

OP 32.01: Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures

DATE: _____

Formatted: Tab stops: 362.9 pt, Left

PURPOSE: The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to define University level standards and procedures concerning promotion and tenure ~~for faculty hires starting in the fall of 2010 and thereafter. All faculty being considered for promotion and tenure prior who were hired prior to this time are to be evaluated using the version of prior OP 32.01 dated effective on the date of hire,~~ unless they elect to be evaluated using the current version of the policy.

Comment [FSC1]: Stating a particular hiring date is redundant with the next sentence (once a new date is affixed to this revised OP).

Comment [FSC2]: See FSC1.

REVIEW: This OP will be reviewed in November of odd-numbered years by the senior vice provost, with recommended revisions presented to the provost ~~and~~ senior vice president ~~for academic affairs~~ (PSVPA) by December 15. ~~Any change in this OP must be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Regents.~~

Comment [FSC3]: A formal review by the Faculty Senate is consistent with Sect. 9 line 2 (&OP 10.01 Sect. 4c1)

POLICY/PROCEDURE

Members of the faculty who are employed in a full time tenure track position ~~at the~~with Texas Tech University are covered by this OP. The tenure policy does not apply to strictly administrative or part-time appointments. ~~Approval of continuing appointment approval of persons holding full-time instructional positions that do not acquire tenure is described in OP 32.34.~~ The terms and conditions of every full time tenure track faculty appointment shall be stated in writing and shall be in the possession of both the university and the faculty member at the time of initial employment. These terms and conditions shall include departmental guidelines, college guidelines, guidelines for third-year review procedures, and this operating policy.

Comment [FSC4]: Essential as a contractual foundation.

Texas Tech University has adopted a Statement of Ethical Principles that calls on all members of the ~~university~~Texas Tech community to accept responsibility for promoting the ~~shared~~ ethical principles of the university. -All academic appointments and tenure judgments and recommendations rest upon honest evaluation of the faculty member's ~~ability to perform~~performance of his or her teaching, research, ~~and~~creative activity, and service responsibilities. ~~Consistent with TTU OP 40.01 and OP 10.12, s~~Such judgments and recommendations are to be made without regard to race, religion, ~~sex~~gender, ~~sexual orientation,~~ age, national origin, marital status, or physical disabilities that do not obstruct professional performance—

Comment [FSC5]: Isn't this OP mainly about assessing performance (during the probationary period) rather than estimating future ability?.

Comment [FSC6]: Word change (from sex to gender).

~~Texas Tech University's Strategic Plan, Making it Possible, states as a priority to "attract and retain the best faculty in the world in order to enhance our teaching excellence and grow our number of nationally recognized programs." TIn keeping with the mission of the University tenure and promotion of quality faculty are essential values and processes in this strategy to strengthenstrengthening academic quality and reputation. Tenure and promotion also incentivize~~

Comment [FSC7]: Reference to a particular Strategic Plan is inappropriate because plans change.

Comment [FSC8]: Reworded in keeping with removal of any direct reference to a particular Strategic Plan.

the university's strategies to promote excellence in teaching, expand and enhance research and creative scholarship, and to further notable outreach and engagement.

1. Concept and Purpose of Tenure

a. Academic tenure is designed to assure the faculty the freedom of teaching, of research, of opinion, and of full participation in the community. This includes, but is not limited to, the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern, as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the university.

b. Academic tenure has been adopted so that Texas Tech University may have the benefit of the competent and honest judgment and high quality performance of its faculty. Tenure recognizes the professional status of university faculty and assures that tenured employment may be terminated only for adequate cause (see OP 32.XX Revocation of Tenure and Termination of Faculty).

Comment [FSC9]: The mention of performance does not fit here. Also it's redundant with 1c.

c. Tenure aims at the retention, encouragement, and promotion of the ablest and most promising faculty.

d. Tenure may normally be obtained only after a period of probationary service. After tenure is granted, the burden of proof rests upon the university when it wishes to dismiss a faculty member.

2. Procedures for Admission to Tenure

a. All departments shall have in place procedures for a third year review for each untenured faculty member which is to include provision of a written and assessment and recommendation advise them in writing regarding the faculty member's their progress toward in the tenure and promotion process.

b. A faculty member must complete a reasonable probationary period before acquiring tenure in the university. The maximum probationary period for admission to tenure is the same for all tenure-eligible ranks. Before the end of a six-year probationary period at Texas Tech University, an untenured tenure-eligible assistant, associate, or full professor, librarian, or archivist must be notified in writing either that tenure has been awarded or that the appointment will not be renewed at the end of the seventh, terminal year.

c. Computation of the maximum probationary period begins based on the written terms and conditions upon of the a faculty member's initial appointment to a tenure-eligible rank. Probation is not reduced by previous non tenure-track appointments or by promotions made during that period.

(1) The probationary period for admission to tenure shall begin in September of the calendar year in which the appointment is made.

(2) After the probationary period begins, all time accrued in full-time service at Texas Tech University in a tenure-eligible rank will be counted in the probationary period. If ~~unusual~~ extenuating circumstances, as judged by the PSVP, justify a suspension of the tenure probationary period causing the years included not to be sequential, a request for an extension of the probationary period may be made to the PSVPAA. The request will be initiated by the ~~candidate~~ faculty member, reviewed and commented upon by the department/division ~~administrator~~ chairperson and college dean, and forwarded to the PSVPAA.

d. Exceptions to tenure timeline.

(1) In exceptional cases, associate professors, librarians and archivists and full professors, librarians and archivists may be hired with tenure when the traditional tenure review procedure precedes the appointment.

(2) Faculty members who are promoted in rank shall not thereby acquire tenure unless the normal tenure review procedure has been completed.

