the probationary period. After two full years of service, the University will provide notice of its intent to renew the appointment one full year in advance of its action. Therefore, since the probationary appointment may not extend beyond seven years, a decision is mandated in the sixth year whether the candidate will subsequently be offered a tenured appointment.

Because some candidates arrive with prior academic service that may be credited toward the seven-year limit, up to a maximum of three years, these candidates will have a shorter probationary period. Therefore, a decision concerning tenure generally comes earlier than the sixth year for candidates with prior academic service. Some candidates may be able to waive the prior academic service credit to which they are entitled, thereby extending their overall probationary period. In such instances, however, the decision must be made with the full assent of the faculty member, the department, and the dean, preferably at the time of the initial appointment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Tenure upon arrival. Normally, candidates for senior appointments will be offered tenure-upon-arrival if they hold tenure at a peer institution. Each case, however, must be reviewed by the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), the Dean, and the Provost. Formal offers of a faculty position with tenure may not be made without advance approval of the Provost. (For more information, see the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Hiring Guidelines.) A candidate with extraordinary qualifications who does not hold tenure at a peer institution may be offered tenure-upon-arrival. In such cases, the department head should forward to the DAC, through the Dean, a dossier including evidence of excellence in teaching, research, and service. The dossier submitted to the DAC must include the P&T Committee's vote and its summary report on the candidate's teaching, research, and service. **The department must also submit a short biographical paragraph to be submitted to the Board of Regents.** The DAC will hold the candidate to the same scholarly/creative standards applied to other candidates for tenure in the College of Liberal Arts.

C. Discussion of Criteria

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

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

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

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

III. PROCEDURES

A. Formal College-Level Reviews

Probationary appointments at Texas A&M University are generally for one year only and are renewed on a year-to-year basis. The College of Liberal Arts normally conducts formal college-level personnel reviews of faculty on probationary status at two times: once near the end of the candidate's third year of service and again during the candidate's sixth year of service. Normally, candidates who are credited with two years of prior academic service at the time of appointment will undergo "mid-term" review during their second year in rank at Texas A&M; i.e., during the fourth year according to their tenure clock. Candidates who bring three years of service will not have a formal "third-year review" but will, of course, have annual reviews in their respective departments during the fourth and fifth years. Aside from these two formal college-level reviews, faculty on probationary status are reviewed annually at the departmental level. Any of these reviews can result in a decision not to renew the probationary appointment.

Of the two formal college-level reviews, the review in the sixth year normally includes consideration for tenure and is, therefore, more comprehensive than the review in the third year. For example, since evaluation letters from external referees are required in cases of tenure or promotion but not otherwise, a review in the third year would not usually include such letters.

Dossiers of faculty being considered for the third-year review, or tenure and/or promotion are read and discussed by the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC). DAC members are recused on cases from their own departments and must leave the room while the case is being discussed.

Individuals associated in accordance with the System policy on nepotism (33.03) with the faculty being considered for renewal, tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor may not participate in either departmental or college-level discussions or votes on a case that is covered by the System policy.

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

B. Preparation of the Dossier

1. For the mid-term review:

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

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

- a) Candidate's personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced, 12-point font) of his/her goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in teaching, in research, and in service and other activities.

- b) An up-to-date curriculum vitae that clearly distinguishes between refereed and non-refereed publications and identifies whether unpublished manuscripts have been accepted for publication or are under review. **Includes faculty acknowledgment that the CV is correct and up-to-date.**
- c) Copies of all review letters sent by the Department Head to the candidate.
- d) Separate reports on teaching, research, and service, and a summary report, written by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Copies of numerical teaching evaluations from all courses taught at TAMU and copies of reports of classroom visitation by colleagues, if any, should be included with the supplemental materials.
- e) Votes of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee on the questions 1) Is the candidate making satisfactory progress toward promotion with tenure? and 2) Should the candidate be reappointed?
- f) Recommendation letter from the Department Head indicating his/her overall judgment of the candidate's progress toward tenure, and, if reappointment is recommended, what progress needs to be made during the remainder of the probationary period.
- g) For more information, see section C below.

2. For the review for promotion and tenure:

A fair and thorough evaluation of the candidate's tenure case by tenured members of the department is essential. To this end, the Department Head will establish a Evaluation Subcommittees for each candidate under review. This subcommittees will prepare three separate draft reports—on teaching, on research, and on service. A summary report is also required. The summary report cannot be finalized until after the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee meets, but the report may be presented in draft prior to that meeting.

