Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy
TAMU-CC College of Education and Human Development (Last revised 4/28/2022)

1. Procedure Summaries

1.1. The granting of tenure is the most important decision in the development of an outstanding faculty member. As such, it is a selective process, which recognizes an individual as worthy to be a continuing member of the faculty based on performance during a trial period. The importance of this decision to Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC) dictates that tenure is to be awarded when there is sufficient evidence and documentation that an individual will continue to make significant long-term contributions in each of the areas of evaluation and to the overall goals of the university. This procedure describes the criteria and review process for granting tenure to tenure-track faculty within the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) at TAMU-CC.

1.2. The granting of promotion is one of the most important decisions in the development of an outstanding faculty member. As such, it is a reflective process, which recognizes an individual as worthy to be advanced to a higher rank within the faculty based on performance. It is essential that faculty demonstrate dedication and achieve excellence in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service contributions to preserve and strengthen the vitality of the university. Academic promotion is awarded to those faculty making continuing and increasing contributions in these areas. This procedure provides the criteria and review process for the promotion of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty positions within the COEHD at TAMU-CC.

1.3. Promotion and tenure are, or promotion is, awarded solely by the Board of Regents of the Texas A&M University System. The COEHD handbook is consistent with the TAMU-CC University procedures 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure) and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members) outline the evaluative process for promotion and/or tenure.

2. General Information

2.1. Texas A&M University System Policy 12.01 (Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure) states, “tenure means the entitlement of a faculty member to continue in an appointed academic position unless dismissed for good cause.” The policy also identifies the conditions or circumstances that will constitute good cause for dismissal of a faculty member. Tenure is granted only by the affirmative action of the Board of Regents upon recommendation of the President of the institution. When promotion and tenure are decided jointly and concurrently, a denial of either promotion or tenure results in termination of the process. If a candidate’s application for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor has been denied, the candidate will be given a one-year terminal contract with the current workload and salary to begin in the academic year immediately following the year in which the application for promotion and tenure was denied.
2.2. Promotion in rank is recognition of past achievement of the individual being considered. In addition, the advancement in rank is recognition of future potential and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of even greater accomplishments and of assuming greater responsibilities.

2.3. In accordance with the Texas A&M University System policies and regulations and University Handbook of Rules and Procedures, procedure 12.01.99.C0.01 (Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty) along with 12.01.99.C0.03 (Responsibilities of Faculty Members) provides faculty with descriptors of rank and 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service) provides examples of evidence to be used when judging a candidate’s performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service. Evaluations of a faculty members effort should also consider the individuals appointed workload, University Rule 12.03.99.C1 (Faculty Workload).

2.4. All promotion proceedings and discussions will be strictly confidential to the extent permitted by law, Texas A&M University System policies and regulations, and TAMU-CC rules and procedures.

3. Initial Appointment and Timeline

3.1. The Provost will provide faculty members with a written statement of terms of employment including tenure conditions when employment is initiated.

3.2. Promotion and tenure

3.2.1. Beginning with appointment, the standard probationary period for an eligible faculty member will be five (5) years of full-time, tenure-track experience at TAMU-CC. In fall of the sixth year, the faculty member will apply for promotion and tenure review to the rank of associate professor. Review for promotion and tenure shall be no later than the beginning of sixth year of service unless an extension of the tenure probationary period has been approved according to University Rule 12.01.99.C4 (Granting Extension of Tenure Probationary Period).

3.2.2. A faculty member cannot apply for tenure without jointly applying for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Concomitantly, a tenure-track faculty member cannot be awarded tenure without being promoted to the rank of associate professor. However, a faculty member may be hired initially as an associate professor without tenure. In such a case, the faculty member may apply for tenure without applying for promotion to professor.

3.2.3. Up to, but no more than, three (3) years of full-time service at another academic institution may be granted toward promotion and tenure if agreed to in writing at the time of initial appointment and so stated in the appointment letter from the provost. These years may be used at the faculty member’s discretion.

3.2.4. Application for Early Promotion and Tenure
3.2.4.1. Early promotion for untenured tenure-track faculty members will only be granted as part of the tenure process. See university procedure 12.02.99.C0.01(Tenure) for information on the application for early tenure.

3.2.4.2. Faculty members with the rank of assistant professor who have demonstrated exceptional records (based on annual overall evaluation ratings of excellent in every year under consideration for promotion) in terms of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service may apply for promotion and tenure no earlier than the beginning of their fourth year of full-time service at TAMU-CC. Faculty members must consult with their department chair and receive approval from the Dean before applying for early promotion.

3.3. Promotion

3.3.1. A faculty member must possess at least four (4) years of full-time faculty experience at the rank of associate professor prior to applying for promotion to the rank of professor. Ten (10) years of documented and credited (according to COEHD 3.4.1; see below) full-time tenure-track faculty experience at TAMUCC or another accredited post-secondary institution is required before a faculty member can apply for promotion to the rank of professor. Years of credit at another institution that are stated in writing at the time of the initial faculty appointment may count towards this ten-year timeframe at the discretion of the faculty member.

3.4. Notification of Years of Credit

3.4.1. Credit for appropriate full-time service at other academic institutions may be granted at the time of hire if agreed to in writing and so stated in the appointment letter from the Provost at the time of initial appointment. Years of credit may be stated in terms that provide faculty members “up to” the stated number of years allowing the faculty member to choose whether to utilize those years of credit. In such cases, the appointment letter will note the earliest and latest dates that an application for promotion and tenure, or promotion, may be submitted.

4. COEHD Standards for Promotion and Tenure or Promotion

4.1. To be eligible to receive promotion and tenure, or promotion, a faculty member must be an employee of TAMU-CC, must have an earned terminal degree in their academic discipline or related discipline and must hold the academic rank of assistant professor or associate professor. Members of the faculty whose appointments are not full-time tenured, or tenure-track, are not subject to the requirements outlined in this procedure.

4.2. Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the department chair to discuss progress, accomplishments, opportunities for improvement, and expectations regarding responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Annual reviews are reviewed and approved by the Dean. All annual reviews are submitted to the Office of the Provost for inclusion in the faculty member’s official file.
4.3. Administrative personnel who hold academic rank at TAMU-CC in addition to their administrative title retain their tenured status as faculty members, but administrative positions are not subject to tenure. The initial appointment letter, or if applicable, the letter notifying the faculty member of their appointment to the administrative position, should state the portion of the employee’s salary that is associated with the administrative position. Also, in such cases, this letter should state that the administrative position and the salary associated with such position may be terminated without cause. The letter must also include the faculty salary to be paid when administrative assignment is terminated. Except in extraordinary cases, administrators who have not held a tenured faculty position at an institution of higher learning will not be hired with tenure at TAMU-CC.

4.4. The tenured faculty of a program and/or Dean may determine that it is in the university’s best interest to recommend an initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure. Such a circumstance must be accompanied by a written recommendation to the Provost from the Dean including letters from an expedited tenure review process. The Department Review Committee (DRC), the Department Chair, the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (College P&T Committee), and the Dean will evaluate the candidate’s credentials to determine if they meet the criteria for tenure and appropriate academic rank. Candidates will only be considered for tenure if they have been awarded tenure at another accredited institution; therefore, a full portfolio is not required for this review.

4.4.1. The Provost (and/or President) will consider the recommendation and appropriate documentation before making the faculty appointment.

4.4.2. The final disposition on all tenure appointments is subject to review and approval by the Texas A&M University System Board of Regents.