(3) Tenure may be awarded prior to completion of the full probationary term, though a positive third-year review is advisable. ~~After a positive third-year review, a~~ faculty member can may request early tenure consideration prior to completing the full probationary period without prejudice for later reconsideration. For an early tenure bid, the faculty member's record of accomplishment on the standard criteria set by the department and college for admission to tenure is to be at least what would be expected at the completion of a full probationary period.

e. The faculty member has primary responsibility for preparation and submission of a dossier, by the start of the sixth year of the probationary period, with guidance provided by the department chairperson, ~~or~~ designated representative, or departmental committee (see ~~dossier format attachment~~ Attachment A). Material submitted to the PSVPAA shall be limited to the designated format and should consist of no more than 20 pages, exclusive of all letters, annual reports, curriculum vitae, and department and college guidelines, which must be included in the package or submitted electronically. Any changes in the designated format (Attachment A) must be distributed to the deans by the PSVP no later than March-April 15 of the year in which the affected candidates are preparing their dossiers.

f. A common format (Attachment A) for promotion and tenure dossiers shall be used to assure fairness in the decision-making process. ~~As~~ promotion and tenure require that a person's professional record and contributions be reviewed, the format calls for information on educational background, previous academic and professional experience, and teaching and advising responsibilities, research and scholarly contributions, and service and engagement activities since the most recent promotion or tenure decision. Some departments or colleges may wish to add other special categories for review at those levels. Both a paper and a secure electronic copy of the dossier should be made available for review by the voting faculty within the department.

Comment [jumunoz10]: What about assistant professors that come to TTU the Fall that they would be going up at their previous university? I believe there is case like this pending before the board, at present?

Comment [SEN11]: Inserted in response to RAS13.

Comment [FSC12]: We agree with VP Munoz and have therefore deleted the phrase "After a positive third-year review".

Comment [RAS13]: We want to somehow convey that someone in the standard probationary period (i.e., having started here as an assistant professor) should wait until at least the third-year review before going up early for tenure consideration. T ... [1]

Comment [jumunoz14]: Are all colleges complying with this requirement?

Comment [FSC15]: Currently, higher levels are not always aware of u ... [2]

Comment [RAS16]: Each college will submit its own and its relevant departments' guideleines separa ... [3]

Comment [SEN17]: Inserted in response to RAS16.

Comment [SEN18]: Date changed in response to RAS20.

Comment [FSC19]: This insert was requested by chairs & deans to whom the FSC spoke. It will allow suffi ... [4]

Comment [RAS20]: April 15 would seem a reasonable time since m ... [5]

Comment [jumunoz21]: The new strategic priority IV for TTU, require P&T policies be revised to includ ... [6]

Comment [Rob 22]: Are we ready to require electronic copies? In { ... [7]

g. Primary responsibility for the evaluation of the academic qualifications of candidates for tenure rests with the faculty. When the organizational structure permits, four sequential levels exist in the tenure review process. (Note: Colleges and schools may be organized by departments or divisions or function as a single unit. In this OP, “department” and “chairperson” will be used to refer to the basic academic unit of a college and that unit’s administrative head.)

(1) Evaluation by the department, which includes a vote by the tenured faculty, and a recommendation by the chairperson, **who does not attend or participate in the faculty vote;**

(2) Two events occur at the college level: first, a review by the college tenure committee, which provides a recommendation to the dean; second, a letter of recommendation provided by the dean, **who does not attend or participate in the department faculty vote, nor participates in the vote of the college tenure committee.**

—— (3) Review by the PSVPA, which includes review and a vote by the Dean of the Graduate School except for candidates from the school of Law, and, at the PSVP’s discretion, review (but not votes) and a vote by the Vice President for Research, and review, but not votes, by members of the provostial staff. In any such deliberations the greatest possible weight should be accorded to the department’s and dean’s assessments of the candidate. Any decision to overturn a departmental or college vote by the PSVP should only be made after further consultation with the affected dean or chair.

—— (4) Review by the University President, who makes recommendations for tenure to the Board of Regents. The action of the Board of Regents awards or denies faculty members tenure.

3. Procedures for Promotion

a. Promotion from Assistant to Associate **Professor, Librarian, or Archivist** normally occurs at the same time as the decision on tenure and follows the same procedures. **Only faculty at a higher rank may participate in any promotion vote during the department or college review process.**

b. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor, Librarian, or Archivist generally follows the same procedures as for promotion to Associate, except that only faculty at the higher rank may participate in **any vote during the department or college review process.**

4. General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Academic promotion and tenure are awarded to faculty who make continuing contributions in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service, any of which may include outreach or engagement. While promotion and tenure determinations are separate and distinct, similar standards and procedures apply to both. The preservation of quality requires that

Comment [Rob 23]: This is where to change the policy to include a vote by the VPR, as with the Graduate Dean.

Comment [SEN24]: Inserted by RAS. See RAS26.

Comment [FSC25]: The FSC has no problem with provostial staff advising the PSVP, but we insist on language such as this to prevent such officials (who have no expertise in the candidate’s discipline) from unduly influencing the PSVP’s decision relative to opinions from experts.

Comment [RAS26]: This language (FSC21) should be no problem as it reflects the Provost’s current practice, except that “and dean’s” should be added along with the department’s assessment.

Comment [FSC27]: Insert needed.

Comment [FSC28]: TTU’s strategic plan calls for “Revise promotion and tenure policies to include Outreach and Engagement activities in teaching, research, and service.” It does not consider them to be separate activities.