The draft reports prepared by the Evaluation Subcommittees will form the basis for consideration of a case by the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee (which consists of all tenured faculty in the department) and are to be forwarded to the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee along with the candidate's dossier for review. These materials will form the basis for discussion at the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee meeting. The discussion will be moderated by the chair of the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee, who is selected according to department bylaws. The chair is also responsible for ensuring that the final version of the four reports represents the faculty voice. The final version of the reports, prepared by the faculty rather than department heads, must summarize the discussion of the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee's meeting and reflect the vote of the committee. The bylaws of each department shall indicate whether absentee balloting is permissible and under what circumstances. If absentee ballots are permitted, the bylaws shall indicate the voting procedure.

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

The candidate may meet with the Evaluation Subcommittees before they begin deliberation of the case to confirm the status of the dossier and to provide or receive any information pertinent to consideration of the

case. Thereafter, a candidate for renewal, tenure, or promotion shall not attend any committee meeting at which the candidate's case is being considered, unless invited for a specific purpose.

C. Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Interdisciplinary Programs

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

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

The department(s) and program(s) involved will work together to identify a single set of between three and six external reviewers that will be acceptable to the P&T committee in each department/program. The head/director of the units and an additional representative from each unit will meet in the fall of the 5th year to identify specific steps for soliciting nominations from the candidate and from each department/program. This group will create a final list of individuals to be contacted.

The department or program in which the candidate holds the majority of his/her appointment (or in which the candidate is administratively located, in the case of a 50/50 appointment) will be responsible for contacting external reviewers, and securing letters, vita, and short biographies from external reviewers.

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

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

D. Materials to be Included in the promotion/tenure dossier. Refer to the Dean of Faculties "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion" (<http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/>) for submission format and guidelines:

Item 1. Candidate's personal statement and acknowledgment. Candidates must submit a personal statement (a maximum of three pages, single spaced; 10 or 12 pt font; 1 inch margins) of his or her goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases in carrying out his or her professional responsibilities in teaching, in research, and in service and other activities.

Item 2. The curriculum vitae. The basic descriptive document forming a dossier is a complete curriculum vitae which should include at least the following information:

- (a) Degrees received, including dates and institutions;
- (b) History of prior academic and related employment, including time and various ranks;
- (c) Fields one is qualified to teach, including areas of special interest;

- (d) Course program for at least the last two years including, by semester, the course number, course title, and enrollment;
- (e) Record as:
 - (i) supervisor of independent work of undergraduate or graduate students and
 - (ii) principal adviser of graduate students working on advanced degrees, distinguishing between completed and uncompleted degrees;
- (f) Record of publications with complete citations making clear the distinction among the following categories:
 - (i) books and monographs,
 - (ii) articles, indicating which are refereed,
 - (iii) notes and comments,
 - (iv) chapters in books,
 - (v) fellowship and research grants received,
 - (vi) papers presented at professional meetings, and
 - (vii) abstracts and book reviews.

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

- (g) Professional and service activity, both intramural and extramural, such as committee or other assignments, membership or leadership in scholarly societies, editorial services to scholarly publications, consulting activity, honors and special recognition received, and public service related to professional expertise.
- (h) A signed statement indicating that the curriculum vitae being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature. NOTE: This is different from the Verification of Contents sheet. See item 3 below.

Item 3. Verification of Contents sheet. This consists of a list of ALL materials submitted by the candidate (not including outside letters) to the departmental review committee as well as a signed statement by the candidate acknowledging the contents of the dossier.

Item 4. The teaching report. Because of the self-evident difficulties in persuasively defining teaching effectiveness, no single set of satisfactory criteria can be prescribed. Conscientious examination of a variety of indicators of teaching performance, however, produces an overall pattern which can be fairly evaluated. Such indicators are generally of two kinds: materials prepared by the teaching faculty member and records of the reaction of colleagues and students. Both should be examined by the Evaluation Subcommittee. While teaching evaluations need not include comparisons with departmental norms, if the teaching report includes comparative claims about the candidate's scores on student opinion surveys, it must cite the specific departmental or college averages to which the comparisons are made.

Prepared materials that should be examined and evaluated include course syllabi and examinations. Qualitative judgments could include an assessment of the care with which instructional materials such as texts have been selected; use of instructional aids such as films, demonstrations, and field trips; and appropriate use of the course format, including, for example, whether laboratory exercises were integrated with lectures. The focus of concern should be on the quality of mind brought to bear on the enterprise of teaching. Also to be considered under prepared materials is any record of the development of techniques or modes of instruction, including substantial revision of existing courses or development of new courses.