4.5. Eligibility for promotion and tenure, or promotion, includes a record of achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The average of the faculty member’s annual overall performance evaluation ratings must be “Meets Expectations” or higher during the time period under consideration to be eligible to apply for promotion and tenure, or promotion. Eligibility to apply for promotion and tenure, or promotion, does not guarantee that the faculty member has met all the college’s standards to be awarded tenure.

4.5.1. As faculty advance in rank, faculty members are expected to achieve increasing success both by progressively mastering and by demonstrating continued consistent sustained performance as is described in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.01 (Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty).

4.6. Academic ranks and general expectations for faculty applying for promotion and tenure, or promotion, are as follows:

4.6.1. Associate Professor - To earn the rank of associate professor, a faculty member should represent maturity, experience, and leadership in the academic profession. Associate professors should have begun to assume a position of leadership in their department, college, and the university. Unless early promotion is granted, at least five (5) years of full-time tenure-track experience at the rank of assistant professor at TAMU-CC is
required before a faculty member can apply for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor. Years of credit at another institution that are stated in writing at the time of the initial faculty appointment may count toward this five-year timeframe at the discretion of the faculty member.

4.6.2. Professor - To earn the rank of professor, a faculty member must have assumed a position of leadership and service to their department, college, and the university. A faculty member must possess at least four (4) years of full-time faculty experience at the rank of associate professor prior to applying for promotion to the rank of professor. Generally, ten (10) years of full-time tenure-track faculty experience at TAMU-CC are required before a faculty member can apply for promotion to the rank of professor. Years of credit at another institution that are stated in writing at the time of the initial faculty appointment may count towards this ten-year timeframe at the discretion of the faculty member.

4.7. Examples of performance indicators for promotion and tenure, or promotion, include:

4.7.1. Teaching: This category may include, among other things: classroom and laboratory instruction; development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods; service learning; distance education; publication of instructional materials; advising; supervision of undergraduate students and/or graduate students; meeting institutional requirements for posting grades and student engagement; and other examples defined by departmental and college criteria.

4.7.2. Scholarship/Creative Activity: This category may include, among other things, creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities and/or the preservation of knowledge. For most disciplines, this category consists of research, grants, peer-reviewed publications, and/or creative work. This category may also include securing patents, copyrights, and commercialization as defined by departmental and college criteria.

4.7.3. Service: This category may include, among other things, service to the university, students, student organizations, colleagues, department, college, as well as service beyond the campus. Examples of the latter include service to professional societies, research organizations, governmental agencies, the local community, and the public at large, as it relates to their discipline and area of expertise, as well as other activities that benefit and enhance the community and university/community relations as defined by departmental and college criteria.

4.7.4. Criteria for promotion and tenure or promotion are aligned with criteria outlined in the handbook information on the Annual Development Evaluation Plan (ADEP). In addition, departments may utilize some quantitative measures to evaluate excellence, as exemplified by the quality, impact, and significance of accomplishments.

4.8. Each department must establish written criteria for each area of evaluation and provide examples of evidence to be used for judging the candidate's performance. The guidelines
must be appropriate to the various disciplines within the college and consistent with the missions of the college and university.

4.9. The COEHD evaluative procedures for promotion and tenure, or promotion, are provided to all incoming faculty members at the time of initial appointment to university faculty (hire). Additionally, the COEHD Handbook will be published and made available on the COEHD website.

4.9.1. Departments may determine additional written criteria, consistent with the missions of the department, college, and university regarding the promotion and tenure, or promotion, or promotion, process.

4.10. Although faculty members are provided the procedure for promotion and tenure, or Promotion, at the time of initial appointment, considerations for promotion and tenure, or promotion, will be made with respect to the procedures and rules in effect at the time the application for promotion and tenure, or promotion.

4.11. All proposed changes to written college and department criteria for promotion and tenure, or promotion, procedures will be ratified by a simple majority vote from the full-time tenured or tenure-track COEHD faculty. Revised COEHD proposals for COEHD promotion and tenure, or promotion, procedures and criteria must be approved, in writing, by the Dean and Provost before they are scheduled to go into effect.

4.12. Procedure Review and Approval Process

4.13. All faculty ballot-approved revisions are subject to review by the Dean and the Provost to ensure alignment with University and System policy. Upon approval of Dean and Provost, newly revised written policies are made available to COEHD faculty within the appropriate section of the COEHD handbook.

4.13.1. If departments create additional written criteria, then departmental measures must be ratified by a simple majority of the full-time tenured or tenure-track department faculty either by a) balloting or b) through an alternative process that has been approved through balloting. In either case, the criteria and measures must be approved, in writing, by the Dean and Provost.

4.13.2. When revisions are made to departmental criteria for promotion and tenure, or promotion, the revisions should address how they apply to current tenured or tenure-track faculty. Any special provisions for current faculty should consider the degree of change in the criteria and the time until promotion and tenure, or promotion, review. Revisions shall be approved by a simple majority of faculty.

4.14. If a faculty member is appointed jointly to more than one department, a memorandum of understanding will clearly communicate the criteria for promotion and tenure, or promotion, and the nature of the Promotion Review Unit at the time of the joint appointment.

5. Pre-Tenure/PT Review Process timeline
University Procedure 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure) requires Pre-Tenure review of tenure-track faculty. The review will commence in the faculty member’s fourth year of full-time academic employment at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The faculty member may be evaluated earlier than their fourth full year of employment if he/she was awarded credit at another institution towards tenure at the time of their initial appointment.

5.1. The purpose of the Pre-Tenure review is to give tenure-track faculty members a constructive peer evaluation prior to the tenure review. Tenure-track faculty members shall be informed of recommended alterations or improvements in performance to enhance their chances for a positive promotion and tenure recommendation by the department chair and Dean based on feedback from a systematic peer review of faculty performance after completion of three (3) full years of faculty appointment as assistant professor. Accordingly, the pre-tenure review process will be initiated in the fall of the faculty member’s fourth (4th) academic year.

5.1.1. Documentation for Pre-Tenure Review

Documentation for Pre-Tenure Review will follow the documentation requirements for tenure as described in University Procedure 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure).

5.2. Review Process

5.2.1. The Pre-Tenure review process will commence in the fall semester of a faculty member’s fourth year of full-time academic employment at TAMU-CC. In the event the faculty member was awarded credit at another institution towards Tenure at the time of their initial appointment, the faculty member may be evaluated earlier than their third full year of employment at their discretion as per the terms of employment stated in their initial appointment letter.

5.3. Recommendations for improvement or directed efforts will be provided to the faculty member by faculty peers, the department chair, and the Dean. The documentation and requirements for tenure must be consistent with the candidate’s assigned workload. In instances where tenure-track faculty members have been granted time toward tenure during the hiring process, the Provost shall note the year of the Pre-Tenure review in the hiring letter.

5.4. The Pre-Tenure and tenure review shall be administered in accordance with the following timeline:

5.4.1. On or before April 1, the Dean’s Office shall notify each college faculty member who is subject to Pre-Tenure, Promotion and Tenure, Post tenure Review that they will be reviewed during the following academic semester.

5.4.2. On or before June 30, candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure candidates will provide department chair with a list of up to five (5) potential external reviewers.
5.4.3. **By July 15,** Department Chair solicits external review letters for all P&T candidates in accordance with the Promotion and Tenure External Review policy.

5.4.4. **On or before September 1,** candidates for COEHD faculty Pre-Tenure & Promotion & Tenure review will submit their Pre-tenure /P&T portfolio within Interfolio to the Dean’s Office documenting performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in accordance with college criteria.

