

**DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES**

**FOR FACULTY USE**

**IN**

**PREPARATION OF**

**PROMOTION & TENURE DOCUMENTATION**

**Adopted by the CASNR Administrative Council  
and CASNR Tenure & Promotion Committee  
May, 2007, [Rev. August, 2010, 2012, 2018]**

# Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Documentation

**GENERAL INFORMATION:** (use as a check list)

**THE STYLE AND FORMAT MUST BE FOLLOWED. DOSSIERS NOT CONFORMING TO THIS WILL BE RETURNED WITHOUT EVALUATION.**

1. Use Times New Roman font. Make sure that all materials (except for the letters of support) are in the same font type.
2. Headings should be in 14-point bold font and all capitals.
3. Text should be in 12-point font and not bolded.
4. Letters of support
  - a. Solicit and include a **maximum of 10 letters**. The choice of potential reviewers should be made by the department chair from a diverse list developed by the candidate in consultation with the department chair.
  - b. Letters should represent a cross section of the candidate's discipline from peer academic institutions. At least three outside reviewers should be selected from among TTU's national peer institutions, whenever possible, and most of the external reviewers should be personally unacquainted with the candidate. A list of national peer institutions is on pp. 82 of Texas Tech University's 2010-2020 Strategic Plan.  
<http://www.ttu.edu/stratplan/docs/Making-It-Possible-Strategic-Plan-2010-Texas-Tech-9-21-10pdf.pdf>
  - c. Do not solicit letters from current students.
  - d. Letters should be on letterhead stationery and signed by the author or at the least they should indicate the professional affiliation (current or past) of the author. Letters may be submitted electronically in PDF format as long as they carry a letterhead and/or author's professional affiliation and are signed.
  - e. ALL letters received should be included in the dossier.
5. Only one hard copy original dossier is required.
6. Dividers used to separate sections should be labeled as follows:
  - a. Dean's Evaluation
  - b. Department Chair Evaluation
  - c. Curriculum Vita with Ratings of Publications
  - d. Letters from External Reviewers
  - e. Basic Information

- f. Candidate's Self-Statements on
    - Teaching
    - Research and Creative Activity
    - Service
  - g. Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service Self-Statement Goals
  - h. Appendix (to include):
    - Faculty Annual Reports with Chairperson Assessments
    - Third-Year Review
    - Ballot Comments
7. Publications must be rated from 0 to 5 or S by the chair as follows:
- 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 publications, not discriminating on articles published.
  - 0 = Not to be counted as publication.
  - S = Special publication not ranked above.
8. All documentation, including publications, must be presented in chronological order with the earliest presented first and progressing to the most current.
9. **For Promotion and Tenure consideration**: This should be your entire career documentation.
10. **For Promotion only**: Include information **since last promotion only** with the following exceptions:
- a. In the summary sections: provide summary information since last promotion AND career total numbers for:
    - i. Number of graduate students programs chaired or co-chaired and numbers of graduate committees on which you served.
    - ii. Dollars of grant support generated. For awards received since being at TTU, this must be those dollars attributed to the candidate only and should match the Office of Research Services report. However, the total grant amount should also be included. Include funded and pending grants only. Do NOT include unfunded grant proposals.
    - iii. Gifts-in-Kind obtained or other recognized sources of support.

- iv. Publications that are published or in press (books, refereed journal articles, technical publications). Do NOT include publications in review.

**See attached example dossier outline for preparation of promotion and tenure documentation.**

(Cover letter)

**Departmental letterhead**

Date

Department/Unit Chair  
(address)

Dear \_\_\_\_:

This letter is to affirm that I have reviewed the contents of my dossier as it is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, in consideration of my application for tenure and promotion to [associate professor/professor].

Sincerely,

(Candidate)

(Cover page)

**IN CONSIDERATION FOR [PROMOTION AND TENURE/  
PROMOTION/TENURE]**

**Submitted by**

**Candidate's name  
[Current Rank]**

**Department of \_\_\_\_\_  
Texas Tech University**



Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

(Divider Page)

**DEAN'S EVALUATION**

## **Letter of support from the Dean of the College and College Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

Dean's Letter:

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.

