

**College of Arts & Sciences Tenure and Promotion Dossier Format
Checklist & Required Order of Documents**

The dossier is to be submitted to the dean's office as a PDF document.

The dossier consists of 19 sections. A blank, colored page should separate each section.
Dossiers that do not adhere to format will be returned.

- ☐ 1. Cover page
 - ☐ Candidate Election of Tenure Policy
 - ☐ Recommendations and Signatures Page
- ☐ 2. Statement of Access to Policies and Dossier
- ☐ 3. Dean's Letter
- ☐ 4. Chairperson's Letter
- ☐ 5. Departmental Tenure and Promotion Review Committee Report (if available)
- ☐ 6. Statement of Ballot Counts
- ☐ 7. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae
- ☐ 8. Information on Selection and Qualification of External Reviewers
- ☐ 9. Letters from External Reviewers
- ☐ 10. Candidate's Original Letter Offer
- ☐ 11. Basic Information
- ☐ 12. Summary of Teaching Effectiveness
- ☐ 13. Summary of Research and Creative Activities
- ☐ 14. Summary of Professional Service
- ☐ 15. Summary of Candidate's Goals
- ☐ 16. Annual Reports, Chair Evaluations, and Third-year Review

Appendices

- ☐ 17. Unsigned Ballot Comments
- ☐ 18. Peer Evaluations*
- ☐ 19. Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

*These items will not be forwarded to the Provost's Office.

An electronic copy of this dossier to be provided to the Provost will be compiled under the supervision of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

The department should retain a complete copy of the dossier.

**Texas Tech University
College of Arts & Sciences
Department of Academic Studies**

Application for Promotion to Rank and/or Tenure

Faculty Member, Ph.D.

Current Rank

October, Year

Candidate Election of Tenure Policy

Last Name

First Name

Middle Name(s)

Consideration for: Tenure ☐ Promotion ☐

Candidate elects to be evaluated by the following tenure policy (select one):

- ☐ Tenure policy in effect at time of hire
- ☐ Tenure policy in effect at time of last promotion (promotion dossiers only)
- ☐ Tenure policy that is currently in effect

Recommendations & Signatures

Last Name

First Name

Middle Name(s)

Consideration for: Tenure _____

Promotion _____

Recommendations

Evaluator	Tenure	Promotion
Department Committee (ballot count)	Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Abstention _____	Approve _____ Disapprove _____ Abstention _____
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 _____

* If the Department Chair has a conflict-of-interest, Chairperson throughout the dossier shall refer to the individual serving as acting chair for the purposes of this T&P case.

Statement of Access to Policies and the Dossier

Dr. So-and-So, Chair
Department of Academic Stuff
Texas Tech University

September 30, 2018

Dear Dr. So-and-So:

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 Arts & Sciences in consideration of my application for [tenure/promotion/etc] to [assistant/associate] professor.

Sincerely,

Your Best Candidate Yet
[Assistant/Associate] Professor

Dean's Letter

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.

Chairperson's Letter

Chairperson's letter must evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness, research, and creative activity, and professional service. 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. See OP 32.01 for additional information.

Include the total amount of funding and the amount attributed to the faculty member from ORS.

Describe departmental procedures for voting and state the counts for, against, abstaining, and absent on promotion and tenure.

Describe procedures for selection of external reviewers and summarize annual evaluations and third-year review.

State how rating of publications were arrived at.

Departmental Tenure and Promotion Review Committee's Report

If available. Not all departments use this process.

Statement as to the Count of Ballots

Faculty Member, Ph.D.

Candidate for Tenure and/or Promotion to [Rank] in the
Department of Academic Studies

Sealed ballots were collected by Chairperson, Dr. NAME, and opened in the presence of Dr. NAME. Votes were counted twice and recorded on the Tally Cover Sheet.