5.4.5. Each department in the COEHD shall convene a departmental review Committee (DRC) comprised of all tenured faculty members in the department (or Promotion Review Unit) to conduct an evaluative review of each candidate. The Committee shall elect amongst themselves a Committee chairperson, who will be responsible for summarizing discussion in a written review identifying strengths and opportunities for improvement in each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service).

5.5.

5.5.1. **By September 2.** The Dean’s Office will populate the Interfolio with annual reviews and forward the dossier to the departmental DRC to begin the departmental review process.

5.5.2. Departmental DRC Committees begin to review Pre-tenure/Promotion and Tenure candidates

5.5.3. **On or before September 20,** the DRC Pre-Tenure Review/Promotion and Tenure Committee chairperson will forward the written evaluative review to the department chair on behalf of the Committee.

5.5.4. **On or before October 15,** the Department Chair shall develop an individual review and meet with each candidate to discuss the Chair’s evaluation and the review provided by the Pre-Tenure/ P&T Review Committee. The faculty member will receive a copy of the Chair’s Written comments and recommendations, as well as the developmental review from the Pre-Tenure/PT Review Committee. The candidates will have five (5) working days to provide a written response (2-pages maximum) to the chair and the Pre-Tenure Review Committee related to feedback received.

The Pre-Tenure Review Committee may (if it is in their departmental written policy) meet with faculty candidates to provide opportunities for interactive feedback. At this point the Pre-Tenure candidate materials will be forwarded directly to the COEHD Dean. The PT candidates will be forwarded to the College P&T committee.

**On or before November 5,** the COEHD promotion and Tenure Committee chair shall submit the completed review, committee vote (for or against) candidate and written recommendation, including the Chair’s evaluation, the review provided by the DRC Committee and any response provided by the faculty candidate to the COEHD Dean.

**On or before November 30,** The Dean will review the entire dossier and write an individual
recommendation for each candidate to grant or deny tenure and/or promotion. The Dean will meet with each candidate (including Pre-tenure candidates) and share results from each level of the review including his/her recommendation to the provost. Candidates will have five (5) business days to provide a written response to the Dean’s letter.

**On or before December 1,** The Dean will forward his/her recommendation to the Provost. All documents including any candidate-written responses will be forwarded to the Provost for processing of TAMUCC university and TAMUS review. The COEHD Dean will also forward documentation related to the Pre-Tenure review according to the Pre-Tenure review process. Accordingly, if the review of the faculty member indicates they are not progressing adequately towards the requirements for tenure, the department chair will convene a meeting with the faculty member to discuss how he or she should improve their academic record prior to application for tenure review. The Dean shall forward the chair’s evaluation and the Dean’s evaluation to the Office of the Provost for the faculty member’s official file.

6. **COEHD Tenure and Promotion, or Promotion, Review Process**

6.1. The evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure, or promotion, will take place in accordance with all applicable university guidelines. Before the end of the spring semester, and prior to the fall semester when applications are due, first-time assistant professor candidates eligible for promotion and tenure and eligible associate professor candidates who wish to apply for promotion will meet with the Dean. The Dean will review timelines, processes, dossier expectations, and submission deadlines.

6.1.1. **COEHD Promotion and Tenure Annual Timeline.** All dates, if falling on non-workday (holiday or weekend day), default to next business day (see COEHD Annual Timeline and Calendar below). The COEHD timeline and calendar are aligned with University timelines published by Office of Academic Affairs (see university calendar:

[http://academicaffairs.TAMU-CC.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf](http://academicaffairs.TAMU-CC.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf)

**COEHD Pre-Tenure/Promotion and Tenure Review TimeLine**

COEHD Annual Timeline & Calendar for Faculty Evaluation Processes including Annual performance Review (ADEP); Pre-Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure and Post-Tenure Review. All dates, if falling on non-workday (holiday or weekend day), default to next business day. COEHD P&T Timeline is aligned with TAMUCC academic affairs annual guidelines provided in

[http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf](http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Dean/Delegate sends notification to eligible COEHD faculty for pre-tenure, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Eligible COEHD Faculty submit a letter to Dean/Dean’s delegate of intent to submit for evaluation review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1-May 15</td>
<td>Dean/delegate meets with P&amp;T/pre-tenure candidates to discuss the specific evaluation process and provides formal written certification of candidate’s eligibility based on length of service requirements for the candidate’s portfolio. Deans’ office administrator establishes an Interfolio Case for all eligible candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>P&amp;T candidate provides department chair with a list of up to five (5) potential external reviewers. Candidate also prepares a statement of research activity to be included in the external reviewer solicitation packet. Department Chair reviews candidate nominate up to five (5) additional potential external reviewers. The department chair and candidate meet to discuss potential issues (e.g., conflict of interest) with any candidate and work toward a goal of submitting 7-10 names to Dean for final approval. <strong>This does not apply to pre-Tenure review; Post-Tenure Review candidates.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>Department Chair forwards list of 7-10 recommended reviewers emerging from the Collaborative nomination process to COEHD Dean for final approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Department Chair solicits external reviewer letters for all P&amp;T candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>P&amp;T candidate submits dossier within Interfolio; (Candidate cannot add any new materials after this date) Department chair convenes DRC committee for departmental review process of all P&amp;T candidates and Pre-Tenure candidates. A DRC chair is identified and will manage Interfolio process at departmental level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>Dean’s Office certifies that P&amp;T/pre-tenure materials are complete and adds required elements (i.e., faculty annual evaluations). Deans Office forwards candidates Interfolio CASE to the DRC chair for departmental review DRC committee Reviewers are instructed to begin candidate portfolio review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>Department Chair receives the DRC committee recommendation and prepares his/her Department Chair’s evaluation &amp; Recommendation. Department Chair receives External Reviewer Letters and prepares a summary of strengths &amp; Weaknesses identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20- October 15</td>
<td>Department chair meets with each candidate and provides copy of DRC recommendation and Chair Recommendation as well as a summary of external reviewer letters received to date. Candidate is informed that they have (5) business days to provide a 2-page (max) written response to DRC &amp;/or Chair feedback. DRC report, Department Chair Report and any candidate response is forwarded to COEHD Promotion and Tenure Committee. <strong>Pre-Tenure candidate materials are forwarded directly to the COEHD Dean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16-November 5</td>
<td>The COEHD P&amp;T Committee proceeds with candidate reviews. The COEHD P&amp;T Chair forwards the recorded formal committee vote (for or against) and a written recommendation to Dean of COEHD for each candidate considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 6-30</td>
<td>The Dean will meet with each candidate and share results from each level of the reviews including his/her recommendation to the provost. Candidates will have five (5) business days to provide a written response to the Dean’s letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>The Dean will forward his/her recommendation to the Provost for promotion and/or tenure. All documents including any candidate written responses will be forwarded to the Provost for processing of TAMUCC university and TAMUS review. The COEHD Dean will also forward documentation related to the Pre-Tenure review according to the Pre-Tenure review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COEHD Portion of P&T Evaluation Process Formally Ends.** Faculty member may appeal process Begins if promotion and/or tenure is not recommended by the dean or college committee (see faculty appeal process).
TAMUCC processes after this point are detailed in http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf

December 1. Office of the provost forwards application materials to the University P&T committee

January 10. University P&T recommendations to the office of the Provost

January 15. Provost's recommendations to the President

January 29. President's list of approved candidates to System Academic affairs

March Meeting Board of Regents action on recommendations for promotion and tenure

May 30. Written notification to candidate of decision to award promotion and/or tenure

September 1. Promotion and Tenure Decisions become Effective

6.2. During the candidate review, the COEHD Dean will verify the candidate has fulfilled the required faculty responsibilities, as described in 12.01.99.C0.03 (Responsibilities of Faculty Members) and must assess their qualifications in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The COEHD Dean will verify the candidate has the academic preparation and experience required for the rank being considered 12.01.99.C0.01 (Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty); 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure); and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members).

