



Faculty are the foundation of a university, and are integral to fulfilling the land, sea, and space grant missions of Texas A&M University. The process of promotion and tenure review is intended to support faculty as they move through a career path, and to recognize their growing expertise and contributions in their areas of responsibility. It is imperative for the individual faculty members and for the integrity of the university that each member of the faculty community take the promotion and tenure review process seriously, and carefully follow the established procedures and criteria for these reviews.

University Timeline

March 2024	Faculty Affairs releases the annual P&T guidelines and requests that deans initiate promotion and tenure proceedings.
April 12, 2024	Deans release their timelines for review and submit to Faculty Affairs. This should include dates for candidates to submit their dossier and dates for departments to submit to the college/school.
September 2024	Colleges/schools and branch campuses conduct elections for the University Promotion and Tenure Committees and convey two elected nominees to Faculty Affairs.
November 4, 2024	Deans submit electronic copies of college/school chart (no need for college/school P&T and Dean’s vote at this time), and candidate photos, for all candidates, to the Office of Faculty Affairs.
December 2, 2024	Deans submit recommendations of cases to Faculty Affairs by forwarding complete dossiers of all candidates, through Interfolio, to the Office of Faculty Affairs. If unusual circumstances delay this submittal, the Dean must obtain approval from Faculty Affairs to submit late materials.
January 2025	University Promotion and Tenure Committees offer recommendations to Faculty Affairs and Provost.
February 2025	Deans meet with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Provost to review recommendations. Faculty Affairs forwards recommendations to the President.
February 2025	President meets with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Provost and reviews recommendations. The President forwards recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents (BOR), through the Chancellor. The President makes final decisions on promotion only cases.
April/May 2025	BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases.
September 1, 2025	Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.

School of Dentistry Timeline

March 2024	The P&T cycle begins when Faculty Affairs releases the guidelines and requests the proceedings begin. Multiple workshops are held in these months for leadership and for faculty preparing for the review process.
March 29, 2024	Colleges/schools and departments establish and release their due dates for materials (marked as [set by unit] in this chart)
June 3, 2024	School of Dentistry and departments establish the chair(s) and committee for P&T for the upcoming cycle. It is recommended to release this information for transparency.
March 15, 2024	Candidates must notify their department head if they wish to be considered for promotion in this cycle. Some units might request this information earlier than the March start to coordinate external reviews. SOD requests this in early February .
April 15, 2024	Candidate creates a list of potential external reviewers. The department/unit also creates a list of potential external reviewers.
May 1, 2024	Department selects at least 7 external reviewers (for TT) and 5 external reviewers (APT) that meet criteria for initial invitations and sends a preliminary “save the date” email.
May 1, 2024	Candidates submit their materials to the department head or delegate for preliminary review and feedback.
May 6, 2024	Candidates upload their materials to Interfolio. The department head or delegate does a final review of the materials.
May 15, 2024	SOD Faculty Affairs sends external reviewer requests through Interfolio and sets a due date and timeline for checking the status of the requests. If reviewers decline, additional reviewers may need to be invited to obtain the minimum required number of letters.
June 3, 2024	Department makes assignments as needed for completion of the sections of the department report and sets meeting dates/times to discuss the candidates.
August 5, 2024	Department P&T committee should have met by this date to discuss each candidate. After the meeting, the assigned member prepares the synopsis of the meeting and modifications are made to the report to reflect the opinions of the committee. A vote is completed according to department guidelines and recorded in the report. All members sign the report.
August 9, 2024	OFA and/or the department head notifies the candidate of the outcome of the department committee P&T recommendation.
August 12, 2024	Final reports are due to the department head. Dept. Head completes their review and report.
September 13, 2024	OFA and/or the department head notifies the candidate of the outcome of the department head recommendation.
September 16, 2024	The dossier to this point, including the head recommendation, are due to the OFA. T OFA works with the college/school P&T committee to coordinate meeting dates/times to discuss the candidate.

During first 2 weeks of October	SOD P&T committee meets to discuss each candidate. After the meeting, the assigned member prepares the report to reflect the opinions of the committee. A vote is completed according to college/school guidelines and recorded in the report. All members sign the report.
November 1, 2024	OFA and/or the dean notifies the department head of the outcome of the college/school P&T committee recommendation and the head notifies the candidate.
November 4, 2024	Final SOD reports are due to the dean. Dean completes review and formulates report.
December 1, 2024	OFA and the dean notifies the department head of the outcome of their recommendation, and the head notifies the candidate.
September 2024	Colleges/schools and branch campuses conduct elections for the University Promotion and Tenure Committees and convey two elected nominees to the Office of Faculty Affairs for any open positions.
December 2, 2024	Deans submit recommendations of cases to Faculty Affairs by forwarding complete dossiers of all candidates, through Interfolio, to the Office of Faculty Affairs.
January 2025	University Promotion and Tenure Committees offer recommendations to Faculty Affairs and Provost.
February 2025	Deans meet with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Provost to review recommendations. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs forwards recommendations to the President. Deans receive recommendations and forward to department heads, who notify the candidate.
February 2025	President meets with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Provost and reviews recommendations. The President forwards recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents (BOR), through the Chancellor. The President makes final decisions on promotion only cases. Deans receive recommendations and forward to department heads, who notify the candidate.
April/May 2025	BOR reviews recommendations and makes final decisions on tenure cases. Department heads receive outcomes and notify the candidate.
September 1, 2025	Promotion and tenure decisions become effective.

Candidate Process

Each college/school or department will notify faculty members of the [timeline for promotion and tenure reviews](#). Before beginning the process, faculty members preparing for review should become familiar with these university guidelines, as well as the [college/school and/or department guidelines](#).

These guidelines include the procedures that will be followed during the review process, the criteria that will be used as indicators of contributions, and the expectations for contributions at each level of promotion for each faculty track. Faculty members who are jointly appointed (funded) will be reviewed and evaluated separately by each unit according to their guidelines, although the units will

collaborate on the list of external reviewers and will have shared access to the candidate's Interfolio file.

There are [workshops](#) offered by the Office of Faculty Affairs during late February and March and candidates are encouraged to attend these workshops to gain insight into the process and to prepare in the year before they undergo review. Recordings of these workshops will be posted on the Faculty Affairs website for those who cannot attend in person.

