COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

I. Introduction

The “College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion” is one of four
documents governing the granting of tenure and promotion of Arts and Sciences faculty. The
other three documents are: (a) the Texas Tech University Tenure Policy, which is currently a
supplement to the Faculty Handbook and available at
http://www.depts.ttu.edu/officialpublications/facultyHB/TenurePolicy.html; (b) O.P. 32.01,
available at www.depts.ttu.edu/opmanual/OP32.01.pdf, and (c) the individual department’s or
school’s tenure and promotion guidelines and criteria. Unit guidelines must be consistent with
those of the College of Arts and Sciences, and any revisions must be submitted for the approval
of the Dean by July 1 of the year in which they are to be put into effect.

Chairpersons or Directors must provide access to these documents to any candidate for
tenure and promotion. A signed statement by the candidate stating that he or she has seen these
documents and received a copy of the dossier must accompany the promotion and/or tenure
dossier.

The College and the University view the probationary period for tenure-track faculty as
an essential time for determining whether the faculty member will be able to sustain a strong and
continuous record of effective teaching, significant research and creative activity, and service to
the unit and the profession. Thus, the College of Arts and Sciences normally will not
recommend candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor prior to their sixth year
of service unless a compelling reason for doing so is advanced by the unit and/or the candidate.
If a candidate wishes to be considered prior to the end of the normal probationary period, he or
she should notify the chairperson or director, and the chairperson or director should consult with
the Dean.

II. Procedures at the Departmental Level

Evaluation at the departmental level begins in the first year of a tenure-track faculty
member’s service at Texas Tech. The evaluation process is to be conducted in accordance with
the guidelines provided in the College of Arts and Sciences “College of Arts and Sciences
Principles and Procedures For the Third-Year Review of Faculty in Tenure Acquiring Positions,”
and in accordance with the guidelines in part III of this document.

It is the responsibility of the chairperson or director to notify the faculty of the
department or school deadlines for applying for tenure and promotion. These deadlines must be
sufficiently early to permit a thorough evaluation of each candidate’s teaching, research, and
service achievements and to enable the chairperson or director to submit originals and copies of a
well-organized dossier to the Dean’s Office by the third Friday in October.
The version of the dossier to be forwarded ultimately to the Provost should conform to O.P. 32.01. The basic form is as follows and should be presented in a three-ring binder (Format Checklist available from Office of the Dean):

1. Dean’s letter
2. Chairperson’s or Director’s letter
3. Vita (with chairperson’s/director’s ratings of publication or creative activities)
4. Solicited and unsolicited letters (as in item 10 on College Format Checklist)
5. Basic information (parts 1-9 of item C, pp. 4-6 of Attachment A to OP 32.01)
6. Teaching effectiveness (as in item 11 on College Format Checklist)
7. Research and creative activities (as in item 11 on College Format Checklist)
8. Service activities (as in item 11 on College Format Checklist)

As an appendix to the original dossier and copies for the College of Arts and Sciences only (not in the copy for the Provost), the following materials should be added:

- Ballot comments (but not the ballots)
- Annual general peer evaluations, if available (e.g., advisory committee reports)
- Annual faculty reports with chair’s/director’s assessments, Third-Year Review in appropriate position, all chronologically (Third-Year Review to contain review report, chair’s letter, ballot report).

In working with the candidate in preparing the dossier, the chairperson or director should keep the following points in mind:

1. A candidate who does not receive a majority vote from the department or school faculty and/or the support of the chairperson or director may elect to have his or her dossier sent forward to the Dean’s Office. However, in such circumstances the candidate should be made aware of the fundamental importance of peer evaluation and of the need for an exceptionally strong dossier and/or rationale to receive favorable recommendations at the higher levels of review.

2. The candidate’s dossier should contain a comprehensive summary of peer and student teaching evaluations. The chairperson or director, who is responsible for compiling it, should sign the summary of student evaluations.

3. The candidate’s dossier should contain evidence of the comparative quality of the publications and/or creative activities of the candidate. This is to be done by the chair rating the outlets in accordance with the guidelines in O.P. 32.01. This rating is to be done on the vita. Chairpersons or Directors and faculty should independently assess the candidate’s publications and/or creative activities prior to voting rather than depending only on the reputation of the outlets.