Comment [jumunoz29]: The new strategic priority IV for TTU, require P&T policies be revised to include Outreach and Engagement consideration.

all persons recommended clearly satisfy the general criteria presented herein. The relative weight given to each of the three components and specific criteria will depend on the standards in the individual disciplines as expressed in the departmental promotion and tenure standards, which must conform to documented college and university standards.

a. Teaching

Teaching includes activities that contribute to student learning. Evaluation of teaching ~~begins with~~ shall include effectiveness of course content and delivery, student learning outcomes, and demonstration of up-to-date knowledge of the candidate's discipline. In some instances, teaching may be indirect, primarily in support of student learning activities. Faculty members also influence teaching by designing courses and curricula. Textbooks, articles and other contributions to creative pedagogy, and innovative instructional materials — including documentation related to service-learning outcomes -- may be considered contributions to teaching. Leading students on studies abroad is another contribution to teaching. In addition, faculty members influence teaching in less tangible, but no less decisive ways, through activities such as counseling students.

Detailed and specific evidence of effective teaching should be included in the dossiers of faculty members being recommended for promotion and tenure. Each department is to apply its documented procedures for peer evaluations of teaching to each probationary tenure-track faculty member at least annually, at least annually, and preferably on a semester basis. Candidates for promotion should also be provided peer evaluations of teaching in, at latest, ~~semesters the semester prior to application for promotion.~~ Evidence in the dossier should be limited to a one-page summary of peer evaluations and student evaluations for each year of service since appointment or previous promotion. The department chairperson, in consultation with the candidate, shall provide the summary of teaching effectiveness, including involvement in graduate education, as applicable as applicable where available, including clear outlines indications and data on of involvement in graduate education, if applicable. Faculty colleagues should be asked to evaluate the objectives, methods, and materials of courses designed and/or taught by the individual as part of summative peer evaluation. ~~Whenever possible, evaluation should also include evidence of student learning outcomes. These data are available to the candidate and the public upon request.~~ Charts, graphs, portfolios, and other data may be included in appendices and subsequently removed before submission to the PSVPAA.

b. Research and Creative Activity

~~Faculty are expected to contribute directly to the enhancement and expansion of Texas Tech University's research and creative scholarship. Faculty are expected to contribute directly to the enhancement and expansion of Texas Tech University's research and creative scholarship mission. Faculty are expected to contribute directly to the enhancement and expansion of Texas Tech University's research and creative scholarship mission.~~ Research and creative activity serve to advance the discipline or the state of the art. Evidence of research and creative activity includes print or electronic publications, non-print presentations, funded grant applications and reports, patents and other intellectual property, (cf. RR 10, OP 70.??), curatorships, and artistic

Comment [FSC30]: Reworded.

Comment [FSC31]: Inserted from the deans' input draft that Rob Stewart sent the FSC on 9/17/10.

Comment [FSC32]: Clarification.

Comment [SEN33]: Inserted by RAS. See RAS35.

Comment [FSC34]: The frequency of peer evaluations should be left to the discretion of the department.

Comment [RAS35]: We probably need to disagree on this point, as peer review of teaching should be on a regular, uniform basis; e.g., at least annually.

Comment [SEN36]: Inserted by RAS.

Comment [FSC37]: Clarification.

Comment [SEN38]: Reworded by RAS. See RAS41.

Comment [jumunoz39]: What if the faculty member only teaches undergraduates and has no or limited exposure to graduate students?

Comment [FSC40]: Not all faculty teach grad students. The deleted wording implies that they all should. (See comment below by VP Munoz.)

Comment [RAS41]: Use of "as applicable" should accommodate those faculty who do not teach in graduate programs.

Comment [FSC42]: Some departments monitor student learning outcomes on a pooled basis. [8]

Comment [SEN43]: Reinserted by RAS without the word "mission" to a [9]

Comment [FSC44]: Isn't the purpose of this OP to let scholars pursue [10]

Comment [RAS45]: Isn't the pursuit of their individual research and [11]

Comment [SEN46]: Inserted by RAS

productions and performances. Textbooks and innovative instructional materials having significant value beyond this campus may be considered contributions to research and creative activity.

The dossier of an individual should provide substantiating evidence of quality submitted by appropriate observers within and outside the university, such as appraisal of the candidate's books or artistic performances. Outside reviewers who work in the same or a closely related field, and who have an objective expertise to evaluate the faculty member, shall be selected by the chair in consultation with the faculty member, ~~and must. Wherever appropriate, the dossier should include at least three of the reviewers should be from TTU's national or international peer institutions and/or AAU member aspirational peer institutions (Attachment B) or the equivalent.~~ Every effort should be made to select outside reviewers who are peers in the sense of having experience at institutions of similar scope as Texas Tech, who work in the same or a closely related field, and who have an objective expertise to evaluate the faculty member, though letters. ~~Letters by scholars from equivalent or better schools in the US or elsewhere will also qualify for the three letter minimum, and the total number of letters is not restricted.~~ The majority of a candidate's outside reviewers shall be persons with whom the candidate has no ~~Candidates must disclose which letters come from reviewers with whom they have a~~ personal relationship that might raise a potential conflict of interest, such as collaborators, coauthors, former professors, - or - students, - and - mentors. ~~The total number of letters is not restricted.~~

c. Professional Service

Faculty members are expected to make professional contributions through service to the department, college, university, ~~and~~ discipline at large, and, as appropriate, to the broader community. These contributions to outreach and engagement may include discipline-related activities in service to the immediate community, to the state and region, and to society at large through outreach and engagement, as well as service in one's department and across the university as advisers, committee members, task force members, workshop and symposium participants, international development grant participants, and similar types of activities. ~~such as participating in international development grants, and actively participating members of the university. Discipline related activities in service to the immediate community, to the state and region, and to society at large also represent important contributions.~~

Participation in the activities of professional societies and organizations, especially through service in leadership roles, is a strong indication of professional commitment. Contributions through presentations and consultative services are regarded as further evidence of professional reputation. ~~All~~ such service and activities may include paid (compensated) as well as unpaid work on behalf of the profession. An evaluation by qualified individuals indicating the quality and extent of the service rendered shall be submitted with the promotion and tenure dossier.