Deciding to undergo review

Candidates on the tenure-track have a mandatory review date set at the time of hire. To calculate the academic year of mandatory review, take the calendar year hired and add the probationary period, then subtract 2 years. This will give you the fall semester of the tenure consideration year. For example, a faculty member hired in 2019 with a 7-year probationary period will undergo mandatory tenure review in 2024-2025 ($2019+7-2 = 2024$).

Candidates can choose to undergo review before this mandatory date and should speak to mentors and the department head if considering this option. If an early review is not successful, the next review will be conducted at the mandatory time. [Extensions to the probationary period](#) may be granted through petition by the faculty member, recommendation by the department head and dean, and approval by Faculty Affairs. Candidates may choose not to use the approved extension.

Candidates who are tenured do not have a mandatory time to undergo review to full professor. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in research/scholarship/creative works, teaching, and service, with national and/or international recognition. Candidates considering promotion review should speak with mentors and their department head to assess the degree to which their work has demonstrable impact consistent with promotion.

Candidates should be advised that their department head will need to include in their review a statement about any documented and currently pending sanctions, requirements, or personnel issues that are not resolved at the time of the review. This does not include any allegations under investigation, past allegations that were dismissed, or past allegations where the faculty member was found responsible, but requirements or sanctions have been completed. The department head review will be part of the dossier beyond the department level.

Candidates for faculty positions whose initial appointment at Texas A&M University is at the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible to be considered for Tenure Review Upon Hire (TRUH). Note that tenure is obtained only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the University President. The review and submission process for TRUH can be submitted out-of-cycle for candidates that have tenure at a peer or aspirant peer institution, and candidates can be eligible for expedited review (see external reviewer section for the implications of expedited review).

Candidates on academic professional tracks do not have a mandatory time to undergo review for promotion. They need to demonstrate sustained excellence in their assigned responsibilities. These responsibilities vary by title, and can include one or two areas in research/scholarship/creative works, teaching, and service. Additional information about the primary areas associated with each title can be found in the [Faculty Title Guidelines](#), as well as the appointment letters for the faculty member. Candidates considering promotion review should speak with their mentors and their department head to assess the degree to which their work has a demonstrable impact consistent with promotion.

For promotion cases for full professor or in academic professional tracks that have a negative outcome after the dossier is submitted to Faculty Affairs, a minimum of one full year is required before resubmission (if negative in 2024-2025, the earliest to resubmit is 2026-2027).

For mandatory tenure reviews that have a negative outcome, the faculty member's appointment will end ([see procedures for dismissal](#)). In exceptional circumstances where the case has changed substantially, a faculty member who was considered in the mandatory year and unsuccessful can be reconsidered in their terminal year, at the discretion of the department head with agreement of the dean and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Building the Dossier

The dossier is an assembled file for a candidate undergoing review. All materials included in the dossier should be reviewed by mentors and the department head or delegate before they are uploaded. These mentors should provide feedback on the structure of the materials, as well as suggestions for improving the dossier with particular attention to how the candidate describes the impact of their work. The candidate is responsible for the content and submission of the dossier. The dossier is assembled through Interfolio and the department will open a case for each candidate ([see instructions here on accessing Interfolio](#)). No scanned documents or pictures of documents should be uploaded.

Impact Statement

This is a concise statement, written by the candidate, that conveys the quality and impact of their contributions within each of their areas of responsibility. The candidate's name, date, and proposed personnel action should be noted at the top of the statement. The statement should also state the appointment of the individual (including assigned weights to each area), individually address each area of responsibility, and include past accomplishments and evidence of impact, present activities, and future plans in each area. The weighting of areas of responsibility will vary across title, rank, and units, and the statement should explicitly state the weight assigned to each area. Further, the composition of the statement should reflect the weight assigned to the individual faculty member. For example, a faculty member who is assigned 75% responsibility in teaching should dedicate approximately 75% of the statement to describing the impact of their contributions to teaching. Academic Professional Track faculty will have a primary contribution in one or two areas, and the focus of the statement should be primarily on those areas, although statements can be included about contributions beyond those assigned areas that reflect the impact of the faculty member. The statement should be a maximum three (3) pages, single-spaced, minimum 12 point font, with 1 inch margins. The statement is uploaded to Interfolio.

The statement is an important document both for providing the candidate’s perspective on their impact and for providing context for other materials in the dossier. Each statement should include 1-2 sentences that convey impact of the work in layperson terms (e.g., “My research led to early detection of ovarian cancer,” “My innovative pedagogy resulted in a 30% drop in DFW grades in XYZ course”). The statement should present the best evidence that the candidate is excelling in the areas of work assigned to them. The relationship of work to impacts should be clear; for example, what student placements, patents, or publications are related to specific grants should be clear. For collaborative contributions, the annotated CV and statement together should inform reviewers of the candidate’s contribution to the projects. The statement should be written to engage and be understood by both a general academic readership (e.g., dean, president) and by a professional readership (e.g., external reviewers). It should be jargon free, enlightening and exciting. It provides a context for the review of the entire case. Faculty are encouraged to get feedback from their department head and mentors on their statement.

[Additional examples and guides are available.](#)

Examples of evidence for contributions in each of the 3 major areas of responsibility.		
Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Work	Teaching	Service
Quality Publications	Feedback from teaching observations	Officer in a (inter)national professional organization
Editing a scholarly book	Narrative of significant continuous improvement	Serving as a program chair at a (inter)national meeting
Major research or fellowship awards	Student satisfaction	Governmental commission
Citation of publications	Student outcomes	TAMU administrative role
Research or Scholarship Awards	Publication of instructional materials	Editor or member of editorial board for a major journal
Juried works of creative activities	Essential course development	Reviewer journals and grants
Review panel service	Teaching awards	Officer on Faculty Senate
Invited national presentations	Direction of graduate students	Chairing a major standing or ad hoc TAMU committee
Invited international presentations	Invited teaching at peer or aspirant institution	Evidence of professional service to local community or public, including clinical work and extension service
Significant external peer-reviewed research funding	Student professional development and mentoring	
Publications with teaching focus in leading journals	Significant service as an advisor	Committee chair in (inter)national professional organization
Public activity in performing arts	Teaching grants	

Patents or commercialization of research, where applicable	Service as a course coordinator	Advising a student organization
	Member of graduate committees	Department, college/school or university service
	Graduate student publications	
	Graduate student placement in industry or academia	
Significant self-development activities, such as intensive workshops or Faculty Development Leave that improve research effectiveness	Significant self-development activities that led to demonstrated enhanced teaching effectiveness	Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness

Annotated Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae reflects experiences and development in the candidate's career and provides an overview of academic accomplishments. It should be concise and clear. All accomplishments and activities listed in the CV should accurately reflect the candidate's specific contributions, and candidates will be asked as part of submission to verify that the contents of their dossier are current and correct.