6.3. If there is a disagreement over whether the faculty member applying for promotion has fulfilled their responsibilities to the extent, they are eligible to apply for promotion review, the faculty member may seek final clarification and review of their relevant academic record from the Office of the Provost. In such an instance the Provost, in consultation with the faculty member, Dean, and other relevant parties will provide in writing a clarification and justification for whether the faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion review, based on the formal criteria outlined in TAMUS, TAMU-CC, and relevant college and departmental level guidelines.

6.4. Each candidate shall submit a dossier to the Dean’s Office in accordance with the guidelines references in Section 6.1 of 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure); Section 5.1 of 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members); and Section 7.1 of the COEHD Handbook procedure listed below.

6.5. It is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for tenure to submit a complete dossier with all appropriate documentation on or before the due date to the Dean’s Office.

6.6. Evaluation of faculty performance for tenure should be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the faculty member’s assigned workload during the period under evaluation 12.03.99.C1 (Faculty Workload).

6.6.1. The COEHD recognizes not all teaching loads require equal effort because of
differences in class size, number of preparations, course level (graduate or undergraduate), and course delivery method.

6.6.2. In addition, the COEHD acknowledges intellectual contribution performance varies as acceptance and time to press for publication in highly respected journals is more difficult than publication in other journals. Service effort also varies depending on level of effort, type of committees, and visibility of effort. The reviewers will consider these variances when evaluating individual candidates’ noted activities in these areas.

6.6.3. Accordingly, the relative weighting of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and Service may vary among candidates whose formal work assignments have been specified consistently as part of the annual review process (refer to the candidates’ Annual Development Evaluation Plan [ADEP] and 33.99.99.C0.02 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members).

6.6.4. The negotiated statement of assigned time (faculty workload) should be the main basis for determining the relative weighting of faculty responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

6.6.5. Significant administrative duties, workload reassignments (including adjustments of typical evaluative weighting) must be documented in official workload reports and approved by the Dean - see University Procedure 12.03.99.C1.01 (Assignment of Faculty Workload Credit)

6.7. Evaluation of faculty performance for promotion should be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the faculty member’s assigned workload during the period under evaluation 12.03.99.C1.01 (Assignment of Faculty Workload Credit) and 33.99.99.C0.02 (Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members).

6.7.1. The period under evaluation for an assistant professor applying for the rank of associate professor includes all the full-time, tenure-track experience at TAMU-CC or equivalent agreed to in writing at the time of the faculty member’s initial hire date.

6.7.2. The period under evaluation for an associate professor applying for professor includes all the full-time faculty experience in the rank of associate professor, as well as the year that the faculty member applied for promotion to the rank of associate professor.

7. COEHD Documentation for Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion, Candidates

7.1. Candidates for Promotion and Tenure Review will be processed within the Interfolio system. A Deans office designated Interfolio Case manager (ICM) will set up the portfolio system for each individual candidate. Candidates will participate in the process by providing requested material from Interfolio (e.g., CV and Faculty Activity Report (FAR) when requested via email notification from the Interfolio system once the candidate Case has been established.

7.2. Candidates for promotion and tenure, or promotion, review will provide the Dean’s Office with enough documentation to support their candidacy. Except as detailed in this
procedure, additional documents may not be added to the candidate’s dossier once the review process has begun. At a minimum, the dossier must include the following sections in the specified order:

Section I. The Department Chair will provide a letter noting the nature of the appointment (percent teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service including semi-administrative and administrative duties) and any changes in those duties over time.

Section II. An executive summary (2 pages maximum) that clearly illustrates how the candidate’s qualifications meet each of the requirements in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Section III. A current curriculum vita (generated by Interfolio or uploaded from another source).

Section IV. The Interfolio case manager will insert copies of candidate annual or other evaluations from the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost along with student course evaluations for the time period under review and any faculty responses to evaluations. The Interfolio case manager will also include teaching evaluations for the student course evaluations for the time period under review.

Section V. Evidence of performance regarding teaching: 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

The COEHD is committed to teaching and the instructional process as a high priority. Teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated for consideration for promotion and tenure, or promotion, of candidates.

The candidate should demonstrate a broad knowledge of the discipline and an in-depth knowledge in one or more parts of the field. The candidate should be a teacher of proven quality, with the ability and expertise to teach undergraduate and/or graduate courses. The candidate must demonstrate a continuing interest in improving as a teacher and in developing knowledge of university-level pedagogy.

Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in a teaching portfolio. Additionally, the candidate may authenticate quality teaching efforts and performance through student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and student advising activities. Weight should be given to teaching load, average number of students taught, average number of classroom preparations, and undergraduate versus
graduate courses.

The COEHD considers extensive advising involvement and mentoring of graduate (masters and doctoral level) as a thesis or dissertation advisor and/or methodologist as a teaching activity for which a faculty may receive teaching workload reassignment.

Evidence of performance in teaching must include:

1. A statement of teaching philosophy and growth (2 pages maximum) discussing improvements, innovations, and changes initiated over the Pre-Tenure period.

2. An account of teaching assignments and teaching loads, by semester, during the Pre-Tenure period.

3. Additional evidence of teaching excellence may include a peer review of teaching effectiveness as defined by department and/or college criteria and other evidence of teaching effectiveness as determined by college policy.

4. External reviewers will be asked to evaluate teaching and probably not the focus of external letters will likely be mostly limited to scholarship.

Section VI. Evidence of performance regarding scholarship/creative Activity: 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

Intellectual contributions are accrued in the areas of applied scholarship, instructional development, and basic scholarship. Intellectual contributions can be accumulated through publication in peer reviewed professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals; papers in proceedings; published case studies; instructor manuals; instructional software; books; or chapters in books. In addition, intellectual contributions can be accomplished through presentations at faculty research seminars, professional meetings, professional development presentations, book reviews, presenting research papers for peer review, new course development, which is publicly reviewed, and publishing in in-house journals.

The intellectual contributions described in the following paragraphs are normal requirements to be satisfied to be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor. The intent is to encourage faculty to be productive in developing skills to produce impactful intellectual contributions within their field of study.
The candidate must demonstrate competence and productivity in scholarly activities (applied scholarship, instructional development, and/or basic scholarship) that are related to the candidate's discipline and to the mission of the college. While not expected to be leaders in their respective scholarly arenas, candidates must demonstrate a record of participation, competence, and productivity in their field. The candidate's work must be peer reviewed or otherwise publicly evaluated.

The following represent some, but not necessarily all, of the activities that can be used to demonstrate scholarship and creative activity. Scholarship and creative activity should be consistent with the definitions found in the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, such as:

- Funded federal, national, state, local, or institutional grants
- Published books (contracted or self-published)
- Articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals
- White papers, technical reports, program accreditation reports
- Conference proceedings or published abstracts
- Conference presentations
- Published instructor manuals or instructional software

Evidence of performance in scholarship/creative activity must include:

1. A statement explaining contributions and success in the area of scholarship/creative activity (2 pages maximum).
2. Documentation demonstrating performance regarding scholarship/creative activity.
3. External reviewers letters of evaluation solicited from reviewers at peer or aspirational institutions who are leaders in their field as described in college guidelines (see section VIII Below).

Section VII. Evidence of performance regarding service: 12.01.99.C0.04 (Descriptions of Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service).