5. Standards for Academic Ranks

Comment [FSC47]: Requiring letters from "Peer Schools" (instead of scholars per se) is unwise b/c (1) what matters is the expertise of the referee, not the ranking of his/her school & (2) faculty should be allowed to get the best letters they can, including from experts at colleges abroad (e.g. Oxford) & even from experts not affiliated with any college (e.g. NIH, NASA, & other national labs, editors of journals, etc.). Also some faculty do research in fields so narrow that they can't get letters from peer institutions that have no such matching specialties. Note (6 Apr. 2011): The final language of this passage, including the phrasing of the section dealing with potential conflicts of interest, was approved by Sr. Vice Provost Rob Stewart af ... [12]

Comment [SEN48]: Reworded by RAS.

Comment [SEN49]: Reworded by RAS.

Comment [FSC50]: These loopholes are stated in the PSVP's 18 August e-mail to AAUP president Gad Perry: "These guidelines in no way lim ... [13]

Comment [FSC51]: Of course, it is in a candidate's best interest to avoid letters from collaborators, but in small fields, this standard may be ... [14]

Comment [SEN52]: Reinserted with the approval of RAS, who had deleted it accidentally.

Comment [FSC53]: Requiring junior faculty to do outreach when they are under so much pressure to be productive is unrealistic. Why ... [15]

Comment [FSC54]: Inserted from deans' comments on the draft that Rob Stewart sent to FSC on 9/17/10.

Comment [FSC55]: Isn't this gratuitous because the chair should be able to evaluate the validity ... [16]

Each department and college may have requirements defined for each rank that exceed those of the university. The minimum university requirements for each tenure track academic rank are as follows: -

a. Assistant Professor/Librarian/Archivist

— In a tenure track, normally, one is appointed as an assistant professor. This initial appointment requires completion of the terminal academic degree (or its equivalent) defined by the department, as appropriate for the position to be held by the candidate, and an ability to teach effectively, ~~and completion of the terminal academic degree (or its equivalent) defined by the department, as appropriate for the position to be held by the candidate.~~ Promise of growth in teaching, research and creative activity, and service are also necessary. -

b. Associate Professor/Librarian/Archivist

— Promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor, and a tenure decision at this level, requires:

— (1) A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher;

— (2) A record of peer-reviewed publication and/or peer-reviewed creative activity which has contributed to the discipline or field of study, ~~and to the candidate's intellectual and artistic development, and to the quality of the department, and to the quality of the department;~~

~~(3) A discipline appropriate record of successful competitive, peer reviewed grantsmanship. An earnest effort to generate external funding if deemed appropriate to the candidate's research as indicated by the departmental tenure guidelines, and commensurate with terms of the faculty member's initial appointment, where appropriate, from either external and/or internal sources, though with recognition that certain disciplines do not traditionally have access to funding opportunities.~~

~~(4) A record of engagement of undergraduates or graduate students in research, scholarship and creative activity, including, but in disciplines where such efforts are mandated, specified by departmental tenure guidelines.~~

— (35) A record of professional service ~~that meets departmental tenure guidelines.~~

— (46) Promise of growth in teaching and research or artistic and creative activity.

c. Professor/Librarian/Archivist

— For promotion to the highest academic rank, or a tenure decision at this level, the candidate's academic achievement and professional reputation should be superior and should have resulted in national and/or international recognition. This rank can be earned only by the faculty member who has demonstrated continued growth in, and has a cumulative record of,

Comment [SEN56]: Reinserted by RAS. See RAS57.

Comment [rstewart57]: Here's where to place a clause about external grant activity.

Comment [RAS58]: Retaining a clause about contributing to the quality of the department or area is important and not inconsistent with the individual's academic freedom. Why else is the individual here if not to contribute to the department or program?

Comment [FSC59]: See the FSC's earlier comment about ensuring the academic freedom of scholars (independent of departmental goals).

Comment [FSC60]: Added based on deans' comments in the draft given to FSC by Rob Stewart 9/17/10.

Comment [jumunoz61]: I recommend strengthening the language regarding how this provision may not apply to disciplines for which external support is limited or non-existent.

Comment [RAS62]: It isn't clear that department guidelines "mandate." Maybe the wording should be "specified" or "emphasized" or "expected."

Comment [FSC63]: Librarians do not engage students, so a qualifier phrase like this is essential. Language about funding is not relevant here.

Comment [FSC64]: Professional service for junior faculty should be judged at the departmental level.

teaching effectiveness, substantial peer-reviewed publication and/or peer-reviewed creative activity, external peer reviewed funding of scholarship (for those disciplines where such funding is available and expected), engagement of undergraduates or graduate students in research, scholarship and creative activity, support for those students (for those disciplines where such support is expected), and professional contributions and service, which may include outreach and engagement.

Comment [rstewart65]: Here is another place to state expectations for grant activity.

Comment [FSC66]: Outreach in not feasible or appropriate for many disciplines.

Comment [RAS67]: The statement re outreach and engagement is to remain. Departments may qualify it within their guidelines.

6. Decision-Making Procedure

a. Review by the Department

Recommendations for promotion and tenure originate with the department. Each department will develop written procedures to be utilized in promotion and tenure considerations.- Each department will also develop specific written standards for promotion to each professorial rank that reflect its mission and, at the same time, meet university criteria.- These procedures and standards must have the approval of the dean and the PSVPA. Subsequent changes in approved standards or procedures must be similarly approved. -After the department, the dean, and the PSVPA have ratified written standards, the primary responsibility for evaluating individual promotion and tenure requests in terms of those standards will be assigned to the faculty in the department in which the request is made. If changes are made to a department's promotion and tenure standards and procedures, or a candidate moves to another department, the candidate may choose to use either the new standards and procedures, or the ones in effect when hired.

Comment [rstewart68]: Not sure this clause added by the Faculty Senate Study Committee is warranted given the infrequency of candidates moving to another department.