- Primary audience is the Provost
- Provide a critical review from the Dean's perspective relative to college expectations
- Describe College procedures for arriving at College Committee votes and the Dean's own recommendation
- Briefly explain the College Review Committee votes, especially if negative or mixed
- Explain any differences of the Dean's recommendation from the faculty vote or Chair's recommendation, based on evidence
- The Dean's letter should cite notable observations from the external letters

**CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**  
**TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY**  
**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

- I. The mission of Texas Tech University and of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources encompasses three primary areas: teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service. All faculty members of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources are expected to participate and be productive in teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service. A faculty member should be fully cognizant of this threefold mission and most importantly of the fact that acceptable levels of performance in each of the three areas will be required for tenure and promotion. Because of the diversity of appointment status and time commitment in the College, it is virtually impossible to establish “quantitative specifications” that are applicable to each and every individual; rather the expectation is that each individual will clearly demonstrate competency in each of the three primary areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service in line with their specific appointment. The candidate should develop a clear understanding with the department chairperson at the time of appointment to a tenure track position concerning the relative amount of time to devote to teaching, research and creative activity, and professional service.
- II. The criteria in this statement shall serve as the basis for the evaluation of individual faculty members in the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources who have requested consideration for tenure and/or promotion. They also are guidelines by which individual faculty members may evaluate their personal progress toward eligibility for tenure and promotion and the preparation and presentation of the materials necessary for the tenure and/or promotion consideration process. The candidate is expected to meet with the department chairperson at least once annually to assess his or her progress toward tenure and/or promotion. It is the responsibility of the individual seeking tenure and/or promotion to prepare the required vita and associated documentation for consideration. Evidence of accomplishments and

relative percentage time of appointment in research/creative activity and teaching should be clear and specific. Letters of support should be solicited by the department chairperson and limited to no more than ten. In cases where the faculty member under consideration has a split appointment with other units at Texas Tech University or other agencies, appropriate input will be solicited from senior faculty of that unit or agency as part of the review process. This input will be used to evaluate the balance and total contribution of individual faculty with split appointments.

III. Criteria for evaluation of individual faculty of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources requesting tenure and/or promotion consideration are:

A. For Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Teaching:

- a. Has demonstrated quality performance as an undergraduate and/or graduate instructor. Assessment is based on student-teacher evaluations, peer evaluations, student advising (undergraduate and graduate), advising of student organizations, coaching of students for competitive events, or other activities supportive of the educational goals of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources.
- b. Has made positive contributions to Departmental, College, and University instructional program goals. Assessment is based on leadership, participation and contribution to teaching activities of the Department, College, and University.
- c. Has successfully directed graduate student programs. Assessment is based on number and quality of Ph.D. and Master's degree students advised and number of completed graduate degrees in line with relative percentage appointment in teaching and research/creative activity.

2. Research and Creative Activity:

Results of research and creative activities to be considered for tenure and promotion must have appeared in refereed publications, juried presentations, or other professionally prestigious outlets. Also, evidence of the candidate's ability to plan, conduct, and generate external support for independent

research and creative activity must be provided. Interdisciplinary research is encouraged.

3. Professional Service:

a. To University, College, and/or Department.

Documentation of continued service to Texas Tech University, the College, and/or the Department must be presented (committee assignments and/or participation in Department, College, and University programs and/or activities).

b. To public and profession.

Documentation of continued involvement in professional public service, international activities, and/or service to the candidate's national professional societies must be presented.

B. For Promotion to Full Professor

1. Teaching:

Has demonstrated excellence in instruction and in direction of graduate student programs. Assessment is based on level of courses taught, student-teacher evaluations, student advising, leadership and contributions to teaching activities of the Department, College and University, and number of completed graduate degrees. Consideration of the number of graduate students directed and their completion record should be commensurate with the teaching/research appointment and the discipline.

2. Research and Creative Activity:

Has demonstrated significant independent and interdisciplinary research and creative activities which are documented by refereed publications, juried presentations, or other professionally prestigious outlets since promotion to Associate Professor. Establishment of a national reputation and recognition for scholarly competence should be documented with evidence of invitations to contribute to national and/or international symposia, consultantships, participation in national professional societies, continued professional development, and demonstration of success in obtaining extramural funding.

3. Professional Service:

Documentation of leadership responsibilities to the academic community and the professional community is required.

4. Other Requirements:

- a. Possess what is considered to be the terminal degree of the profession.
- b. Provide assistance and guidance to the career development of junior colleagues.
- c. Promote the recognition and reputation of the Department, College, and University.

These College standards and procedures augment those of the University addressed in Operating Policy and Procedure Manual, OP 32.01. Some disciplines may choose to clarify further this document with an addendum in order to elaborate on specific examples of appropriate criteria for appointment, promotion, or tenure.