4. Outside letters of recommendation must be solicited on behalf of the candidate and
included in the dossier.

5. Ballots should be submitted unsigned by the voting faculty to the chairperson or director, who, in the presence of one other faculty member of the same unit, will tally them and record the tally on the form to be forwarded to the Dean’s Office. The chairperson or director will indicate in writing to the Dean the name of the other faculty member who witnessed or assisted in the counting.

6. Faculty members should be encouraged to explain fully the reasons for their votes. These unsigned comments should be typed, rather than handwritten. They are to be collected, separate from the ballots, and forwarded by the chairperson or director to the Dean’s Office appended to the dossier.

7. The Chairperson’s or Director’s letter should clearly state his or her recommendation and the reasons for this recommendation. A copy of this letter must be given to the candidate at the time the dossier is forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

8. The candidate must see the dossier, but he or she does not have to approve it. Letters of rebuttal from candidates are not accepted as part of the dossier.

9. Six copies of the dossier plus the original are to be submitted to the Dean’s Office. One of the copies, not the original, is to be placed in a three-ring binder for subsequent submission to the Provost (per the format outlined on the previous page). An additional copy will be provided to the candidate.

III. Procedures at the College Level

The College of Arts and Sciences conducts its own independent tenure and promotion deliberations. Chairpersons or Directors should inform candidates that this review is not a mere formality. A favorable vote from the department or school and a favorable recommendation from the chairperson or director do not guarantee that the ultimate recommendation from the College of Arts and Sciences, and later from the Graduate Dean, the Provost, and the President to the Board of Regents, will be favorable. Likewise, unfavorable departmental or school votes are not always upheld.

At the College level, the Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Committee, appointed and chaired by the Dean (or his/her designee), is responsible for making recommendations to the Dean on all tenure and promotion applications. Following careful deliberations, the Committee takes a formal vote, which is recorded on the Consideration of Tenure and Promotion Form. Committee members do not vote on tenure and promotion applications from their own departments or schools. The Dean does not cast a vote at this stage.

In their deliberations, Committee members rely primarily on the evidence contained in the applicant’s dossier. For this reason it is important that the dossier be complete and compiled in a neat, professional manner. The Committee may, however, ask for additional information. In all cases in which there is a serious question about the desirability of recommending tenure for a
candidate in his or her mandatory year for consideration of tenure, the candidate and the
department chairperson or school director will be asked to meet individually with the Committee.
At the discretion of the Dean, other individuals may be asked to meet with the Committee as
well.

Following the deliberations of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean will
make his/her own independent recommendation. He/She will at this point inform the candidate
of his/her decision, permitting the candidate to decide whether or not he or she wishes to have
the dossier sent on for further evaluation.

IV. Standards for Academic Ranks

1. Assistant Professor: For promotion from the rank of Instructor to Assistant Professor
   the candidate must have the ability to teach effectively and hold the terminal degree (or
   its equivalent) as defined by the academic unit as appropriate to the position of Assistant
   Professor. In addition, the candidate must show promise for growth in teaching, research,
   and service.

2. Associate Professor: Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
   requires that the candidate have (a) a demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher,
   (b) a record of peer-evaluated publication or creative activity which has contributed to the
discipline or field of study, to the candidate’s intellectual and artistic development, and to
the quality of his or her academic unit, (c) a demonstrated record of significant
contributions to the university’s graduate programs through such activities as teaching of
graduate courses, service on thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate
students; (d) a record of promise for growth in service.

3. Professor: For promotion to the highest academic rank, the candidate’s academic
   achievement and professional reputation must be superior. The candidate is expected to
demonstrate a clear and continuing record of significant involvement in the university’s
graduate programs through such activities as teaching of graduate courses, service on
thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate students. This rank can be
earned only by a candidate who has demonstrated continued growth in, and has a
cumulative record of, teaching effectiveness, substantial peer-reviewed publication or
creative activity, and professional contributions and service.

V. Standards for Tenure

A favorable tenure decision requires that the candidate have (a) a demonstrated record of
effectiveness as a teacher, (b) a record of peer-evaluated publication or creative activity which
has contributed to the discipline or field of study, to the candidate’s intellectual and artistic
development, and to the quality of his or her academic unit, (c) a demonstrated record of
significant contributions to the university’s graduate programs through such activities as teaching
of graduate courses, service on thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate
students, (d) a record of promise for growth in service.