Comment [FSC69]: Response to rstewart: Please leave as is. Shifts may soon become more common if dept. reorganizations ensue from state's financial downturn.

(1) Department procedures should identify the nature and composition of promotion and tenure committees. Procedures must allow for a formal vote of appropriate faculty members. The faculty vote should be strongly considered throughout the promotion and/or tenure process. Each department shall determine in advance its voting criteria, subject to adhering to university guidelines, and the college of which this department is a part must approve these criteria. A procedure shall be developed whereby faculty votes are unsigned. Voting faculty should be made aware that ~~the ballots and~~ written ballot comments will become part of the promotion/tenure dossier. Written ballot comments are encouraged because of insights they provide to the pattern of voting and to peers' considerations of the candidate's record. The chairperson and one other individual shall count the ballots and certify in writing as to the vote. ~~Each department shall determine in advance its voting criteria, subject to adhering to university guidelines, and the college of which this department is a part must approve these criteria.~~ In the absence of compelling reasons otherwise, people holding ranks equal to or higher than that to which the person desiring promotion aspires shall constitute the eligible voters, whether or not these individuals are tenured.

Comment [SEN70]: Inserted by RAS.

(2) The candidate shall prepare, in cooperation with the designated department representative or committee, the formal promotion and tenure dossier. Once the dossier has been submitted for consideration in the department, no further information should be added to the dossier, other than that required by department and collegiate procedures with regard to recommendations by review committees, department chairpersons, ~~and~~ or dean. Each dossier

should contain a signed statement by the candidate indicating that the candidate has reviewed all contents of the dossier as prepared for submission to the dean and dean's department/college committee.

(3) In transmitting a recommendation to the dean, a department chairperson must indicate who has been consulted, the form of the consultation, the faculty vote, ~~and~~ the vote of any departmental committee charged with the recommendation, and the chairperson's own vote positive or negative (the department chairperson may not abstain). The recommendation of the department chairperson will be provided to the candidate at the time it is forwarded to the dean. Faculty members may then request without prejudice, in writing, that their dossiers be withdrawn from further consideration, in which case, the dossiers will not be forwarded. ~~without prejudice.~~

Comment [SEN71]: Inserted by RAS.

(4) At Texas Tech University it is not possible to hold different academic ranks in different departments. Therefore, for a faculty member who holds budgeted joint appointments in two academic departments, the recommendation for promotion and tenure must be a joint submission of both departments concerned, and the promotion and tenure recommendation shall be considered positive only if both departments make positive recommendations. Recommendations must be processed according to the regular procedures of both departments. It is incumbent upon the chairpersons of both departments to ensure initiation of the review process.

(5) If a faculty member holds less than a half-time appointment in one department and more than a half in another department, the recommendation will be made by the department where the major responsibility lies. It is the primary department's responsibility to originate consideration and to inform the secondary department of its intent. For these unequal joint appointments, recommendations must be processed according to the regular procedures of both departments. However, while the secondary department must process the candidate according to its normal procedures, the outcome of its deliberation will be provided to the primary department. The primary department shall take into consideration the secondary department's opinion and shall include it as part of the dossier. These specifications apply to all joint appointments, whether or not the salary is divided by source.

(6) In addition to the required consultation with faculty members of senior rank within the department and the joint consideration of joint appointments, originating departments are urged to consult with others who may have special knowledge of the performance of candidates and to solicit letters from such persons. Examples of such persons include faculty members from other departments if candidates under consideration have taught a number of students from those departments, served on committees in those departments, or engaged in interdisciplinary teaching or research with members of those departments. It is also appropriate to solicit letters from administrative officers in various parts of the university concerning service by the candidate. Any such written correspondence is to be part of the dossier as prepared for submission to the dean and reviewed by the candidate.

Comment [RAS72]: See RAS39 and make this point consistent with that one.

(7)- The majority of comments related to a candidate's credentials should come from qualified persons outside Texas Tech University. ~~At least three outside reviewers should be~~

Comment [FSC73]: See FSC's previous comment about dossier letters.

~~selected from among TTU's national peer institutions (Attachment B), whenever possible.~~

Letters from reviewers shall be solicited by the chairperson or designated representative, and become a part of the candidate's dossier.- The reviewers shall be selected in consultation with the candidate. Such persons should be asked to comment on the quality of published research or creative activity of a candidate, on service to professional or other organizations, on the candidate's teaching ~~in a visiting capacity in another university~~, or on relevant matters within their competence to judge. Reviewers should not be asked simply "Does this individual merit promotion?"

All letters solicited from within or outside the university shall be included in the dossier so that review bodies may have access to all relevant information. Respondents should be informed that the letters become a component of the dossier.

(8) A department may ~~be too small~~ ~~have too few voting-eligible faculty~~ to provide sufficient review. In such cases, the department chairperson, in consultation with the dean, should seek the advice of an existing executive committee or other college-wide body, or may appoint an appropriate advisory committee for review of a specific case. If this is done, the composition of the committee and its recommendations must be reported in the dean's recommendation to the PSVP~~AA~~.

Comment [SEN74]: Reworded by RAS.

b. Review by the College or School

(1) It is the responsibility of the dean to recommend either positively or negatively on all promotion and tenure recommendations forwarded by department chairpersons. The dean shall forward to the PSVP~~AA~~ all dossiers and recommendations together with a statement indicating the reasons for each recommendation. In all cases, information regarding the dean's recommendation will be provided to the department chairperson and the candidate. ~~A faculty member candidate for tenure and/or promotion~~ may then request in writing that the dossier be withdrawn from further consideration, in which case the dossier will not be forwarded, ~~without prejudice~~.