(Divider Page)

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR EVALUATION**

## **Letter of support from department chair and departmental procedures**

### **DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND ACADEMIC UNIT EVALUATION**

#### **1. 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.

#### **2. 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.

### **THE CHAIR'S LETTER**

- The Dean, College Committee, and Provost are the Primary Audience
- Describe Departmental Procedures for voting, stating the counts in favor and against and any absences, separately for tenure and for promotion.
- Abstentions are no longer recorded; encourage only votes for or against
- Describe procedures for selection of external reviewers, which should entail primary role of the chair with some input from the candidate.
- State how ratings of publications were arrive at
- Explain chair's own recommendation fully and clearly based on critical review of the evidence from annual reviews, third-year review and other documented records of teaching outcomes, research agenda and indices (including engaged scholarship, as applicable), professional service and outreach contributions.
- The Chair's letter should cite notable observations from the external letters

(Divider Page)

**CURRICULUM VITA**

## Curriculum Vita

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, adjacent to each publication. The chairperson may use additional sheets for notes and explanations if necessary. Include only publications or activities that have occurred since the last promotion (or only rate publications/items since the candidate's most recent promotion at TTU).

- The CV should only appear once; no cut and paste to self-statement sections
- Publication/creative activity ratings should be in the left-hand margin

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.

- Include citation indices and impact factors, where applicable
- Footnote the publication section to clarify meaning and weight of order of authorship. Highlight student authors.
- Itemize graduate student committees served, highlight graduate students completed and when
- Clearly itemize grant proposals and fellowship applications, whether PI or Co-PI, whether funded, and amounts by total and percentage.

**VITA**  
**(All items should be listed in chronological order.)**

Name  
Address  
Phone  
Fax  
E-mail

**EDUCATION:**

(Example degrees)

- 1965 B.S. University of Nebraska, Landscape Architecture.  
1975 M. S. Iowa State University. Agronomy; Minor: Animal Science.  
1979 Ph.D. Louisiana State University. Animal Science; Minor: Agricultural Economics.

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:**

- 1958-1964 Assistant Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.  
1964-1968 Post-doctoral Fellow, Louisiana State University.  
1968-present Assistant Professor, Texas Tech University

**LICENSES AND CERTIFICATIONS: (Career)**

**INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE: (Career)**

**MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL AND HONORARY SOCIETIES: (Career)**

Professional:

1. Horticultural Society; 1967 to 1998
2. American Society of Animal Science; 2001 to present
3. Texas Society for Roadside Improvement; 2005 to present

Honorary:

1. Gamma Sigma Delta; 1999 to present

**HONORS AND AWARDS: (Career)**

Honors:

1. Fellow, American Society of Agronomy, 2001

Awards:

1. Outstanding Service to Agriculture, Gamma Sigma Delta, 2004

(Section C, continued)

**AREA OF EXPERTISE:**

**PATENTS:** total of \_\_\_\_\_ (Career)

1. Smith, James K., Paul R. Jones, and Jerry N. Green, 2004. Granola supplemented diet for enhancing birth control in mammals and poultry. US Patent Number 5,864,291 B2, Date of Issue Jul. 20, 2004.

**PUBLICATIONS<sup>1,2</sup>:** (Since last promotion; use numbered lists)

**Books:** total of \_\_\_\_\_

**Book Chapters:** total of \_\_\_\_\_

1. Brown, W.K. 1968. Influence of environment on calcium metabolism. *In: Calcium in Cellular Processes and Medicine*. B.M. Altura, J. Durlach, and M.S. Seelig (eds.). 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Calcium. Lubbock, TX. P. 50-66.

**Books and Book Chapters Edited:** total of \_\_\_\_\_

**Refereed Journals:** total published \_\_\_\_\_, in press \_\_\_\_\_

**Published:**

1. Morton\*, J.L., **D.H. Vaughn**, J.M. Luna, and M.A. Cochran. 2004. Establishment of corn in rotation with alfalfa and rye: Influence of grazing, tillage, and herbicides. *Agronomy J.* 95:642-844.

**In press:**

**Proceedings:** total of \_\_\_\_\_

**Refereed**

**Volunteered:**

**Invited:**

**Non-refereed**

**Volunteered:**

**Invited:**

---

<sup>1</sup> Indicate your graduate students with an asterisk (\*).

<sup>2</sup> Put your name in **bold**.