Service encompasses a variety of professionally related activities through which members of the faculty employ their academic expertise for the benefit of the University, the community, and the profession.

The candidate must document how they have taken an active role in
service. Administrative work in the department as a program coordinator may be considered for course reassignment in overall workload and will be evaluated as service. Service may include committees, events, and special projects at the university, college, department, community, and/or professional levels. Participation and leadership in professional and community service is considered insofar as they serve the mission of the college, the university's purposes, or the candidate's academic discipline. Significant participation in professional service is shown through professional association activities such as serving as an editor, officer, program chair, or in similar roles.

The following represent some, but not necessarily all, of the activities that can be used to demonstrate service:

University, College, and Department Service (see annual review Rubric):

- Elected senator or appointment to a university council or committee.
- Elected or appointed member of a college or department/discipline committee.
- Internal program evaluation.
- Completion of a special project for the university, college, department/discipline.
- Lead author/editor of a major curriculum addition or revision.
- Service on a board, council or committee outside the University by appointment as the University’s or College’s representative.
- Completion of an institutional research project.
- Grant writing for institutional development.
- Student recruitment.
- Committee work involving hiring new faculty.
- Other service to the department/discipline.

Professional Service: The University and the College encourage professional service in support of the institution’s mission. These activities must relate to one’s academic field or else be clearly approved by the University. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to:

- Officer or board member of a professional organization.
- Conference organizer.
- Editor of a journal or newsletter.
- Moderator of a panel at an academic conference.
- Committee membership in a professional association.
- Peer review of professional papers, manuscripts, performances, exhibitions, and presentations.
Community Service: The University and the College also encourage community service in support of the institution’s mission. These activities must relate to one’s academic field or else be clearly approved by the University. Examples of these activities include, but are not limited to:

- Serving as an officer or board member of a community organization.
- Giving volunteer assistance to a community organization or project through provision of advice, grant writing, or other application of one’s professional expertise.
- Conducting workshops, giving talks or demonstrations locally (maybe creative or even expand knowledge, but usually there is no academic peer review to substantiate it).
- Serving on a committee for a local professional association or community organization.
- Judging local competitions.
- Visiting local schools in some professional capacity.

Evidence of performance in Service must include:

1. A statement explaining service contributions (2 pages maximum).
2. Documentation demonstrating performance regarding service.

Section VIII. External review and/or other documentation as defined and required or permitted by the department or college (see COEHD External Reviewer policy).

Understanding that the tenure review process provides for review by individuals outside of the candidate’s field of expertise, candidates should make every effort to provide context and explanations relating to their documentation and evidence of excellence.

7.3. Candidates for promotion and tenure, or promotion, are required to document their effective and engaged performance in a variety of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service contributing to the University as a whole. Candidates are evaluated on a total portfolio demonstrating these three endeavors.

8. COEHD Evaluative Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure:

8.1. Reviewing bodies will assess the candidate in the three primary areas of Teaching, Scholarship/Creative activity, and Service, using the definitions, explanations, and
8.2. Teaching Effectiveness: Candidates must demonstrate consistent above average performance in the annual ADEP process throughout the course of their evaluation period (see annual review rubrics). Evidence of above average performance should be documented by activities and artifacts outlined in the COEHD annual review policy relevant to teaching.

8.2.1. Through self-evaluation, the candidate must demonstrate the development and application of effective instructional strategies and techniques.

8.2.2. The candidate must show high levels of student satisfaction with average course ratings consistently at, or above, the “good” (4.0) standard.

8.2.3. The candidate may provide written exemplars of peer input to document teaching quality and effectiveness.

8.2.4. The candidate must demonstrate familiarity with degree requirements in the discipline and should be experienced in academic advisement and career counseling. The candidate serves as a mentor for students desiring advanced degrees and career entry.

8.3. Scholarship/Creative Activity Effectiveness: Candidates must demonstrate consistent above average performance in the annual ADEP process throughout the course of their evaluation period (see annual review rubrics). Evidence of above average performance should be documented by activities and artifacts outlined in the COEHD annual review policy relevant to scholarly/creative activity.

8.3.1. The candidate should have numerous intellectual contributions. As a minimum qualification to be considered for promotion to associate professor, the candidate should have at least seven (7) intellectual contributions including a minimum of three (3) articles in peer-reviewed journals. One (1) of the required minimum contributions may be listed as “In Press” with appropriate documentation (letter of acceptance from the journal editor). The acceptance letter must state the article requires no further revision before being published.

8.4. Service Effectiveness: Candidates must demonstrate consistent above average performance in the annual ADEP process throughout the course of their evaluation period. Evidence of above average performance should be documented by activities and artifacts outlined in the COEHD annual review policy relevant to service (see annual review rubrics).

8.4.1. The candidate must document how they have taken an active role in service of the COEHD and/or to the university on committees, task forces, councils, and/or special projects. Administrative work in the department as a program coordinator may be considered for course reassignment in overall workload and will be evaluated as service. Participation and leadership in professional and community service will also be considered if the service supports the mission of the college, the university's purposes,
9. COEHD Evaluative Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

9.1. Candidates for promotion to full professor are evaluated on a total portfolio of effort as described in Section 7.2 of this procedure. Significant administrative duties may lessen these performance expectations.

9.2. Teaching Effectiveness:

9.2.1. The candidate should demonstrate maturity and skill in teaching, a proven record of teaching excellence, and continued demonstration of interest in improving pedagogical skills. The candidate should have assumed leadership in curricular development and issues related to teaching improvement in the discipline and may be considered a mentor in teaching effectiveness. Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in a teaching portfolio. Additionally, the candidate may authenticate quality teaching efforts and performance through student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and student advising activities. Weight should be given to teaching load, average number of students taught, average number of classroom preparations, and undergraduate versus graduate courses.

9.2.2. For promotion to the rank of professor, a candidate must meet all the criteria required for candidates applying for promotion and tenure, and include within the appropriate section of the required executive summary (2 pages maximum) their efforts related to:

9.2.2.1. Mentoring junior faculty to help them improve their teaching or teaching related activities, such as student advising, field-based evaluations and assessments, and project, thesis, dissertation work.

9.2.2.2. Demonstrating how courses have been updated to reflect current trends, relevance, and scholarship.

9.2.2.3. Creating a wide variety of student evaluations and assessments to meet learning objectives based on relevant cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.

9.2.2.4. Documenting how course activities provide students with engaged learning activities grounded in relevant philosophies, such as constructivist, behaviorist, and cognitivist frameworks that correspond to the activities.

9.3. Scholarship/Creative Activity Effectiveness:

9.3.1. The intellectual contributions described in the following paragraphs are normal requirements to be satisfied to be eligible for promotion to professor. The intent is to encourage faculty to implement an established systematic research agenda that is visible beyond the university (e.g., regional, state, national, international) arena.
9.3.2. The candidate must demonstrate competence and productivity in scholarly activities (applied scholarship, instructional development, and/or basic scholarship) that are related to the candidate's discipline and to the mission of the college. While not expected to be leaders in their respective scholarly arenas, candidates must demonstrate a record of participation, competence, and productivity in their field. The candidate's work must be peer reviewed or otherwise publicly evaluated.

9.3.3. The candidate should have numerous intellectual contributions evidencing an active and sustained research agenda. As a minimum qualification to be considered for promotion to professor, the candidate should have no less than ten (10) intellectual contributions within the last five years including a minimum of four (4) peer-reviewed articles in professional, pedagogical, or scholarly journals. One (1) of the required minimum contributions may be listed as “In Press” with appropriate documentation (letter from journal editor). The acceptance letter must state that the article requires no further revision before being published.