(2) In the process of reviewing the recommendation, the dean will seek formal advice of an executive committee or other appropriate college-wide committee. In making a recommendation to the PSVP~~AA~~, the dean will specify the nature of the report and the vote of the committee.

c. Review by the Provost ~~& Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs~~

It is the responsibility of the PSVP~~AA~~ to receive dossiers and recommendations regarding promotion and tenure, to review them with respect to the department, college or school, and university standards, and to approve or disapprove all recommendations received. A review ~~and vote~~ by the dean of the Graduate School will be included at this stage in the decision making process. ~~The PSVP may also include as reviewers the Vice President for Research and faculty members of the provostial staff. At the PSVP's discretion, review and a vote by the Vice President for Research, and review, but not votes, by faculty members of the~~

Comment [SEN75]: Added by RAS.

~~provostial staff may also be included.~~ The PSVPA will ~~then~~ meet with each collegiate dean and discuss that dean's recommendations. The PSVPA will subsequently transmit dossiers and recommendations to the president.

Comment [Texas Tec76]: Glad to be a person that signs off...

Comment [FSC77]: Shouldn't the PSVP be able to schedule the meeting any time during the review process?

-d. Review by the President

It is the responsibility of the president to receive all recommendations regarding promotion and tenure from the PSVPA, to review them and to approve or disapprove the recommendations. After the review, the president will meet with the PSVPA and discuss the recommendations. The approved recommendations will thereafter be transmitted to the Board of Regents for final consideration.

7. Documentation

a. Materials to be provided by the Candidate to the Academic Unit

(1) Appropriate supporting materials that cannot be provided from academic unit files;

(2) All materials required by the academic unit's procedural guidelines, and in particular each of the candidate's annual faculty reports with chairperson's assessments, and a report of the third-year review in the case of probationary assistant professors; and

(3) Summaries of research and creative activity, including external funding efforts, professional service, and, in consultation with the unit head, summaries of teaching effectiveness. The teaching summary should clearly delineate contributions to graduate education (if applicable); such as teaching of organized graduate courses, chairing or memberships on thesis and dissertation committees, mentoring individual graduate students, and the like (if applicable).

Comment [FSC78]: This qualifier belongs here, not at the end.

b. Materials to be provided by the Department Chairperson to the Dean

(l) A separate letter concerning each candidate, giving the following information:

_____ (a) Chairperson's evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, research and creative activity, and professional service;

_____ (b) The summary vote of appropriate faculty members;

_____ (c) The summary vote of any departmental committee making recommendations

_____ to the chairperson, and

~~(2).~~ ~~(2)~~ Another section that includes the unsigned ballot comments, separated from the ballots.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 35.45 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 54 pt + Tab after: 72 pt + Indent at: 72 pt

(3) A file concerning the candidate containing letters or memoranda of advice, opinion, evaluation, or recommendation. Chairpersons should prepare a summary of the qualifications and purpose for selection of each individual from whom a letter has been received, and must disclose which, if any of the reviewers have had a personal relationship with the candidate, such as collaborator, coauthor, former professor or student. Most of the external reviewers should be personally unacquainted with the candidate. This information should be submitted along with the letters.- Departmental procedures for soliciting letters shall be included in the written procedures for promotion and tenure developed by the unit.

Comment [FSC79]: See FSC's earlier comments about disclosure.

(4) Complete dossier of the candidate organized in the specified format (Attachment A). Copies of publications, works of art, etc., should be included only if specifically requested by the dean. Copies of these materials will not be forwarded to the PSVPA unless requested.

(5) It is the responsibility of the department to clarify, when appropriate, why the candidate is uniquely qualified for promotion or tenure, i.e., to reflect any circumstances that are not readily apparent.

c. Materials to be Supplied by the Dean to the Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

(1) A letter of recommendation by the dean for each candidate, including the department vote; cover letter summarizing collegiate procedures;

Comment [TTU80]: FS/SR: order changed to match Appendix. [RAS]: Agree with edit.

(2) A letter of recommendation by the department chairperson for each candidate;

(3) The report of the department tenure and promotion committee for each candidate if such is required by departmental guidelines; and A letter of recommendation by the dean for each candidate, including the department vote; and/or

Comment [TTU81]: FS/SR: Appendix lists department committee rather than college-wide committee report. [RAS]: Agree with edit.

~~(4) Recommendations of any college-wide review committee, including the summary vote of each such committee; and~~

~~(5) The dossier of each candidate, excluding appendices, but including letters solicited by the chairperson.~~

Comment [TTU82]: FS/SR: The dossier as prepared by the candidate includes annual reports / assessments, so that addition to the Appendix does not have to be separately listed here. [RAS] Agree

8. Appeal of Decisions to Deny Tenure

Faculty who feel that they have been unfairly denied tenure or promotion may address their concerns to the Tenure Advisory Committee through the Senior Vice Provost. The composition and responsibilities of the Tenure Advisory Committee and hearing panel procedures are found in OP 32.XX Revocation of Tenure and Termination of Faculty.

9. Policy Revision and Implementation.

Under the statutory authority of the State of Texas, the Board of Regents has the sole authority to revise this tenure policy. Proposal of revisions is the joint responsibility of the PSVPAA and the Faculty Senate in accordance with the principle of shared governance. In addition to the regular reviews, the Tenure Advisory Committee, the Faculty Senate, or other academic groups may submit proposals for revision at any time. Proposals approved by the PSVPAA will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. If the Senate approves the proposed revisions but judges that they represent significant changes to the intent, standards, or procedures of the policy, the PSVPAA shall present them to the voting faculty for consideration. In this process, the voting faculty (as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate) will vote for approval or disapproval of the proposals. If approved by the voting faculty, the proposals shall be forwarded by the PSVPAA to the president for his review and then, if the president approves, to the Board of Regents for its consideration. Proposed revisions that are not deemed by the Faculty Senate to require a faculty vote shall be sent directly from the PSVPAA to the president, who will take them to the Board of Regents.