Candidates must use the university's P&T [vita template](#), and have the option of using the [vita template created in Interfolio](#) (drawing on data already entered during the annual review). Candidates should not alter the order or structure of items in the template (specifically, the order of headings and the grant table must be the same; other structures and formats can be changed as needed). The template includes an annotation to specify authorship protocols within the discipline regarding order of authorship and contributions if not lead author. The grants section of the template should be used as is, without alteration, and including all the indicated information. The template includes a 200-word biography of the candidate, which will be published in the recognition booklet featuring newly promoted and/or tenured faculty. This biography should be written in the third person and specify the contributions of the candidate to the university.

Candidates can submit an "Addendum Memo" to their package if they have any substantive additions or changes to the CV after the initial submission (e.g., "Grant proposal X to NSF, listed as pending on page Y, has now been awarded"). This may occur at any level prior to the deadline for submission to Faculty Affairs. The Addendum Memo should be addressed to the department head and must contain a statement that the candidate deems the changes to be accurate as of the date of the memo and must be signed and dated by the candidate. The Addendum Memo must then be submitted through the department head (or dean if no department head) who will ensure the new information is added to the candidate's package in Interfolio.

Other Materials and Documentation

There are two areas where you can upload additional documents that are deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. Departments and/or colleges/schools may require certain documents to be included in this section, as indicated in their approved guidelines, and these should be included in the "Unit/Department Specific Required Documents" section. If a CV in a different format is requested or required by the unit, this document should go in this section, rather than in the main CV section. Candidates might also choose to include supplemental documents, including an optional [COVID-19 impact statement](#), and these can be uploaded in the "Candidates supplemental documents" section. Candidates should be thoughtful about the materials they choose to include. Curated evidence that supports the case for promotion is helpful at other stages of review; excessive documentation detracts from the evidence for a case. Candidates should not upload documents related to grievances, complaints, or appeals through any process. If candidates upload such documents, they should be removed at the department level before any further level of review.

External Reviewer Letters

External review letters are an essential component of the tenure and promotion review process for tenured, tenure-track, and research faculty. The purpose of external review letters is to provide an independent evaluation of the candidate's scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline.

Each dossier for tenure and promotion, tenure only, promotion to full professor and promotion for Research faculty is required to include a minimum of five (5) arm's length letters, although seven (7) is preferred. Some colleges/schools may require more than five (5) arm's length letters, but units are encouraged to use reviewer time judiciously and not require more than seven letters. The department should set a timeline for requests and reminders about letters to ensure that the minimum number of letters is obtained for review of the candidate.

The university does not require outside letters for academic professional track appointments (except for research track). However, departments and/or colleges/schools may require external letters in their units for some titles and not others, based on assigned responsibilities, expectations, and criteria (see [unit guidelines](#)). Internal evaluation letters can also be required by units for academic professional track faculty, although the unit should be clear about how they will use these letters and why they are requiring them. Units are encouraged to assess teaching through a standard assessment of teaching, such as through peer observation. The letters, if required, should convey an evaluative professional assessment of the impact demonstrated in the candidate dossier. Members of the P&T committee or the evaluative process at any level should not provide or be asked to provide internal evaluation letters. In units where letters are required or if faculty members choose to upload letters, they should be included in the "other materials" section and a reviewer chart should also be included.

For candidates who are members of Interdisciplinary Programs, a letter from the program chair or director may be requested by the unit. Such letters should be solicited simultaneously with external reviewers' letters so they may become part of the dossier reviewed by the departmental P&T committee. The report by the chair/director of an Interdisciplinary Program may consist simply of a letter including comments on teaching, research and/or other scholarly/creative activities and service, and intercollegiate cooperation. The letter should not include an evaluation or recommendation on whether the candidate should be promoted. Both the letter requesting this review and the letter received should be uploaded in the "Other Materials" section.

Identifying External Reviewers

Both the candidate and the department will generate lists of potential external reviewers. Candidates should NOT contact potential external reviewers themselves to inquire about their willingness to write a letter.

External reviews are from nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline who are therefore qualified to speak with authority about the candidate's accomplishments, future trajectory, and impact to the field. At Texas A&M University, external reviewers are expected to be from peer or aspirational top universities. Examples of peers and aspirational peers include members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) (<https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are/our-members>) and leading international institutions.

Colleges/schools can request approval to add universities that are peers or aspirational peers within their disciplines but are not included in the AAU list, to the list for their college/school recruitment of external reviewers. External letters should be from scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. If the application is for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and if a letter(s) is requested from an associate professor, the majority of the letters should be from full professors. Letters from associate professors should only be used when that person is the leading expert in a particular area, and no full professors are available with related expertise.

In addition to the above rank requirement, the following track requirements apply:

- External reviewers who are tenured faculty can review all promotion dossiers for tenure-track, and academic professional track.
- External reviewers who are academic professional track can only review promotion dossiers for academic professional track candidates.
- If an external reviewer, who is an academic professional track faculty member, were to review a tenure track dossier, the letter from the reviewer would not be counted as one of the five required arm's length letters.

Letters may also be sought from scholars at top academic programs from other institutions, and from preeminent experts from non-academic institutions, although a justification in the form of program ranking and expertise credentials must be included in these cases. The unit should strive to request a balanced number of letters from peer or aspirational programs/universities and other eminent programs and scholars.