9.3.4. For promotion to the rank of professor, a candidate must meet all the criteria required for candidates applying for promotion and tenure, and include within the appropriate section of the required executive summary (2 pages maximum) their efforts related to:

9.3.4.1. Mentoring junior faculty to help them in scholarship and creative activity.

9.3.4.2. Mentoring students in their scholarship and creative endeavors.

9.3.4.3. Collaboration engagement with scholars across disciplines at TAMU-CC or other institutions nationwide.

9.4. Service Effectiveness:

9.4.1. The candidate must document how they have taken an active role in service of the COEHD and/or to the university on committees, task forces, councils, and/or special projects. Administrative work in the department as a program coordinator may be considered for course reassignment in overall workload and will be evaluated as service. Participation and leadership in professional and community service will also be considered if the service supports the mission of the college, the university's purposes, or the candidate's academic discipline.

9.4.2. It is the expectation that to be promoted to professor, the candidate should actively serve on, and hold some leadership position on, at least one departmental committee, council or task force and one COEHD committee, council or task force and/or one university level committee, council or task force and/or one professional committee, council or task force in any given academic year. Cumulatively, the candidate should have served on, and have held some leadership position on departmental, college, university and/or professional level committees, councils, or task forces before promotion.

9.4.3. For promotion to the rank of professor, a candidate must meet all the criteria
required for candidates applying for promotion and tenure, and include within the appropriate section of the required executive summary (2 pages maximum) their efforts related to:

9.4.3.1. Mentoring junior faculty to be engaged in a state, regional, national, or international organization related to one’s field.

9.4.3.2. Demonstrating accomplishments made in a leadership role in a state, regional, national, or international organization related to one’s field.

10. COEHD Department Review Process

10.1. Each department (or Promotion Review Unit) shall have a Department Review Committee (DRC). Promotion Review Unit may be synonymous with a department where appropriate. While all departmental faculty holding tenure may attend and participate in DRC discussions, voting members of the DRC will be designated as faculty members at, or above the rank at, which promotion is requested in the department.

10.2. The DRC shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty in the department. The DRC shall have at least three (3) members. A simple majority rule shall prevail. The committee shall not include the Department Chair, Assistant/Associate COEHD Dean, or departmental representative on the COEHD P&T committee.

10.3. If the number of eligible committee members in a department is fewer than three (3), the actual tenured faculty members in the department, plus additional tenured faculty members nominated by the department committee members and confirmed by the Dean, shall act as an ad hoc DRC for promotion recommendation.

10.4. The addition of any designated voting members to the DRC outside of the departmental process must be tenured and have a faculty rank at or above the rank at which candidates are applying for consideration.

10.5. After consultation with the appropriate Department Chair(s), the Dean or delegate shall convene a meeting of the DRC. Each DRC shall elect a chair at the meeting convened by the Dean. The Dean, or designee, and the Department Chair shall review college policies and university rules and procedures related to promotion with the committee. The Dean or designee and the Department Chair will not be present during subsequent meetings of the DPRC.

10.6. The Dean’s Office shall maintain control of the dossiers throughout the process and shall
delegate a secure location where the dossiers are available for review by the committee members. The Dean and the Department Chair must not be present during subsequent meetings of the DRC.

10.7. The chair of the DRC shall convene subsequent meetings as needed to conduct the reviews of all promotion candidates. The DRC shall work and provide a completed report to the Department Chair.

10.8. Within at least five (5) business days of written notice, the chair of the DRC shall reconvene the committee for a final meeting to hold the promotion vote. By a simple majority of those voting, the committee shall recommend granting or denying promotion. The chair of the DRC shall document the results of the review to the department chair in a written statement and recommendation which shall be signed by all members of the committee and include the result of the vote alongside a written explanation of the vote and decision.

10.9. After receiving the report and recommendation from the DRC, the chair shall develop a written recommendation to grant or deny promotion.

10.10. The Department Chair will meet with the candidate and review the DPRCs and the chair’s recommendations. The candidate will be provided a copy of the DRC’s and the chair’s written recommendations. Written recommendation letters from DRC and the Department Chair will be included in the candidate's dossier.

10.11. Each candidate may submit a written response to the DRC’s and the Department Chair’s recommendations. Responses must be submitted to the Deans Delegate for inclusion in dossier within five (5) business days of the meeting with the department will be included in the dossier.

10.12. The response shall indicate concurrence with the recommendations or non-concurrence. Responses shall be no more than two pages in length.

10.13. The Department Chair’s recommendation, the DRC’s recommendation, and the candidate’s response, if available, must all be added to the dossier and forwarded to the Dean/Dean’s Delegate on or by October 25th.

10.14. In departments where an insufficient number of eligible faculty are available to adhere to the provisions of this procedure, an alternative process may be employed as recommended by the college faculty and approved by the COEHD Dean and the Provost.

11. COEHD External Review Process
   1. Independent external review is an important part of the promotion and tenure process. The use of external reviewers in this review process advises the university on the broader impact and value of a faculty member’s research/scholarly/creative productivity to their discipline. One of the chief purposes of promotion and tenure is to ensure that the university is making progress towards its strategic goals and aspirations, which cannot occur unless advice is continually solicited from those who represent peer and aspirant institutions.
2. At TAMU-CC, external reviews are used to confirm the significance of results arising from a faculty member’s scholarly efforts but are not intended to be conclusive elements of the promotion and tenure review. While the COEHD Promotion and Tenure Committee, Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees, and respective Department Chairs will remain the primary evaluators of faculty teaching, scholarship, and service contributions, external reviewers are best positioned to provide a critical evaluation of the prominence of a candidate’s scholarship as viewed by their professional peers.

3. Accordingly, the promotion and tenure portfolio of all faculty with research expectations specified in the appointment and annual workload must include a minimum of three (3) external reviewer letters from qualified, independent reviewers (See section on qualified reviewers). These letters will be uploaded to the candidate’s Interfolio packet at the end of the external reviewer selection, solicitation, and receipt process.

Guidelines for Selecting Potential External Reviewers

1. Nomination and Selection of qualified Independent External reviewers

External reviewers must be established scholars in the candidate’s field of study or a closely related field. The reviewers must have faculty appointments at or above the rank for which the candidate is applying.

The selection of qualified independent external reviewers will be a collaborative process between the faculty candidate and their respective department chair, with each individual nominating potential reviewers. Faculty candidates will be asked to nominate up to five (5) names of potential reviewers. Chairs will be asked to nominate up to an additional five (5) names. Faculty candidates will be encouraged to meet with their department chair to review the list of potential reviewers before it is forwarded to the COEHD Dean for final approval. Upon collaborative (Department chair and faculty candidate) review of the preliminary nomination list, the candidate will have the right to exclude (if desired) up to two (2) of the Chair suggested nominees for reasons of obvious conflict of interest. As part of the collaborative process, additional reviewers may be nominated by department chair or faculty member so as to forward at least (7-10) to the COEHD Dean for consideration. The combined list of 7-10 reviewer nominations will be reviewed. Further the department chair will ‘qualify’ each nominated reviewer and record observations on the reviewer qualifying worksheet provided in Appendix 3 (which is used to validate the independence, expertise of reviewer) and forward the list to the Dean of COEHD for approval.