This The revised policy is to be implemented immediately upon approval by the Board of Regents. Faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure will have the opportunity to choose to be evaluated under the policy in effect on the date of their hire or the current policy. All tenured faculty members are subject to this tenure policy's applicable provisions and procedures. The tenure of faculty members who have attained tenure under prior policies-versions of this policy at Texas Tech University continues. This policy shall not be applied in derogation of any faculty member's contract rights.

Related Operating Policies

OP 32.06 Faculty Responsibility

OP 32.17 Faculty Appointments and Titles

OP 32.34 Approval of Faculty in Non-tenure Acquiring Ranks

OP 32.XX Revocation of Tenure and Termination of Faculty

Attachment A: Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format

Comment [FSC83]: Inserted as an affirmation of mutual cooperation and academic tradition.

Comment [FSC84]: The Senate represents the faculty and is legitimately responsible for any polling that needs to be done.

Comment [FSC85]: Clarification.

Comment [FSC86]: Clarification.

Comment [FSC87]: Clarification.

Comment [FSC88]: Chairs & deans to whom the FSC spoke requested that Attachment A be amended to require inclusion of (1) Faculty Annual Reports, (2) Reports written by Peer Evaluation Committees, & (3) the original letter of hire, which set forth TTU's expectations. These internal documents are important in order to balance the external letters to give a more complete assessment.

Comment [RAS89]: Amendments recommended in Comment FSC74 are now indicated in a revision to Attachment A.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Dossier Format

	<u>Abstention</u> _____	<u>Abstention</u> _____
<u>Department Chairperson</u> (signature)	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____
<u>College or School</u> <u>Committee</u> (ballot count)	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____ <u>Abstention</u> _____	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____ <u>Abstention</u> _____
<u>Dean of College</u> <u>or School</u> (signature)	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____
<u>Dean, Graduate School</u> (signature)	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____ <u>Abstention</u> _____	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____ <u>Abstention</u> _____
<u>Provost & Senior Vice</u> <u>President</u> (signature)	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____	<u>Approve</u> _____ <u>Disapprove</u> _____

<u>President</u> <u>(signature)</u>	<u>Approve _____</u> <u>Disapprove _____</u>	<u>Approve _____</u> <u>Disapprove _____</u>
--	---	---

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Dossiers should be submitted electronically according to instructions provided by the Provost's office.

Comment [RAS90]: Suggest this wording or something like it until we have the electronic format and procedure standardized.

B. The vita should include the chairperson's ratings of publications, exhibits, or performances adjacent to each item. Only those items since the candidate's most recent promotion at TTU need to be rated.

C. Include copy of the candidate's original letter of hire that set forth TTU's expectations for the faculty member.

D. Copies of the candidate's annual reports with chairperson's assessments and the report of the third-year review should be provided. Just the annual reports and assessments as of the most recent promotion should be provided for cases that are promotion only.

Solicited or unsolicited letters should be included in the submission to the dean and the provost/senior vice president (PSVP). Letters from individuals outside the university are required (see OP 32.01 section 4.b.). Unit heads should provide information on the qualifications to judge the candidate's work for each person who provides a letter.

D. Only one submission regarding departmental and collegiate procedures should be included for each department and college.

E. Format of the submission to the PSVP

The dossier should be submitted as an electronic file with the following sections:

Comment [SEN91]: Reworded to conform with electronic format.

1. Dean's letter

2. Chairperson's letter. If a department or area tenure and promotion review committee provided written recommendations to the faculty and/or chairperson, that committee's report should follow the chairperson's letter.

3. Vita with chairperson's rating of publications and creative activity

4. Letters from external reviewers.

5. Basic information, to include the faculty member's original letter of hire.

6. Applicant's summary of teaching effectiveness

7. Applicant's summary of research and creative activities

8. Applicant's summary of service activities

9. Faculty annual reports with chairperson's assessments, including third-year review where applicable.

DEAN'S EVALUATION

Dean's Recommendation:

The dean should submit in this section of the dossier a letter to the PSVP indicating the basis of the recommendation for the candidate. At the time the dossier is submitted to the PSVP, the candidate should also be provided information regarding the dean's recommendation.

(At this stage, only summary data should be submitted to the PSVP on student and peer evaluations, etc. Research and creative activity should be rated in the vita, but examples, publications, slides, etc. should not be forwarded unless requested.)

ACADEMIC UNIT EVALUATION

A. Department Chairperson's Recommendation:

The department chairperson should submit in this section of the dossier a letter to the dean indicating the basis of the recommendation(s) for the candidate. At the time the dossier is submitted to the dean, the candidate should also be provided information regarding the recommendation.

B. Departmental Procedures:

The department chairperson should submit to the dean and college committee tenure and promotion ballots and ballot comments for each candidate. The ballot comments should be separated from the ballots when submitted to the college.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A. Include a complete up-to-date vita with chairperson's rating of research and creative activity. After the applicant's submission to the department, the department chairperson must evaluate the reputation of the source publishing the results of the research, or standard for creative exhibition or performance, by placing a number in the left-hand margin of the curriculum vita. The chairperson may use additional sheets for notes and explanations if necessary. Include only publications or activities that have occurred since the last promotion. Only the applicant's summary and vita with chairperson's rating of publications or creative activity should be included for submission to the PSVP unless additional evidence is requested.

The scale is to be used for publications with the following definitions:

5 = Outstanding recognition in field, highly prestigious, refereed.

4 = Highly respected in field, refereed.

3 = Good reputation, selective in publication, refereed.

2 = Average, fairly easy to publish in, typically refereed.

1 = Below average publication, not discriminating on articles published.

0 = Not to be counted as publication.

S = Special publication not ranked above.

B. Solicited and unsolicited letters of support, especially from outside the university, including

information related to qualifications of the persons submitting letters to judge the candidate's work

(see OP 32.01 section 4.b.).