**Abstracts: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**(Section C, continued)**

**Volunteered:**

**Invited:**

**Technical reports: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**Other publications: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**PRESENTATIONS AND LECTURES: total of \_\_\_\_\_ (Since last promotion)**

**1. Date, Title, Organization, Place**

**GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEES: (Since last promotion)**

**Completed:**

**Chaired: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**M.S.**

1. Jim Brown    Completed in 2005. Title of thesis:

**Ph.D**

1. Jon Doe        Completed in 2006. Title of dissertation:

**Co-Chaired: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**Committee member of: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**In progress:**

**Chair: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**M.S.**

1. Jim Brown    Anticipated completion date \_\_\_\_\_

**Ph.D.**

1. Jon Doe        Anticipated completion date \_\_\_\_\_

**Co-Chair: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**Committee member of: total of \_\_\_\_\_**

**UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING: (Since last promotion)**

**TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES: (Since last promotion)**

(Section C, continued)

**Other Teaching Responsibilities (Since last Promotion)**

Departmental Coordinator of Undergraduate teaching, (1992 to 1996)

Coach of the TTU Soil Judging Team – 2006 to 2009

Describe contact hours if relevant.

**GRANTS AND AWARDS: total funded \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (Since last promotion)**

**Funded:**

**2005**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**2006**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**2007**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**Pending:**

**Rejected: (to be filled out by candidates for promotion and tenure ONLY).**

**Cash and Gifts-in-Kind**

**Funded:**

**2005**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**2006**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**2007**

1. PI or Co-PI, title, granting agency, total amount funded, own portion of total amount.

**SERVICE TO PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS** (Since last promotion)

**National:**

1. **American Society of Agronomy (member since 1999.)**
  - a. **Board of Directors, 2001 to 2002**
  - b. **President, 2003**

**Regional:**

1. **Southern Pasture and Forage Crop Association (member since 1964.)**
  - a.
  - b.

**State:**

1. **Texas Association of Animal Scientists (member since 2006.)**
  - a.
  - b.

**OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:** (Since last promotion)

1. **Member of Board of Directors, Texas Cattlemen's Association, 2002 to 2006.**

**CONSULTING ACTIVITIES:** (Since last promotion)

1. **Consultant to Agripro Chemical Company, Midland, TX, 2002 to 2003.**

**SERVICE TO:** (Since last promotion)

For the following, list boards of directors, committees served on (chaired), officer, editor, advisor, or other positions held, field days or workshops organized, and other relevant activities that illustrate service activities. Follow the numbered list format.

**UNIVERSITY:**

**COLLEGE:**

**DEPARTMENT:**

**(Section C, continued)**

**COMMUNITY:**

**INDUSTRY:**

**OTHER:**

(Divider Page)

**LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

## LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

- **Precede letters with a page listing brief bios of each letter writer. As much as possible, none of the external reviewers should be direct collaborators, mentors, or other personal affiliates of the candidate. Please state whether they are.**
- **Include a sample of the letter or email that was sent to solicit external reviews and provides them instruction on what to review.**

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.).

- To be selected primarily by the Department Chair, allowing some input from the candidate. Procedure for selection should be described in the Chair's letter. (State any involvement of the Dean's Office in this process.)
- All Solicited external letters received become a part of the dossier
- The candidate may view the external letters when the dossier is reviewed\*
- At least 3 letters from TTU Peer Institutions (see Strategic Plan pp. 16-19).
- When there is a preponderance of letters from either women or men, consider stating whether the candidate's field is gendered in order to clarify that the distribution is representative or not.
- Consider how to clarify when the candidate's area of study or performance is so new or recently emerging that most letter writers claim lack of expertise or direct involvement with what the candidate does.
- The Chair's and Dean's letters should cite notable observations from these letters

*\*The accessibility of external letters to the candidate is a long-held assumption at TTU. This apparently has not been practiced in all the colleges, but it is encouraged owing to the State's open records statutes. Those concerned that this openness will restrict the availability of objective writers may be relieved in that reviews of dossiers over about two decades indicates that letters are routinely received that clearly and objectively evaluate the candidate's record and span the spectrum of supportive to non-supportive.*

(Divider Page)