External reviewers must be arm's length and not have a vested interest (professional, personal or financial) in the outcome of the decision. Their selection must, therefore, be limited to those whose professional and personal relationship with the candidate can provide an objective and unbiased review. Letters should come from distinguished scholars who are not:

- The candidate's thesis advisor (MS or PhD) or postdoctoral advisor
- Collaborated with candidate in last 5 years
- A coworker of the candidate in the last 5 years
- A business or professional partner
- Any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative.

In some fields or for some candidates, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with the candidate. In such a case, the department head must send a memo request to the dean with a justification, and the pdf of this approved memo must be included in the dossier.

The candidate provides a list of names of possible reviewers and, if desired, a "do not contact" list. With the list of possible reviewers, the candidate must also provide a signed [Candidate's External/Internal Reviewers checklist](#) attesting to the qualification of the external reviewers as "arm's length", appropriate rank and track, and from appropriate institutions.

The unit (e.g., department head, P&T committee) also provides a list of possible reviewers. For funded

joint appointments, both units should collaborate on the selection of external reviewers. The unit will verify that the external reviewers meet requirements using the [Reviewers Chart](#).

Inviting External Reviewers

From the two lists, a group of **at least seven** should be selected and contacted by the department head or delegate, as indicated in the unit guidelines. It is recommended that about equal number of letters be solicited from the candidate and department lists. A minimum of three (3) letters included in the dossier must be from the unit-suggested list. External letters cannot be requested from the “do not contact” list submitted by the candidate. The number of requests declined and/or not responded to should be closely monitored to ensure that the minimum number of letters from qualified reviewers is obtained before review. If needed, the unit will ask the candidate for additional reviewers to ensure a balanced distribution of letters from each list. If an external letter writer discloses a potential conflict of interest, the unit must solicit an additional letter to ensure the minimum of five (5) letters is met. The original letter would remain in the file and listed under the "non-arm's length" section of the [Reviewers Chart](#).

Letters are solicited through Interfolio using the [University Standard External Review template](#). College/schools will have the option to modify the solicitation letter based on the need of their discipline, but must obtain approval from Faculty Affairs prior to making any changes. Units can send a preliminary message to the potential reviewers to notify them of the upcoming request through Interfolio, but should not provide the candidate’s dossier information as part of this message. Units will be asked to provide a short biography for each reviewer, highlighting specific qualifications and credentials.

In general, external reviewers are asked to evaluate the candidate’s scholarly reputation and achievements in the discipline. Therefore, it is appropriate to provide examples of the candidate’s work to include as an attachment to the Interfolio request (e.g., representative publications, portfolios). If a reviewer is asked to judge an individual’s teaching effectiveness, it is recommended that they be sent a teaching portfolio or equivalent materials to review.

Information for all external reviewers contacted must be submitted as an excel file in the [Reviewers Chart](#) plus a separate reviewer biography. In this chart, the unit indicates which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which by the unit, the reason for declination if known, and a justification for the reviewer’s qualifications if relevant. The department head and dean should review this information during their evaluation and request that the department committee recruit additional letters if 1) the minimum number of five has not been reached, 2) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not at peer institutions or programs, 3) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are not arm’s length from the candidate, or 4) the required five reviewers includes faculty who are associate professors on dossiers undergoing review for promotion to full. Files that reach Faculty Affairs that do not meet these requirements for external reviewer letters will be returned to the department to request additional letters.

Department Process

The department head and P&T chair should prepare for the P&T cycle by reviewing the university guidelines and requirements, as well as their unit guidelines. In cases where a school does not have departments, preparation of the candidate and committee should occur at the school level. 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 to avoid any misunderstanding of the matter by any party.

Identifying the P&T committee members

The P&T committee should be formed and charged with the reviews for all candidates. The committee is a single faculty committee that is charged with reviewing candidates who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, and whose members are voting on those candidates (this is the vote that is forwarded as the faculty vote). There cannot be different P&T committees for different candidates in the same track seeking the same rank within the same department. **Only one vote should be submitted as part of the dossier.** Departments can have different committees for tenure track and academic professional track reviews.

The department guidelines must explain how the composition of the department level P&T committee 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. Departments can create promotion committees composed of academic professional track faculty, or include academic professional track faculty in the regular P&T committee, for the evaluation of academic professional track faculty seeking promotion. Academic professional track faculty cannot vote in cases involving tenure-track candidates; however, they can participate and vote on academic professional track promotions for ranks below their own rank. Units are strongly encouraged to incorporate APT faculty in the review of promotion cases within APT faculty ranks.

The department head should not participate in department committee discussions and deliberations. The department head also cannot be a voting member of the P&T committee. College/school and university level administrators should not participate in P&T committee deliberations, at the department or college/school level if, as a consequence of their administrative responsibilities, they can influence the department head, dean, faculty affairs, provost, or president's decisions. If a dean seeks advice from one or more associate deans as a normal part of the review process, the associate dean(s) should not participate in the department or college/school P&T committees, nor should they provide evaluation letters.

Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committees, must be composed of a minimum of five (5) eligible-to-vote committee members for all types of cases for promotion and/or tenure. If there are not enough eligible faculty members within the unit, the unit must develop guidelines on how faculty from other units with related expertise will be selected and added to the committee. If a department does not have enough eligible committee members because they vote at the college/school level, those committee members should vote at the department level and recuse themselves from voting at the college/school level. Committee voting should be conducted outside of Interfolio and in a way that preserves the anonymity of the committee members.

The criteria for voting eligibility are:

- Only tenured TAMU faculty are eligible to vote in cases where tenure is being considered for the candidate, or when the candidate already holds tenure and is seeking promotion.
- To be eligible to vote on tenure or promotion, the voting TAMU faculty member must *also* hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate.
- Faculty members have only one vote in the process, (i.e., if they are members of both department and college/school P&T committee, they can only vote in one committee). Department and/or college/school guidelines must clearly state in which committee the faculty member with membership in both department and college/school committee will vote.
- Both tenure track and academic professional track faculty members who hold a rank equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to vote on academic professional track promotion cases. Faculty members in different academic professional tracks are eligible to vote on cases where their rank is equal to or above that of the rank being sought by the candidate.
- Committee members with conflicts of interest (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor of the candidate) must recuse themselves from voting and deliberation on that specific candidate's case.