Textbooks authored by the candidate can also constitute a significant contribution to teaching. A proposal for a grant for curriculum development, if successful, may also be considered as an instance of prepared materials when the grant project aims toward improvement in instruction.

Reactions of colleagues and students that should be considered include:

- (a) surveys of student opinion of teaching,
- (b) receipt of awards for outstanding teaching,
- (c) opinions of other members of the candidate's discipline, particularly if based on class visitations or on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate,
- (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate or attracted to the University by the candidate's reputation as scholar and teacher, and
- (e) evidence of effective learning, such as mastery of material by students taught by the candidate in courses prerequisite to those of the informant. Other forms of student and/or colleague reaction may also be appropriate. For example, a candidate might present evidence based on pre-test/post-test comparisons or other performance measures indicating that the amount of student learning of the material in the candidate's classes has been particularly high. Similarly, if the candidate's colleagues consider the candidate a catalyst for the initiation of new approaches to teaching in their own courses, this should also be noted.

The teaching report should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been based. Surveys of student opinion of teaching are valuable but should be supplemented by other forms of evaluation. Whenever student opinion surveys are part of the dossier, they should be interpreted by the Evaluation Subcommittee. Thus, if a particular instructor's teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

Item 5. *The research report.* An analytical summary of the research or creative record is always useful and can be persuasive in making a case. This kind of summary analysis, however, cannot substitute for qualitative judgment. Counting and sorting publications is not the same as evaluating their quality, and the evaluation is what is important.

A few works of high quality are obviously more important than numerous insignificant works. Emphasis on the quality of work requires attention to these kinds of questions: Is the work that of a single author? If not, what then is the contribution of each individual? What is the quality of the journal? Or, in the case of a book, was it published by a recognized university press or by a good trade press? Is the article or story or performance an integral part of an ongoing research or creative program? Does it show promise of impact and continuing work? Does the work reveal evidence of significant post-doctoral research? How is the work regarded by peers in the field?

Members of both the Evaluation Subcommittee and the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee should personally examine publications and other examples of creative work that are listed in the dossier. Copies of publications, or selected examples of publications, should be deposited in the Department Office to be available to all members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee while the case is under consideration.

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

In the evaluation of publications and other creative and professional accomplishments, interpretations by the most qualified members of the discipline as well as by outside referees of national reputation in the

discipline are extremely valuable. Reviews and citations and appraisals in the publications of others constitute particularly significant testimony. Use of bibliographic citation indices is often helpful. The record of research grant proposals and fellowships applied for and awarded should be examined and interpreted. A positive pattern of professional development as scholar or creative artist should be demonstrated.

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

Original work should normally be considered as evidence only after publication or exhibition. If the work has not yet been published or exhibited, written evidence of acceptance for publication or exhibition must be provided. A given achievement should not be counted as an accomplishment justifying advancement of a faculty member if it has been employed in earlier justifications, except in the obvious sense of counting as part of a cumulative record. Occasionally, a scholarly or creative work increases considerably in stature and importance after its initial publication. In such instances, the increase in stature must be shown through such evidence as reviews, anthologies, and significant citations, and may be considered in context for subsequent promotion decisions.

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

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

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

Item 8. *Outside letters of evaluation of research or creative work.* Letters of evaluation from scholars outside the university are required in all cases of tenure or promotion. The preponderance of outside letters should be from peer institutions or better. In cases where the stature of a particular program or the letter writer is not obvious, the reason for soliciting a particular reference needs to be stated. A minimum of three letters must be included. The candidate may submit a list of persons to be considered as referees, and may also submit a second list of persons who ought not to be consulted. The Evaluation Subcommittee should select referees using its own independent judgment of propriety and qualification, subject to one constraint: at least one of the outside letters should be from a referee on the candidate's preferred list if such a list has been submitted. It is highly desirable that at least two referees be designated independently by the Evaluation Subcommittee. Whenever lists are submitted by a candidate, they must become part of the official dossier that is forwarded.