**BASIC INFORMATION**

**BASIC INFORMATION**

**(Precede with a copy of the original letter of appointment or letter specifying changes to the appointment)**

- 1. Name of Candidate:
- 2. Date of employment in this faculty position:
- 3. Rank and title (title at initial appointment):
- 4. Highest degree earned and where:
- 5. Terminal degree for this position:
- 6. Special qualifications (licensures, certifications, etc.):
- 7. Professional experience in other institutions of higher education or other sectors:
- 8. Allocation of effort with initial appointment to this position:
  - a. Teaching \_\_\_\_\_%
  - b. Research \_\_\_\_\_%
  - c. Service \_\_\_\_\_%
  - d. Other \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., administration) %
- 9. Allocation in present assignment:
  - a. Teaching \_\_\_\_\_%
  - b. Research \_\_\_\_\_%
  - c. Service \_\_\_\_\_%
  - d. Other \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., administration) %
- 10. Average percent of assignment to teaching for last 3 years: \_\_\_\_\_%

**Teaching load last 4 semesters, excluding summer:**

Current Semester (e.g., Fall 2018)			Last Semester (Spring 2018)		
<u>Course#</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Course #</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

Prior Semester (e.g., Fall 2017)			Prior Semester (Spring 2017)		
<u>Course#</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Course #</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>

**To be completed by department chair with reference to the period under review:**

Compared with other teaching assignments in the department, this applicant’s load has been:

\_\_\_\_\_ High                      \_\_\_\_\_ Average                      \_\_\_\_\_ Low

Department Chair’s signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**(Divider Page)**

**SELF-STATEMENT ON TEACHING  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON TEACHING**

**CANDIDATES SELF-STATEMENT ON TEACHING  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON TEACHING**

- One to three page narrative written by the candidate
- Tabulate student ratings of teaching on one page
- One page summary of representative student comments (selected by chair)
- A statement of where the faculty member envisions his or her teaching (goals) to be in five to seven years. What are the post-tenure or post-promotion goals of their teaching?

Summary of Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness  
[Name of Faculty Member]

Evaluation scale: 5 = excellent, 4 = outstanding, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor.  
Entries are the section mean by term.

<u>Term/Course</u>	<u>N of Students Enrolled</u>	<u>N of Students Evaluating</u>	Q1: Course Objectives	Q2: Instructor	Q3: Learning Experience
Spring 2018					
Course 0000	30	22	4.32	4.30	4.10
Course 1111	18	17	4.46	4.35	4.33
	Term Department Mean		4.40	4.26	4.16
	University Mean		4.55	4.43	4.20
Fall 2017					
Course 0001	27	20	4.10	4.32	4.10
Course 1110	36	32	4.63	4.43	4.42
	Term Department Mean		4.37	4.32	4.28
	University Mean		4.34	4.45	4.18

*And so on for each course and semester in the review period.*

(Divider Page)

**SELF-STATEMENT ON RESEARCH AND  
CREATIVE ACTIVITY  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON RESEARCH AND  
CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

**CANDIDATE SELF-STATEMENT ON RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

- One to three page narrative by faculty member
- This may include scholarship of engagement (peer reviewed products)\*
- State how startup has been used and recovered in research/creative activity
- Use ORS %-credit to document grant funding, as applicable
- Speak to unfunded as well as funded proposals
- Refer to citation indices, impact factors, and reviews of work
- A statement of where the faculty member envisions his or her research and creative activity (goals) to be in five to seven years. What are the post-tenure or post-promotion goals of their research and creative activity?

\*Statements about activity in the scholarship of engagement are to be made where there is evidence of such activity. The intention is to begin clearly documenting this sort of research by faculty members who are doing it in recognition of the university's strategic priority. There is currently no specific guidance on criteria for or valuing of the activity aside from what departments and colleges might already have in place.

(Divider Page)

**SELF-STATEMENT ON SERVICE  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON SERVICE**

**CANDIDATE SELF-STATEMENT ON SERVICE  
AND  
GOAL STATEMENT ON SERVICE**

- One page narrative by the faculty member
- Review Service contributions to the department, college, university, and profession
- Comment on how service intersects with teaching and scholarly activity
- A statement of where the faculty member envisions his or her service (goals) to be in five to seven years. What are the post-tenure or post-promotion goals of their service?

(Divider Page)

**APPENDIX**

**FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTS WITH  
CHAIRPERSON ASSESSMENTS**

**THIRD-YEAR REVIEW**

**BALLOT COMMENTS**

**FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTS WITH CHAIRPERSON ASSESSMENTS  
AND/OR 3 YEAR REVIEW (IF APPLICABLE)**

**BALLOT COMMENTS**

- **Annual Report and Third-Year Review**
  - In chronological order, first year through most recent year
  - Third-year review appears after third annual report
- **Ballot Comments**
  - Include copies of all ballot comments submitted by faculty voters