Faculty members with funded joint appointments with interdisciplinary/intercollegiate programs are to be reviewed and evaluated for promotion and/or tenure by the secondary unit, in addition to the unit where they are administratively located. The review should be in accordance with the guidelines from each unit. Please email facultyaffairs@tamu.edu to have the case review steps updated to incorporate both units in the routing as appropriate.

Discussing the Candidates

Promotion and tenure are matters of central concern to faculty members and to the university. This important process has implications for the career of individuals and for the success of the academic institution. Following the published criteria and process are foundational to upholding the integrity of this review process. Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence. In person meetings are strongly encouraged to facilitate discussion and engagement. In the event that online platforms are used, the unit should have in place as part of their evaluation guidelines expectations about how confidentiality and engagement will be maintained with the use of these platforms.

Department heads, and committee members should consult:

- [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
- [Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#), and
- [College/School and/or Department Promotion and Tenure specific guidelines](#)
- [Guidelines for Evaluating COVID-19 Impact Statements](#)

Members of the P&T committee should fully engage in the review and discussion of each candidate's dossier, including attending the P&T discussion committee meetings in person. 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 are not eligible to evaluate and vote on any given candidate can be present during discussions but should not actively participate in the process or discussion. Deans should not be present during the meeting. It is

recommended that a dean's delegate or a college/school ombudsperson attend the discussion to advise about procedural issues.

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 or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities). The organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates.

Reporting the P&T Committee Recommendations

A comprehensive evaluation should be carried out for all areas of responsibility for the candidate. The department P&T committee prepares a summary report with separate sections focused on each of the candidate's assigned areas, which can include teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities. For Academic Professional Track faculty, the report should focus on their areas of responsibility; if a candidate has contributed beyond those assigned areas, this can be noted in the summary of the discussion but performance in this area should not be evaluated separately from the overall evaluation. The report also includes a section to summarize the discussion of the committee about the candidate's overall dossier. The report must be written by a member of the P&T committee who is eligible to vote, and it is recommended that different people write each section in order to incorporate different perspectives. This analysis is the heart of the promotion and tenure process, and should reflect the evaluation of the committee. In no case should the report be generated by any process other than the peer review by the committee members.

The report should document the analysis and assessment of each area of responsibility assigned to the candidate. They should not repeat information that can be found elsewhere in the dossier. They should refer to the external reviewer letters and other materials without directly quoting them. Those who review the candidate's dossier should not interpret a lack of response from a reviewer as a negative statement against the candidate.

The report should be a well-substantiated analysis of the scope (quality, productivity over time) and IMPACT of the candidate's performance. For faculty with joint appointments, committees should have a clear understanding of the expectations in their respective departments in all areas of responsibility. Interdisciplinary activities should be evaluated and valued the same as those that are discipline-specific. The department must address how interdisciplinary contributions will be considered as part of their evaluation guidelines.

Departments should indicate the materials they expect for this analysis in their P&T guidelines or requests for candidates. If the candidate does not provide the necessary materials the P&T committee should issue a documented request. The report should indicate what, if any, issues occurred to limit access to the materials.

The report should reflect the views of the P&T committee voting members. In cases of divided opinion on a proposed action, phrases should be included such as, "some members were in favor..." and "others were not in favor..." In no case, should a particular statement or vote be attributed to a specific committee member. A typed statement at the end of the report such as, "*The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee*" should indicate this.

[Additional guidance and examples of the structure of a department committee report are available.](#)

Evaluating Teaching Activity

A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all faculty with teaching responsibilities. Teaching excellence may be demonstrated through course, lab, and clinical instruction and/ or mentoring of student and post-doc research. Teaching should be documented, reviewed, and defined by the department specified course load. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and post-docs, as appropriate for the discipline, should also be documented and valued.

The category of teaching includes, among other things: classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; publication of instructional materials, including textbooks; supervision of graduate and undergraduate students and post-docs; instruction in the clinical setting. Contributions to the department, college/school, and university efforts in student success are highly valued.

Evaluation of teaching is not determined by numeric targets, but rather, the quality of the contributions and the impact to teaching. The holistic analysis of teaching conducted for the report should be consistent with standards established by the department, college/school, and university guidelines, and should place the candidate's impact of teaching contributions in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

[Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for teaching evaluation is available.](#)

The following must be included for each candidate:

1. Evaluation of course materials (e.g. course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods), as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate's course offerings.
2. Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching: Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and in tabular form) of the student evaluations must be presented, with numerical data set in the context of departmental standards and norms (except data for 2020 courses in the event that a faculty member opted to exclude these evaluations from the review). The department must provide these data to the candidates and include these in the department report (candidates do not have access to departmental data) to allow them to address the trends within their impact statement. The discussion of the data in the teaching report should include addressing the candidate's perspective from the statement.

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

At a minimum, a table including the following information should be provided to the candidates and must be included and analyzed in the teaching report since the last

Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Section	Credits	Course Title	Enrollment	Candidate Rating Question 1*	Appropriate Average for Question 1*	Candidate Rating Question 2*	Appropriate Average for Question 2*

promotion action:

*Departments decide which question(s) for the student course evaluations will be considered. These questions should be the same for all faculty within the unit. The department and the candidate should work together to determine the appropriate comparison for the candidate ratings. It makes no sense to compare the candidate ratings to all courses taught at all levels in the department. Rather, it makes the most sense to compare the candidate ratings to similar courses in the department or the college/school. For example, if the candidate teaches a 200 level core curriculum course to meet the Life and Physical Sciences requirement, which serves both students in the department and students from many other majors, the best comparison might be the average of all 200 level core curriculum Life and Physical Sciences courses offered in the college/school.

3. Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions to the department, such as the direction/mentoring of graduate students, undergraduate researchers and post-docs, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, implementation of high impact learning activities, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching related activities.

Reports from structured classroom observations are strongly encouraged. These are particularly impactful for faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching. If one or more classroom observation report(s) are provided, it should indicate the frequency of observations, as well as criteria for assessment of performance. If a department has engaged in periodic classroom visitation from the beginning of a candidate's service for the purpose of developing teaching ability, a synthetic analysis of these evaluations would be a natural addition to the teaching evaluation section.

