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
\square 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 \square	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)
	Considerati	ion for: Tenure

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 ag4enda 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 con MAME. Votes were con	_		and opened in the presence of Cover Sheet.	f Dr
Tenure VotesF	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 (licensures, certification			
7. Professional experience in other institutions	_		er sectors:
8. Allocation of effort with initial appointment	to this position	on:	
a. Teaching%			
b. Research%			
c. Service%			
d. Other(e.g., administration)%			
O Allocation in proceed assignments			
9. Allocation in present assignment:			
a. Teaching%			
b. Research%			
c. Service% d. Other (e.g., administration) %			
10. Average percent of assignment to teaching Teaching load last 4 semesters, excluding summe	-	nrs:%	
Current semester (e.g., Fall 2018) Course # Credits Enrollment	Last Semest Course #	er (Spring 20 Credits	18) Enrollment
Prior Semester (e.g., Fall 2017) Course # Credits Enrollment	Prior Semes Course #	eter (Spring 2 Credits	017) Enrollment
To be completed by department chair with refere	ence to the pe	riod under re	eview
Compared with other teaching assignments in the de	epartment, this	applicant's lo	oad has been:
HighAverage	High		
Chair's Signat	ture:		

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

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

Representative Student Comments from Course Evaluations—<u>First year through most recent year.</u>
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 three 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 pa	ge statement o	f where the f	faculty memb	ber envisions l	her teaching,	research/	'creative
activity, and se	ervice to be in j	five to seven	years. And	how she antic	ripates to get	there.	



Annual Reports, Chair Evaluations, and Third-year Review

Copies of the candidate's:

- 1. Annual reports <u>with chairperson</u>'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