The COEHD Dean will approve the final list of potential reviewers from the list of potential reviewers nominated. The Dean’s approval of external reviewers will be final and based on his/her independent evaluation of the qualifications of the nominee and the recommendations from the candidate’s Department Chair. The qualifications of external reviewers will include:

- External reviewers should be identified experts in the faculty candidate’s discipline, sub-field, or area, and should not be a past mentor, dissertation advisor, frequent or current (within last 5 years) collaborator (e.g., currently co-authoring or working directly with on a project), nor have a personal relationship with the candidate. Each reviewer will be asked to outline in their review letter any past professional and/or personal associations that they may have with the faculty candidate.
- Reviewers must hold a faculty rank at or above the rank candidate is seeking.
• COEHD department chairs shall document and complete a ‘reviewer qualifying worksheet’ for all identified reviewer nominations to be approved by the Dean and included in the candidate’s dossier.

• The list should include a sufficient number of potential reviewers (typically 7-10 solicitations) to yield the minimum of three (3) independent evaluation letters required to advance the dossier for consideration.

The Department Chair will be responsible for managing this process and ensuring that a minimum of three (3) letters are received by the Sept 15 due date. The COEHD Associate Dean will conduct a check-in with the Department Chair in late July/early August to see if any assistance is needed in acquiring the requisite number of evaluation letters. In the case where less than three (3) letters are received or expected, a second solicitation of additional COEHD Dean approved reviewers will be conducted.

2. External Reviewer Solicitation Process

The official solicitation process will be facilitated through the Interfolio system. Faculty members will also submit a list of five (5) suggested external reviewers to their Department Chair by June 15th. The COEHD Dean will approve the final list of external reviewers by June 20th. The Department Chairs will be responsible for compiling the external reviewer solicitation packets (#3 below) and sending potential reviewers the required solicitation letter (see template below). External reviewers will be asked to specifically comment on the candidate’s scholarly work and the significance of the contributions to the discipline.

3. Compilation of External Reviewer Solicitation Packets

COEHD Dean approved External Reviewers will each receive a packet with instructions regarding the requested input of the faculty candidate’s scholarship. In preparation for solicitation of external reviewers, Faculty candidates will be asked to submit: a current CV, two (2) representative samples of scholarship (e.g., publications, presentations, etc.), and an overview of their scholarly research agenda (scholarship statement) in the context of their current academic appointment (2-3 pages max, single-spaced). The external reviewer solicitation packets will be processed within the Interfolio system with instructions and sent to selected external reviewers on or before July 1. The solicitation will request that letters be received on or before September 15 (see appendix 1)

4. Processing Incoming External Review Letters

All external Reviewer letters will be treated confidentially. Upon receipt of external review letters, the Department Chair will be preparing a summary of both positive (strengths) and negative (weaknesses/limitations) comments and their recommendations in regard to candidates’ qualifications for tenure and/or promotion.

All reviewer letters received, qualifying worksheet and department chair letter summaries will be included in the faculty candidate’s Interfolio packet. While the identity of external reviewers and their letters will be kept strictly confidential, candidates will have access to the Department Chair’s summary of identified strengths and weaknesses as identified by the reviewers.
Appendices (1-3): Materials for Processing COEHD External Review Policy

Appendix 1. Sample Department Chair Solicitation Letter

On behalf of our University and College, I appreciate your willingness to invest your time in this process. We respectfully ask that you please return your evaluation by September 15, 2022 (e.g., and include a current copy of your CV. If you are unable to do so or have questions about the process, please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you in advance for your contribution to this essential university review process.

Sincerely,

(NAME, DEGREE)
Chair, Department of [DEPARTMENT NAME]

Appendix 2. Required Template for COEHD Solicitation of External Reviewer Letters

Dear Referee:

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC) University and the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD) are evaluating [name of candidate] for [tenure and promotion to associate professor; tenure-only; promotion to full professor] in the Department(s) of [name of department(s)].

TAMU-CC is a newly recognized Carnegie R2 and Hispanic-Serving University. Because you are recognized as a leading scholar in [name of candidate]’s field, we would appreciate your assistance in assessing his/her record of work. TAMU-CC values an inclusive view of scholarship and recognizes that knowledge is acquired and advanced through discovery, integration, application, and teaching, as outlined in our Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy. Given this perspective, promotion, and tenure reviews, as detailed in the criteria of individual departments and colleges, will recognize original research, creative and scholarly contributions in peer-reviewed publications, presentations, grant making, reviews, or other documentation of scholarly contributions as well as integrative and applied forms of scholarship including collaborations with community agencies, and school districts.

In your letter, please note how well you know the candidate professionally and/personally. If you have collaborated with the candidate within the last five years, we will appreciate your describing the nature and extent of your collaborations. This will help us understand your perspective on this candidate and any potential conflicts of interest.

We have attached the following materials to help you evaluate [name of candidate]’s’s record:

- a curriculum vitae.
- a statement in which he/she explains his/her program of work (3 pg max).
- copies of our departmental and college promotion/tenure guidance; and
- a representative sample of two (2) Scholarly products (articles, presentations etc.)

To provide a context for your review of faculty Scholarship,

Our COEHD faculty carry a 3-course per semester course load and are responsible for committee work, student advising at multiple levels (UG, MS, EdD, PhD). Our typical annual evaluation is
based on an evaluative weighing of faculty workload as 40% Teaching; 40% Scholarship; and 20% service

If applicable A note, [name of candidate] had been automatically granted an extra year toward tenure and promotion and no negative inference should be inferred.

We appreciate you providing a detailed assessment of the ‘candidate’s scholarly research record. Please focus your review comments on the research/scholarly/creative accomplishments and the potential for the candidate to add to the discourse of your shared discipline. While our COEHD P&T criteria also include consideration of teaching, advising and service, a review of the candidate’s teaching accomplishments and service to the institution/profession is expected to be done in a separate component of the tenure evaluation process.

In your review, we ask that you please address the following questions:

How familiar are you with the candidates’ work or work in this field/sub field in general?

- What are the ‘candidate’s strengths including any contributions and/or impact on their profession/discipline?

- In your professional opinion, does the candidate demonstrate the potential for continued scholarly or creative productivity? Please provide a brief description to support your answer.

- Can you identify any weaknesses/limitations of the candidate? Do you believe the candidate compares favorably to other scholars at a similar stage in their career and/or at a similar institution as Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi? Please elaborate if possible.

Please know that your recommendation will be treated with the greatest possible confidentiality permitted by the Texas A&M university System and Board of ‘Regents’ policy and applicable law. Neither your identity nor letter will be provided to the candidate. Only a prepared aggregated summary of your comments along with those of other reviewers will be available for the candidate’s review. Please note that, pursuant to public information law in the State of Texas, while we make every effort to maintain the privacy of these reviews, we are unable to guarantee confidentiality. Consequently, our review process stresses transparency, and your evaluation may be made available in the event of a valid public information request.
Appendix 3. Department Chair Form for Documenting and Qualifying External Reviewers: Independence/Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Reviewer Nominee</th>
<th>Nominated by</th>
<th>Dept Chair Rec</th>
<th>Dean Approved</th>
<th>Date Solicited</th>
<th>Date Response</th>
<th>Date letter received in Interfolio</th>
<th>Dept Chair Qualified &amp; Included in Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dept Chair Candidate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Date: ___</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reason If No: Conflict?</td>
<td>Date: ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. COEHD College Review Process

12.1. Each year by September 30, departments in the College shall elect or confirm continuing term eligible membership of one member each to serve at two-year term on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee (COEHD P&T Committee).