Evaluating Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities

Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in research, scholarship, and/or other creative activities by demonstrating independence in scholarship, meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field, and being recognized as leaders in their field on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Tenured associate professors seeking promotion to full professor are expected to be recognized leaders nationally, and for many fields internationally, and demonstrate impact that has advanced their field.

Research track faculty are expected to attain similar excellence, although their assigned duties could be associated specifically with a collaborative project under the direction of another researcher, in

which case expectations should be consistent with their appointment. Similarly, academic professional

track faculty in other tracks could have partial assignments in scholarship, in which case the expectations should be consistent with their appointment and with the weight of scholarship in their appointment.

Collaborative work is encouraged; each member of the group should document for reviews their major and independent contributions to the impact of the research. Documentation of the individual contributions to collaborative studies is particularly important for tenure-track faculty.

This category consists of contribution to knowledge and works, and can include publications, books, architectural design, engineering technology, veterinary or medical technology, fiction, poetry, painting, music, sculpture, art installations, etc. Note: publication of scholarship of teaching and learning in quality, peer-reviewed venues is considered a contribution to research/scholarship performance rather than teaching performance.

The evaluation of research and/or other scholarly or creative activities is not a matter of meeting numeric targets. However, contribution and impact generally benefit from cumulative quantity as the level and distribution of productivity is helpful evidence of future promise. An essential aspect of this section is to place the candidate's impact of research, scholarship or other creative activities contributions in the context of the specific discipline and departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

[Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for evaluation of research, scholarship or other creative activities, are available.](#)

The following should be included for each candidate:

- Include a review of selected publications/work (impact in discipline, level of innovation and/or creativity...). In cases where the work is in another language, the committee will need to take steps to ensure they can evaluate the materials; this could include adding a committee member with the necessary expertise, recruiting reviewers with the necessary expertise, or identifying a reasonable approach to translating materials or a subset of materials.
- In multi-authored publications and multi-PI grants, address the candidate's contributions (and authorship ranking based on protocols within the candidate's discipline about author order and/or contributions required to be listed as coauthor). Faculty are encouraged to publish with their students and mentees as lead authors.
- Indicate the degree to which participation in interdisciplinary and team research by the candidate has established more opportunities or greater progress for the candidate. Further, for interdisciplinary work, the committees should make a special effort to understand the customs of other disciplines on co-authorship, sequence of authors, and the use of conferences, conference proceedings, journals, or monographs as premiere outlets.
- If the candidate engages in interdisciplinary/collaborative research, the department should remain flexible about the best approach to ensure a fair analysis of the dossier. For example, if the department committee lacks expertise in a discipline in which the candidate has invested significant effort, consider deliberately engaging an external reviewer with this expertise and/or an evaluative letter from a faculty member in another unit with the expertise.
- Discuss the degree to which any aspect of the research/scholarship/creative work is difficult, complex, innovative, or risky, and how that might relate to the productivity to date.

- In fields where citations are viewed as an indicator of research impact, the report should include information on the candidate's citation frequency, and contextual information on citation norms in the field.
- In fields where citations indexes (such as the H-index) are believed to be an indicator of impact, that information can also be considered and should also be placed within context for norms in the field.
- For candidates in artistic fields, the report should evaluate the quality, selectivity, and stature of a candidate's performance venues, where appropriate. The candidate's reputation in the field is based on invited talks, shows, performances, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline.

Evaluating Service Activities

A commitment to service is an expectation of all faculty in professorial titles. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of external service should grow throughout the career of the candidate.

The evaluation might include service to the institution, to students, colleagues, the department, college/school, and the university. It may also include service beyond the campus, such as service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large. Expectations for service vary by discipline, title, and rank.

An essential aspect of this section is to place the candidate's impact of service contributions in the context of the specific discipline and departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria.

[Guidance prompting examples of evidence, and sample analysis questions, for service sections, are available.](#)

The evaluation of service should go beyond restating the activities listed by the candidate in their CV. The section should explain the candidate's involvement and contributions, as well as the QUALITY and IMPACT of their service activities.

Evaluating Other Activities

Faculty members must be evaluated based on their assigned work responsibilities, which commonly include the above categories. A section of the report can be added to capture any substantive activities that do not fit into the other sections, such as patient care, extension, outreach, administration, etc. Information about expectations and evaluation of these activities may be found in unit guidelines.

Summary of Discussion

The report from the P&T committee must include a section that summarizes the discussion of the committee about the qualifications of the candidate and offers an advisory recommendation about the case. The main purpose of this section is to convey the essence of the departmental committee's discussion and vote regarding the candidate's performance and the impact of their work as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure. The summary discussion section should

address all areas of assigned responsibility, including teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities, as applicable to the candidate. The collegiality of the faculty member is not relevant to this discussion and should not be included in the report; if there are issues with faculty conduct, they should be addressed by the department head through personnel actions; if the issue is unresolved, the department head will document as part of the dossier.

Avoid summarizing information that can be found in other documents, although that information can be referenced. The summary discussion section should highlight the impact (or lack thereof) of the work of the candidate in the context of their field. The summary section should not include quotes, minutes, or transcripts of the discussion. The summary discussion section should address any negative comments made by the external reviewers. Avoiding such comments calls into question the quality of the analysis by the department P&T committee.

The summary discussion section should make it clear that adequate consideration was given to all areas of the candidate’s faculty responsibilities, and that the recommendation was based on a set of written and widely circulated promotion and tenure guidelines promulgated by the unit. The summary discussion section should reflect the vote, such that positive evaluative statements are associated with positive votes, mixed statements are associated with mixed votes, and negative evaluative statements are associated with negative votes. A mixed vote requires further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities and the committee’s concerns. If there are negative votes, it is expected that the summary will make clear the reason for the negative votes.

The summary discussion section 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 number 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.” The summary discussion section should summarize the most relevant issues brought up during the committee discussion and which will explain the outcome of the vote. Discussion and views of any minority or dissenting faculty should be reflected in the discussion report. P&T chairs are responsible for ensuring that committee members are advised of relevant university and unit guidelines relevant to their evaluation and vote, and that any misinterpretations of the guidelines or faculty record are corrected during the discussion.