Tenure Votes

_____For _____Against _____Abstain

Promotion Votes

_____For _____Against _____Abstain

Attest:

Chairperson
Date

Witness
Date

Candidate's Curriculum Vitae
(Candidate is expected to address every item, if applicable)

Candidate's Name _____

Date _____

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Contact Information

Education

Current Academic Position(s)

Prior Academic Position(s)

Membership in Professional Organizations

Research Affiliations

II. TEACHING

Teaching Awards

Pedagogical Accomplishments

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

RESEARCH MENTORING

*(include the name of each student and the title of dissertation, thesis, or project. **Be sure and note graduate students completed**)*

Chair of Doctoral Committees

Member of Doctoral Committees

Chair of Masters Committees

Member of Masters Committees

Undergraduate/Honors Committees

Student Mentoring Activities *(not listed above)*

III. RESEARCH

PUBLICATIONS

Provide full citations. For multi-authored papers, candidate should indicate his/her percentage contribution in parenthesis at the end of each cited work. Include a footnote at the bottom of the first page of the publications to clarify meaning and weight of order of authorship. Include work currently under review. Highlight any student authors.

Articles (refereed)

Chair's ratings should be placed in the left-hand margin next to each entry. Only those items since the candidate's most recent promotion at Texas Tech University need to be rated.

Books

Chair's ratings of publisher should be placed in the left-hand margin next to each entry.

Book Chapters

Proceedings (refereed)

Abstracts (refereed)

Non Peer-Reviewed Publications, including Technical Reports

Manuscripts Currently Submitted

Patents and other Intellectual Property

Research Awards

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS ORGANIZED/CONDUCTED

FUNDING (Agency, Title, PIs and Co-PIs, Amount Requested/Obtained, Duration; candidate's percentage of effort)

External Applications, Accepted and Pending

Internal Applications, Accepted and Pending

External Applications Denied

Internal Applications Denied

IV. SERVICE

Departmental Service

College Service

University Service

Responsible Conduct in Research and Safety Protocols Activities

Service to the Profession

Reviewer: Published book reviews

Academic articles and books

Grant proposals

Conference paper competitions

Professional Consulting

Other Synergistic Activities

Texas Tech University Guest Lectures

Community Guest Lectures

Media Presentations

Professionally Relevant Community Service

Local

National

International

Information on the External Reviewers

Please place in front of the biosketches a sample of the letter or email that was sent to solicit external reviewers and provides them instruction on what to review.

For each external reviewer, include a brief biosketch that explains:

1. *Relationship to candidate, if any (e.g. collaborator, coauthor, former supervisor, student);*
2. *The individuals' qualifications to judge the candidate's work.*
3. **Each dossier should include 8 external letters. (Be sure and include all solicited external letters).**

A majority of letters should be from peer or peer-aspirant institutions.

Of the 8 letters, 3 may be from recommenders determined by the candidate while 5 of the reviewers should be determined by the department.

Chair's and Dean's letters should cite notable observations from these letters.

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. And 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.

Example:

Maggie Smith, Professor, Ohio State University (No Relationship to the Candidate—if there is a relationship be sure and explain it). **BE SURE AND EXPLAIN THE RELATIONSHIP THE CANDIDATE HAS TO EACH EXTERNAL LETTER WRITER AT THE TOP OF THE BIOSKETCH NEXT TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEWER'S NAME.**

Dr. Smith is an expert in the field of U.S. social history with a particular emphasis on workplace interactions and gender. She has published widely on the postwar period and has edited an important series of books for UNC Press.

Letters from External Reviewers

Candidate's Original Letter of Offer

This is the offer letter from the chair prior to hire, signed by the chair and the candidate. It includes the expectations for the position, start-up, etc. (It is not the letter from the Provost.)