12.2. Faculty members tenured at the rank of professor are eligible for membership. Those excluded from membership include individuals: (1) serving as an Assistant/Associate Dean in the COEHD, (2) serving as Department Chair, (3) serving as a voting member of their respective DRC, and (4) eligible for Post Tenure Review in the same year. This elected faculty member cannot serve consecutive terms, unless there are fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members in their home department. Members serving on the COEHD P&T committee may not abstain from any vote.

12.3. If a department has no one qualified to serve on the COEHD P&T Committee, the department and Dean may use one of the following:

12.3.1. The Dean may modify the qualifications to allow a faculty member, other than the Department Chair, to be elected from the department. Such member cannot be considered for promotion during their term on the COEHD P&T Committee.

12.3.2. The department faculty may nominate a faculty member from outside the College. The Dean may appoint that faculty member or seek alternative nominations from the department.
12.3.3. Upon nomination from the department chair, a previously tenured emeritus faculty member may be asked to serve on the COEHD P&T Committee. The Dean may appoint the emeritus faculty member or seek alternative nominations from the department.

12.3.4. As one of the Dean’s appointments, if the department has no one qualified to serve on the COEHD P&T Committee, the Dean may appoint a faculty member from outside the department or a previously tenured emeritus faculty member.

12.3.5. After the DRC and the Department Chair have made their recommendations and the Dean has appointed the remaining members, the DRC department chair will forward the recommendations to the COEHD P&T Committee. At this meeting, the COEHD P&T Committee and the Dean shall review relevant college and university promotion and tenure, or promotion, procedures. The Dean, assistant Dean, or associate Dean may not be present during subsequent meetings of the COEHD P&T Committee. All faculty members eligible for promotion and tenure, or promotion, shall be reviewed within the time frame outlined in section 6 of this document.

12.4. Within at least five (5) business days of written notice, the chair of the College P&T Committee shall reconvene the review committee for a final meeting to hold the tenure vote. For each tenure candidate, the College P&T Committee, by a simple majority of those voting, shall make a recommendation to grant or to deny tenure. A tie vote is insufficient to recommend tenure. The recommendations shall be based on the written measures of the college (and the department, if applicable) and on discussion among the committee members. The committee chair shall forward the recommendations to the Dean/Dean’s Delegate.

12.5. After receiving the recommendations from the department chair, the DRC, and from the College P&T Committee, the Dean shall write an individual recommendation for each candidate, to grant or deny promotion.

12.5.1. The Dean will meet with the faculty member to inform the candidate of the Dean’s and college-level recommendations including numerical votes from departmental and college-level balloting processes. The candidate will be provided a copy of the College P&T Committee’s and Dean’s written recommendations.

12.6. The candidate may submit a written response to the Dean’s recommendation. Responses must be submitted to the Dean within five (5) business days of the meeting with the Dean and will be included in the dossier forwarded to the Provost.

13. University Review Process

13.1. The recommendations provided by the DRC, Department Chair, the College P&T Committee, the Dean’s recommendation, and the candidate’s response, if available, must all be added to the dossier and forwarded to the Provost according to University timeline [http://academicaffairs.TAMU-CC.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf](http://academicaffairs.TAMU-CC.edu/sacs/assets/timeline.pdf)
13.2. Please see University Policies 12.02.99.C0.01 (Tenure) and 33.99.04.C0.02 (Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members) regarding the University Review Process.

14. Candidate withdrawal from promotion and tenure, or promotion, consideration

13.1. A candidate for tenure may withdraw from tenure consideration at any time prior to the forwarding of the recommendations to the Provost for review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

13.1.1. If the candidate is applying for early promotion and tenure and withdraws prior to the forwarding the recommendations to the provost for review, they shall reapply for tenure in their sixth year.

13.2. A withdrawal request must be made in writing, signed, and dated to the Dean. Once the letter is submitted to the Dean it may not be rescinded.

13.3. In the event a candidate requests withdrawal from the promotion and tenure review process, and is not applying for early tenure, the faculty member will be given a one-year terminal contract with the current workload and salary to begin in the academic year immediately following the year in which the application for promotion and tenure was withdrawn.

15. Recommendations Against Promotion and Tenure, or Promotion, or Appeals

15.1. If a candidate’s application for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor has been denied, the candidate will be given a one-year terminal contract with the current workload and salary to begin in the academic year immediately following the year in which the application for promotion and tenure was denied.

14.2. A promotion and tenure candidate may appeal a decision denying promotion and tenure for reasons detailed in System Policy 12.01, (Academic Freedom, Responsibilities and Tenure). Those appealing should refer to System Regulation 32.01.01 (Complaint and Appeal Procedures for Faculty Members) and University Rule 12.01.99.C0.06 (Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments).

14.3. If a candidate’s application for promotion to professor has been denied, the candidate cannot reapply until after one additional year of full-time service has passed beginning in the academic year that follows the issuance of the denial of promotion.

14.4. For additional information on non-renewal of non-tenured tenure-track faculty at the end of a term contract, financial exigency, and the phasing out of programs, please see university procedure 12.01.99.C0.05 (Faculty Dismissals, Administrative Leave, Non-Reappointments and Terminal Appointments).
16. Promotion of Clinical Track Faculty

16.1. COEHD policy for evaluation and promotion of clinical track faculty members is governed by TAMUCC University policy 12.01.99.C0.01: Academic Rank Descriptors for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

16.2. COEHD Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Track Faculty (Non-Tenure Track Faculty)

16.2.1. Clinical Track Faculty members in the COEHD have full-time appointments that bring excellence to the university through high quality teaching and/or research/creative activity and/or service. Clinical faculty members must hold at least a terminal degree (Ph.D., Ed.D.) in education or related field or related discipline and be appropriately credentialed to teach assigned courses prior to the first day of class.

16.3. Promotion from clinical faculty members

16.3.1. Clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion consideration to Associate/professor. To be promoted, the candidate must have a terminal degree and five years of experience at the appropriate preceding (clinical assistant/clinical associate) rank.

16.3.2. While clinical track candidates must meet all the requirements for the promotion to ascendants in the tenure track section. Clinical faculty are not required to document evidence of productivity in scholarly and/or creative Activity (unless research/scholarships is a contracted workload responsibility documented in their appointment letter). Accordingly, clinical faculty are not required to receive letters from external reviewers as part of the process.

16.3.3. Clinical faculty must prepare a dossier according to the same COEHD processes as required by Tenure track candidates which includes:

16.4. Evidence of Performance regarding Teaching:

16.4.1. The candidate should demonstrate maturity and skill in teaching, a proven record of teaching excellence, and continued demonstration of interest in improving pedagogical skills. The candidate should have assumed leadership in curricular development and issues related to teaching improvement in the discipline and may be considered a mentor in teaching effectiveness. Evidence of quality in teaching may be demonstrated by instructional innovation, new course development, or other similar activities compiled in a teaching portfolio. Additionally, the candidate may authenticate quality teaching efforts and performance through student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and student advising activities. Weight should be given to teaching load, average number of students taught, average number of classroom preparations, and undergraduate versus graduate courses. The COEHD considers participation and involvement in the mentoring of graduate (master’s and doctoral level) as a thesis or dissertation advisor/ or methodologist as a teaching activity for which a faculty may receive teaching workload reassignment.
16.5. Evidence of Performance in Service:

16.5.1. The candidate must document how he or she has taken an active role in the service of the COEHD and/or to the university on committees and/or special projects. Administrative work in the department as a program coordinator may be considered for course reassignment in overall workload and will be evaluated as service. Participation and leadership in professional and community service is considered insofar as they serve the mission of the college, the university’s purposes, or the candidate’s academic discipline. Significant participation in professional service is shown through professional association activities such as serving as an editor, officer, program chair, or in similar roles.