A table should be prepared as part of the summary discussion section that lists the committee members and their titles and has a place for signatures. All committee members should review the contents of the committee report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature.

After the committee discussion, a vote should be taken of eligible faculty following [unit guidelines](#). Votes must be anonymous.

The vote of the committee must be included in the summary discussion section, as formatted in the table below:

	Yes	No	Absent	Recused	Total Eligible
Votes					

- Abstain votes are not allowed.
- Absent should be used for a committee member with a justified absence (professional travel, illness, faculty development leave). Absent should not be used for a committee member who does not wish to participate or review the dossier.
- Members with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves (e.g. a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor). Recusal should not be used for a committee member who does not wish to participate.
- All votes across should add to make up the total eligible.
- The vote of the P&T committee must be included in the summary discussion section, as formatted in the table above. A brief justification should be included for recusals or absences.
- If absences, recusals, or negative votes are not explained, department heads should obtain this information from the committee and explain the situation in their report.

The department head (or dean if the school has no departments) is charged with advising the candidates at each level of review of the recommendation for or against promotion or tenure. At a minimum, notifications will be made by email, as soon as possible, after a recommendation is made at a given level and include the information about whether or not the recommendation was for or against.

In the event of a final negative tenure decision by the President, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If it is requested by the faculty member, the statement of reasons will be provided through Faculty Affairs, after the Provost or Provost's designee informs the dean of their decision. This process will also be followed for negative decisions for promotion cases.

Department Head Review

This report gives the department head an opportunity, after reviewing the candidate's dossier, reports and recommendations generated by the P&T committee, and external reviewers' letters, to make an independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. This report should include a discussion of the P&T committee evaluations/recommendations, especially if they disagree with the committee, as well as the external reviewer letters and any further evaluation the department head wishes to make based on the dossier and the context of the department.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the scope (quality, productivity over time) and IMPACT of the candidate's performance in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria. The report should not repeat information that is in the department report, and should not repeat the vote information. The department head should include appointment information and expectations of the faculty member, including for administrative appointments, especially if not included in the department report.

The department head report should provide a general basis for the strengths and weaknesses of the case, and need not reiterate what appears in other reports or letters although they can be referenced. Any special circumstances or consideration (e.g., special hiring circumstances) should be explained. Negative comments from external reviewers should also be addressed and evaluated in the report.

University criteria for promotion includes professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of Texas A&M University (see University Rule 12.01.99.M1). The department head report should explain any currently unresolved issues with the candidate's professional conduct that resulted in documented sanctions, restrictions, or other personnel actions against the faculty member. Currently unresolved issues are those where the requirements have not been completed at the time the dossier is undergoing review (e.g., requirements for return to the classroom were not completed). Supporting documentation can be added in Other Materials and Documentation. Allegations that are under investigation, that were not supported, issues that have been successfully resolved at the time of the review, or issues that have not been documented should not be included at any stage of the review, including the department committee report or the department head report.

The department head report must explain any aspects of the P&T committee review that are relevant to the evaluation of the case. This includes addressing any mixed or negative votes in the P&T committee report. If the reason for negative votes is unclear, the department head must request clarifications from the committee regarding the concerns behind the vote. In some cases, this might have been an issue raised during discussion that the majority did not see as valid, but the issue must still be included in the report to account for negative votes. This also includes other clarifications, such as a low rate of participation or discrepancies between votes and assessment.

The department head report must clearly articulate the department head vote on the case (i.e., "I support/do not support the [proposed action]"). This is particularly important if the vote is contrary to the department P&T committee or external reviewer's recommendations.

The dossier and reports should be evaluated for completeness and consistency with the guidelines and returned to earlier stages of review if there are issues. The department head is responsible for notifying the candidate of the outcome at each level of review ([see example notifications](#)).

[Additional guidance and examples of the structure of a department head report are available.](#)

[See information](#) about resubmitting a case if the department head recommends promotion and/or tenure, and the dean later recommends against

College/School Process

The dean and college P&T members should prepare for the P&T cycle by reviewing the [university guidelines](#), [their unit guidelines](#), and [any department 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 college/school committees on an annual basis. Unit guidelines for promotion and tenure must be reviewed and approved by Faculty Affairs for compliance with University Rules and to be posted on the Faculty Affairs website. The dossier and reports should be evaluated for completeness and consistency with the guidelines, and returned to earlier stages of review if there are issues.

Identifying the P&T committee members

The college/school P&T committee should be formed and charged with the reviews for all candidates. The college/school P&T guidelines must each explain how the composition of the college/school 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.

College/Schools can create promotion committees composed of academic professional track faculty, or include academic professional track faculty in the regular P&T committee, for the evaluation of academic professional track faculty seeking promotion. Only faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying can evaluate the dossier. Academic professional track faculty cannot vote in cases involving tenure-track candidates; however, they can participate and vote on academic professional track promotions for ranks below their own. The committee must be composed of a minimum of 5 eligible-to-vote committee members for all types of cases for promotion and/or tenure.

College/school committees must clarify beforehand the role of the committee members during deliberations of colleagues from their own departments (this must be addressed by the college/school and/or department P&T guidelines). For example, clarifying that a department representative presents the case and participates in the discussion and also votes; a department representative votes at the department but not the college/school level, etc.

Discussing the Candidates

Promotion and tenure are matters of central concern to faculty members and to the university. This important process has implications for the career of individuals and for the success of the academic institution. Following the published criteria and process are foundational to upholding the integrity of this review process. Committee deliberations must be conducted in the strictest confidence. In person meetings are strongly encouraged to facilitate discussion and engagement. In the event that online platforms are used, the unit should have in place as part of their evaluation guidelines expectations about how confidentiality and engagement will be maintained with the use of these platforms.

Deans, and committee members should take care to consult:

- [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#)—University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion
- [Office of Faculty Affairs Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#), and
- [College/School and/or Department Promotion and Tenure specific guidelines](#)
- [Guidelines for evaluating COVID-19 Impact Statements](#)

Members of the P&T committee should fully engage in the review and discussion of each candidate's dossier, including attending the P&T discussion committee meetings in person. 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. Deans should not be present during the meeting. It is recommended that a dean's delegate or a college/school ombudsperson attend the discussion to advise about procedural issues. Individuals who participated in former levels of review (e.g., department heads) should not present or be involved in the discussion of the case at the college/school level.