Basic Information

1. Name of Candidate:
2. Date of employment in this faculty position:
3. Rank and title at initial appointment:
4. Highest degree earned and where:
5. Terminal degree for this position
6. Special qualifications (licensure, 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)

Course #	Credits	Enrollment
----------	---------	------------

Last Semester (Spring 2018)

Course #	Credits	Enrollment
----------	---------	------------

Prior Semester (e.g., Fall 2017)

Course #	Credits	Enrollment
----------	---------	------------

Prior Semester (Spring 2017)

Course #	Credits	Enrollment
----------	---------	------------

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

_____ High

Chair's Signature: _____

Summary of Teaching Effectiveness

Provide a one-three page narrative of the candidate's teaching philosophy.

Tabulate student evaluations of teaching on one page. The new evaluation form instituted in 2014-2015 has only three items and all three should be included (see next page).

*Provide one page of representative student comments. You are not required to provide a comment from every course taught. **You should provide at least one comment from each semester.***

If you are up for promotion to full professor, tabulate student evaluations and provide representative student comments of your teaching for the previous five years.

Summary of Student Ratings of Instruction
Thomas Smith, Ph.D.
Candidate for Tenure and Promotion
Department of Academic Studies

Rating of instructor is the section average on item 1 of the university's Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor, "Overall this instructor was effective." Rating of course is the section average on item 11 of the same form, "Overall this course was a valuable learning experience."

In 2014-2015 the evaluation form was revised and has only three times (All three need to be included). Item 1 "The course objectives were specified and followed by the instructor." Item 2, "Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher." Item 3, "Overall, this course was a valuable learning experience."

First year through most recent year. Not to exceed one page.

Evaluation Scale: 5 = excellent, 4 = outstanding, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor

<u>Term/Course</u>	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>Evaluating</u>	<u>Q1: Objectives</u>	<u>Q2: Instructor</u>	<u>Q3: Experience</u>
Fall 2013					
Course 0000	30	25	4.32	4.27	4.46
Term Department Mean			4.40	4.23	4.37
University Mean			4.12	4.23	4.31
Spring 2014					
Course 1100	270	221	4.50	4.21	4.47
Term Department Mean			4.38	4.37	4.29
University Mean			4.26	4.30	4.16

Representative Student Comments from Course Evaluations—First year through most recent year.
Follow the format below, which includes the course number and the course title. Provide at least one comment per semester. Not to exceed one page.

Fall 2013

Hist. 2301, U.S. History Since 1877, “Sometimes the professor was hard to follow but did a nice job preparing us for the exams.”

Spring 2014

Hist. 4307, U.S. History Since 1945, “The grading was hard and too much writing, but it was an interesting class and I learned a lot.”

Candidate's Narrative of Research and Creative Activities

*Provide a one-to-three page narrative of the goals and accomplishments of your research and creative activities. **Specifically address measures of impact of your work (h-index, citations, invited presentations, fellowships, etc).***

For any faculty member who is up for tenure or promotion for the first time since joining Tech, discuss the startup you received and how it was used/recovered in research activity.

Use ORS % credit to document grant funding, as applicable, and be sure and highlight any other funding. Speak to funded as well as unfunded proposals.

Candidate's Narrative of Professional Service

Summarize your discipline-specific service activities (one page). Comment on how service intersects with teaching and scholarly activity.

Candidate's Statement of Goals

One-to-two page statement of where the faculty member envisions her teaching, research/creative activity, and service to be in five to seven years. And how she anticipates to get there.

Annual Reports, Chair Evaluations, and Third-year Review

Copies of the candidate's:

1. *Annual reports with chairperson's assessments for the last 5 years. These should include the Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation, **by year, first year through most recent year.***
2. *The report of the third-year review (when applicable).*

Example of requested order. Begin each year on a new page

2013 Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation

2014 Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation

2015 Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation

Third-year Review

2016 Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation

2017 Faculty Annual Report and Chair Evaluation

Appendices

Unsigned Ballot Comments (all faculty members who submit a ballot are strongly encouraged to provide an unsigned ballot comment)

Peer Evaluations

Provide the last 5 years of peer evaluations, first year through most recent year. OP 32.01 also states that “Candidates for promotion should also be provided peer evaluations of teaching in, at latest, the semester prior to application for promotion.”

Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines/OPs