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

The value of outside letters depends on the choice of appropriate persons who are discriminating judges and who are familiar with the candidate's work or will take the trouble to study it. Letters from the candidate's major professor, or the candidate's graduate student colleagues, are generally less persuasive to a case than more clearly objective sources and should therefore, as a rule, be avoided. Outside referees should be asked to comment only upon the candidate's research and other creative work, and not upon teaching or service. Copies of outside letters and an evaluation of the credentials of the referees prepared by the chairperson of the Evaluation Subcommittee should accompany the dossier. Further, a copy of the letter soliciting the external evaluation should be included as part of the dossier. The solicitation letter should include the following sentences:

1) *"The candidates' dossiers are, of course, evaluated by faculty and administrators outside their discipline. The question of quality of publication venue is often raised. Thus we would appreciate your assessment of the quality of the presses and/or journals in which the scholarly [or creative] work appears, as well as of the work itself."*

2) *"Individuals and groups reviewing candidate files are interested in placing the scholarly or creative achievements in the context of promotion and tenure decisions being made nationally in the discipline or field. Therefore, it would be helpful if you were to discuss whether the scholarly or creative record of this candidate would lead to a recommendation of promotion/tenure at your institution or, more generally, whether the work meets the standards normally expected for tenure and promotion at nationally visible departments in your discipline or area of expertise. Does this candidate's research or creative achievements qualify as leading work in the discipline or field?"*

The letter must also contain the following statement:

"Your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law. However, under Texas law your letter could be relinquished through an open records request."

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

- (a) The maximum number of reviewers, in the absence of special circumstances, should be six. Normally three will suffice.
- (b) When possible, personal contact (e.g., a telephone call or e-mail message) should precede a written request so that letters of request are not sent to larger numbers of outside evaluators than are necessary.
- (c) The candidate is to be informed what materials (e.g., manuscripts, proposals, publications) are being sent out for review. The materials to be reviewed need not include all of the candidate's work, but should not exclude material the candidate judges indispensable to his or her assessment.
- (d) Three external reviewer is to be provided
 - (i) an explanation of the relative importance of external reviews in the overall review process;
 - (ii) a statement as to the limits on confidentiality of the assessment;
 - (iii) a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae and of the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based; and
 - (iv) sufficient time for a complete and conscientious assessment, as a rule not less than one month.

Item 9. Departmental (T&P) Committee Report and Committee Minority Report. A minority report of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee is not required. However, when a vote on a candidate's case is divided, dissenting members of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee may submit a signed minority report to the department head, who shall then distribute it to the full Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. The majority, if it wishes, may reply in writing. The majority and minority reports and the reply to the minority report, if any, must be submitted to the department head and be included in the candidate's dossier.

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

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

Item 13. Annual Reviews (for candidates for tenure & promotion). All the candidates annual reviews by department head and mid term review from dean should be included in the section label "Other Materials".

IV. SUMMARY

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

V. APPENDIX A: Mid-Term Review

List of Responsibilities

Candidate:

1. Submit curriculum vitae.
2. Prepare statement on teaching, research and service (maximum 3-pages, single spaced, 12-point).
3. Submit all relevant supporting materials (i.e., reprints, books, syllabi, teaching evaluations).

Department Head:

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

Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee:

1. Prepare draft report on teaching.
2. Prepare draft report on research.
5. Prepare draft report on service.
6. Include supporting materials for above.
7. Prepare draft summary report and recommendation of the Evaluation Subcommittee.
8. Prepare a short statement on the quality of the presses or journals in which candidate's scholarly work appears.
9. Transmit recommendation, dossier, and supporting materials to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Head.

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee:

1. Review all primary materials relating to the case.
2. Review the draft Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee reports.
3. Deliberate and vote on final version of reports.

Dean's Advisory Committee:

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

Dean:

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

VI. APPENDIX B: 6th-Year Review

List of Responsibilities

Candidate:

1. Submit curriculum vitae.
2. Prepare statement on teaching, research and service (maximum 3-pages, single spaced).
3. Submit all relevant supporting materials (i.e., reprints, books, syllabi, teaching evaluations).

Department Head:

1. Inform candidate of impending review and of his or her responsibilities.
2. Designate a Chair of the Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee.
3. Report the vote of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee.
4. Submit an independent personal recommendation.
5. Transmit dossier plus supporting materials, including publications, to the Dean's Office.

Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee:

1. Prepare draft report on teaching.
2. Prepare draft report on research.
3. Include at least three outside letters of evaluation (usually only tenure and promotion).
4. Prepare statement on credentials of outside referees (when outside letters are present).
5. Prepare draft report on service.
6. Include supporting materials for above.
7. Prepare draft summary report and recommendation of the Evaluation Subcommittee.
8. Prepare a short statement on the quality of the presses or journals in which candidate's scholarly work appears.
9. Transmit recommendation, dossier, and supporting materials to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Head.

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee:

1. Review all primary materials relating to the case.
2. Review the draft Departmental Evaluation Subcommittee reports.
3. Deliberate and vote on final version of reports.

Dean's Advisory Committee:

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

Dean:

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