Different members or subsets of members of the P&T committee can be assigned with the task of leading the evaluation and discussion of different candidates and/or evaluation areas (teaching; research and/or other scholarly or creative activities; service; and other activities). The organization and assignment of evaluation responsibilities, and the actual process of evaluating and discussing candidates, must be systematic and uniform across candidates.

Reporting the P&T Committee Recommendations

Similar to the department P&T committee discussion report and recommendations, this document should reflect the committee discussion, primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other, and the final committee vote. As with the department report, the discussion report should be associated with the votes and the concerns that resulted in negative votes should be explained. Votes must be anonymous. Committee chairs are responsible for ensuring that committee members are advised of relevant university and unit guidelines relevant to their evaluation and vote, and that any misinterpretations of the guidelines or faculty record are corrected during the discussion.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate’s impact in all the areas or responsibility in the context of the specific college/school mission, goals, expectations and criteria.

The vote of the committee must be included in the college/school P&T report, as formatted in the table below:

	Yes	No	Absent	Recused	Total Eligible
Votes					

- Abstain votes are not allowed.
- Absent should be used for a committee member with a justified absence (professional travel, illness, faculty development leave). Absent should not be used for a committee member who does not wish to participate or review the dossier.
- Members with a conflict of interest must recuse themselves (e.g., a relative of the candidate; a graduate or post-doc advisor).
- All votes across should add to make up the total eligible.

A table should be prepared as part of the report that lists the names and titles of committee members and have a place for signatures. All committee members should review the contents of the committee discussion report and recommendations and indicate agreement that the document reflects the discussion and voting outcome with their signature. An email agreeing to the content of the report can be used in place of a signature. If a committee member has recused or is absent, this should be noted in place of their signature on the report.

Notification of the college/school P&T committee votes should be distributed to the department head of the candidate, to convey the recommendation to the candidate in writing. At a minimum, notifications will be made by email, as soon as possible, after a recommendation is made at a given level and include the information about whether the recommendation was for or against.

In the event of a final negative tenure decision by the President, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons that contributed to that decision. If it is requested by the faculty member, the statement of reasons will be provided after the Provost or Provost's designee informs the dean of their decision, through Faculty Affairs. This process will also be followed for negative decisions for promotion cases.

[Additional guidance and examples of the structure of a college/school committee report are available.](#)

Dean Review

This report gives the dean an opportunity, after reviewing the candidate's dossier, reports and recommendations generated by the P&T committees and the department head, and external reviewers' letters, to make an independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. The dean must identify the most impactful accomplishment by the candidate in their recommendation letter. In cases where there are no departments in the school, the dean's letter should include any information typically included in the department head report. The dean's letter should not repeat information from previous levels of review, but instead add context or analysis.

Similar to the department head report, the dean's report is an analysis of the case which should provide a general basis for strength or weakness, address any mixed or negative votes, and explain the vote of the dean. If the dean vote is contrary to any departmental or college/school recommendations that should be clearly and specifically addressed.

The report from the dean should make an independent determination helpful in laying out the case without merely summarizing/quoting other materials in the package.

An essential aspect of this report is to place the candidate's impact in all the areas of responsibility in the context of the specific college/school mission, goals, expectations and criteria. This is especially important for cases that have generated differences in recommendation during the evaluation process.

The dossier and reports should be evaluated for completeness and consistency with the guidelines, and returned to earlier stages of review if there are issues.

If the dean votes NO and the department head voted YES, the department head will have the opportunity to [resubmit a case for reconsideration](#).

[Additional guidance and examples of the structure of a dean's report are available.](#)

In the case of joint appointments involving more than one college/school, both deans (and both college/school level promotion and tenure committees) provide recommendations to Faculty Affairs. Please email facultyaffairs@tamu.edu to have the case review steps updated to incorporate both colleges/schools/departments in the routing as appropriate. The primary unit has responsibility for submission of the final dossier.

Submission to Faculty Affairs

By **November 4, 2024**, colleges/schools must submit, for each candidate, electronic copies of the following documents to facultyaffairs@tamu.edu.

1. [College/School Chart](#) (Excel) (no need for college/school P&T and dean's vote at this time)
 2. Candidate Photograph (jpeg)
 - a. Photographs should be a vertical head or upper-body shot in which the head is 1" high. Electronic (digital) photos should be high quality with solid color backgrounds. Please do not copy and send website photographs or photographs embedded in a word document (their quality in the printed booklet will be poor). The photographs will be inserted following the formal review process.
- Each file, for each candidate, should be named Last Name, First Name-Item Name (e.g., Doe, Jane-Faculty Tenure Table). Documents may be sent via OneDrive.

By **December 2, 2024**, college/schools must submit each final dossier to Faculty Affairs [via Interfolio](#). **No scanned documents or pictures of documents** should be uploaded at any stage of the review.

These additional P&T documents are due to Faculty Affairs by December 2, 2024, via OneDrive

1. Faculty Bio (Word format)
2. Faculty Tenure Table – if applicable (Word format)

University Promotion and Tenure Committees

Two university-level committees composed of faculty members will evaluate cases and provide recommendations for improving P&T processes across the university. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) will evaluate cases for tenured and tenure track faculty and consist of tenured full professors. The University Promotion Committee (UPC) will evaluate cases for academic professional track faculty and consist of full professor rank (including Principal Lecturer). Votes from the UPTC and UPC will be recorded as part of the dossier. Members are not permitted to vote on candidates from their own colleges/schools. The committees will be chaired by a representative from Faculty Affairs or the Office of the Provost who will serve ex officio.

Both committees will be composed of eligible elected faculty from each Texas A&M University college/school and campus. All faculty eligible to vote for faculty senate elections can vote for their respective UPTC and UPC representatives. Faculty can only vote in one unit for representatives. Deans will submit two nominations who were elected by the faculty from which the Faculty Affairs and the Office of the Provost will together select one representative. Members will serve two-year staggered terms and participation is limited to two consecutive terms, after which a committee member should not serve for at least two (2) years prior to re-election.