C. Basic Information:

Original letter of appointment.

1. Date of employment

—

2. Rank and title

3. Highest degree

—

4. Terminal degree for this position

—

5. Special qualifications

6. Experience in other institutions of higher education

7. Nature of initial assignment

8. Changes subsequent to employment:

Degrees completed:

<u>University</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>
-------------------	---------------	-----------------------

Promotions granted:

a. Date _____ from (rank) _____ to _____

b. Date _____ from (rank) _____ to _____

c. Number of calendar months from last promotion until beginning of this semester _____

Percent of time allocated to teaching, research, and service in current position:

% Teaching % Research % Service

9. In support of this recommendation:

Percent of assignment to teaching (average for last 3 years): _____ %

i.e., the portion paid from teaching salaries for the 9-month academic year

Comment [RAS92]: This item perhaps superfluous with above item and unnecessary.

Teaching load last 4 semesters, excluding summer:

This Semester:

Last Semester:

Course #	Credits	Enrollment	Course #	Credits	Enrollment
a.			a.		
b.			b.		
c.			c.		
d.			d.		
e.			e.		

Previous Semester:

Previous Semester:

a.			a.		
b.			b.		
c.			c.		
d.			d.		
e.			e.		

Student advising activities and responsibilities:

For chairperson's response: Compared to other teaching assignments in the department, this applicant's load has been:

High Average Low

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Summary evidence of teaching effectiveness prepared by the unit head in consultation with the applicant. Peer and student evaluation summaries are to be included.

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Summary evidence of research and creative activity prepared by the applicant.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Summary evidence of professional service prepared by the applicant.

~~Attachment B: Peer National Peer and AAU Institutions from Which to Draw Recommended for Outsider Reviewers~~

~~OP 32.01 Attachment B: Peer Institutions from Which to Draw Outsider Reviewers~~

~~Arizona State University~~

~~Auburn University~~

~~Clemson University~~

~~Florida State University~~

~~Georgia Institute of Technology~~

Comment [SEN93]: Attachment B deleted by permission of RAS & PSVP 4 April 2011.

Comment [c94]: Also include AAU institutions by name

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

~~Indiana University—Bloomington~~

~~Iowa State University~~

~~Kansas State University~~

~~Louisiana State University—Baton Rouge~~

~~Michigan State University~~

~~Mississippi State University~~

~~North Carolina State University~~

~~Ohio State University—Columbus~~

~~Oklahoma State University—Stillwater~~

~~Oregon State University~~

~~Pennsylvania State University—University Park~~

~~Purdue University—West Lafayette~~

~~Rutgers University—New Brunswick~~

~~Texas A&M University~~

~~University of Alabama—Tuscaloosa~~

~~University of Arizona~~

~~University of Arkansas—Fayetteville~~

~~University of California—Berkeley~~

~~University of California—Los Angeles~~

~~University of Colorado at Boulder~~

~~University of Connecticut—Storrs~~

~~University of Florida~~

~~University of Georgia~~

~~University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign~~

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

~~University of Iowa~~

~~University of Kansas—Lawrence~~

~~University of Kentucky~~

~~University of Louisville~~

~~University of Maryland—College Park~~

~~University of Massachusetts—Amherst~~

~~University of Michigan~~

~~University of Minnesota~~

~~University of Mississippi—Oxford~~

~~University of Missouri—Columbia~~

~~University of Nebraska—Lincoln~~

~~University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill~~

~~University of Oklahoma—Norman~~

~~University of Oregon~~

~~University of Pittsburgh~~

~~University of Rhode Island~~

~~University of South Carolina—Columbia~~

~~University of South Florida~~

~~University of Tennessee—Knoxville~~

~~University of Texas—Austin~~

~~University of Virginia—24,068~~

~~University of Washington~~

~~University of Wisconsin—Madison~~

~~Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University~~

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Washington State University – Pullman

West Virginia University

Comment [FSC95]: TBD: Inserted from Rob Stewart's e-mail to Senate 9/17/10.

Page 6: [12] Comment [FSC47] FacSenComm 4/6/2011 2:03:00 PM

Requiring letters from "Peer Schools" (instead of scholars per se) is unwise b/c (1) what matters is the expertise of the referee, not the ranking of his/her school & (2) faculty should be allowed to get the best letters they can, including from experts at colleges abroad (e.g. Oxford) & even from experts not affiliated with any college (e.g. NIH, NASA, & other national labs, editors of journals, etc.). Also some faculty do research in fields so narrow that they can't get letters from peer institutions that have no such matching specialties. Note (6 Apr. 2011): The final language of this passage, including the phrasing of the section dealing with potential conflicts of interest, was approved by Sr. Vice Provost Rob Stewart after consultation with Faculty Senate officers today.

Page 6: [13] Comment [FSC50] FacSenComm 4/4/2011 3:19:00 PM

These loopholes are stated in the PSVP's 18 August e-mail to AAUP president Gad Perry: "These guidelines in no way limit the number of letters of support or who they may be solicited from."

Page 6: [14] Comment [FSC51] FacSenComm 4/4/2011 3:19:00 PM

Of course, it is in a candidate's best interest to avoid letters from collaborators, but in small fields, this standard may be unrealistic. Full disclosure allows the PSVP to judge for him/herself any conflicts of interest.

Page 6: [15] Comment [FSC53] FacSenComm 4/4/2011 3:19:00 PM

Requiring junior faculty to do outreach when they are under so much pressure to be productive is unrealistic. Why jeopardize their chances for tenure since most departments care mainly about publications?

Page 6: [16] Comment [FSC55] FacSenComm 4/4/2011 3:19:00 PM

Isn't this gratuitous because the chair should be able to evaluate the validity of any service activities, and, if not, he/she can consult others to find out?