

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND
HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT**

**REVIEW AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES
FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL TRACK (APT) FACULTY**

Approved November 2, 2016

PROLOGUE

The EAHR Department review and promotion guidelines are designed to promote excellence in faculty research, teaching, and service. In addition, the purpose of these guidelines is to provide clear guidance to the review and promotion process and the 3rd year review process for Academic Professional Track (APT) faculty within the Department. Furthermore, these guidelines and processes are based on the Texas A&M University's policies presented under 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

The university rule and procedures for promotion and tenure are set forth in the Texas A&M University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2, Approved June 20, 2007, Revised July 27, 2001, Revised August 18, 2016), which supplements System Policy 12.01. The university has also established guidelines for annual and mid-term reviews. These rules and policies are available electronically:

University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion:

<http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf>

University Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review:

<http://dof.tamu.edu/sites/default/files/pdfs/Annual%20%26%20Mid-Term%20Review%20Guidelines.pdf>

System Policy 12.01: <http://tamus.edu/offices/policy/12-01.pdf>

University guidelines for Tenure and Promotion <http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01.pdf>

Instructions and timelines for implementing these policies are distributed annually by the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost.

PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION

3rd Year Review and Promotion

Step 1: Initiating 3rd year reviews and promotion of APT Faculty

As required by the College of Education and Human Development, in the spring of the third year as a clinical assistant professor, a 3rd year review will be conducted.

Clinical associate professors may initiate consideration for promotion to clinical full professor at any time. As the CEHD Guidelines indicate, “Such request should be made to the department head, and careful consideration should be given to the faculty member’s record in relation to departmental, college, and university performance criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service.”

As noted by the University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 2.2.2, “Academic Professional Track Faculty are those faculty not on the tenure-track who contribute to the mission of the university in more focused ways. Normally APT faculty have a primary responsibility for teaching or research, but may also be expected to contribute in more than a single area of teaching, research or service”. In EAHR,

APT faculty hold the titles of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Full Clinical Professor.

Step 2: Preparing the review materials

An APT faculty member who is to be reviewed will prepare her or his materials according to the guidelines of the College and within the timeline set by the College for faculty reviews. The faculty member to be reviewed will prepare a list of no more than four external reviewers. Preference will be given to those reviewers who are full professors at peer institutions, though if there are legitimate reasons to include appropriate faculty from other institutions, a justification must be included. In no case, however, can reviewers be at the same rank or below. For APT faculty, a letter sent to the external reviewer must clearly state that the review does not include a tenure review. Instead the review should focus on the following:

1. Evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidates teaching;
2. Judgement of the programmatic development and curricular activities;
3. Judgment of the quality of service as evidenced by the candidate's curriculum vita and biographical statement.

According to the CEHD Guidelines: "External reviewers' letters should include at least one nominated by the candidate and two nominated by the department (Department Committee or program faculty). Letters should not be sought from individuals 'tainted' by close personal ties to the candidate (e.g., mentors, former students, close personal friends, frequent co-authors)." However, for EAHR Department, the external reviewers' letters should include at least two external reviewers nominated by the candidate for a minimum total of five letters.

The review materials will include the candidate's vita, statement, three examples of scholarly work, a record of all student course evaluation scores, number of students taught, teaching peer evaluation reports, and three examples of recent syllabi. New material, such as the publication of a manuscript or election to be an officer in a professional organization, can be added at any point in the process. In the case of APT faculty with no research assignment, sample publications are optional and not required.

Step 3: Setting up 3rd year reviews and promotion committees

The Department Head will appoint the Department review and promotion sub-committee of Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Full Professors in consultation with the candidate. The composition of the review and promotion committee for each individual's 3rd year review will be the same.

The Committee will select at least three names from the external reviewer list provided by the faculty member who is being reviewed. The Committee will then choose enough external reviewers, preferably five external reviewers, to reasonably guarantee that there will be a minimum of three completed reviews by external reviewers. The Committee Chair will work with the Department Head to contact the external reviewers and to obtain their agreement to participate within the appropriate timeline.

Step 4: Review and Promotion Review Committee

The departmental review and promotion committee will review the faculty member's materials and prepare summary reports on Teaching, Leadership and Programmatic and Service activities. In particular, each report will state whether the record in that area is appropriate to a successful review for promotion to clinical associate professor (in the case of clinical assistant or clinical associate professors going up for promotion). These reports must address any negative issues in the record under consideration.

Step 5: Voting by the Review and Promotion Committee

After drafting of the reports by the Review and Promotion Committee has been completed, the Department Head will convene a meeting of all Clinical Associate and Clinical Full Professors to discuss and vote on the review. For 3rd year reviews and for promotion from clinical assistant to clinical associate, the Review and Promotion Committee shall include all clinical associate and clinical full professors. For promotion from clinical associate to clinical full professor, the R&P Committee includes all Clinical Full Professors. The meeting will be led by the Chair of the Review and Promotion Committee. Only those on the Departmental Review and Promotion Committee with the appropriate rank may be in the room for the discussion of the candidates. However, to participate in this vote, the faculty member has to have examined the candidate's record with the examination logged by a staff member, and each member has to sign the following: "I have reviewed the entire dossier." Those who are thus qualified will be the only faculty allowed to vote.

During the review and promotion meeting, the Committee will explain its evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's teaching; judgement of the leadership and programmatic development; and judgment of the quality of service and the Review and Promotion Chair will lead a discussion on this matter. (A staff member will take thorough notes on this discussion so that there can be an informed report about the vote of the Review and Promotion Committee. An emphasis will be placed on a professionally oriented vote on the issues in the record and not on personal attitudes or feelings. When there has been sufficient time for discussion, the committee chair will initiate an anonymous ballot of all committee members in attendance. After the voting, faculty will be provided with papers to provide any justification for the votes (yes, no or abstain) without disclosing their names.

By University policy (12.01.99.M2.4.5.3), "An improper standard [for critiquing the tenure and/or promotion case] is any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member." In other words, critiquing the candidate for any reason not related to "professional performance" is not appropriate.

The vote will be officially recorded by the Committee Chair of the Review and Promotion Committee. Attendance of the review and promotion meetings is mandatory and members must be physically present to vote. Absentee ballots by members not present at the meeting will not be counted. The Review and Promotion Committee will then finalize reports for teaching, research and service and the summary report that records the vote and discusses the vote, including any negative issues. The three area reports should include the statement "*The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the Review and Promotion Committee.*" *The summary report should include the signatures of all voting members. The report must be reviewed and edited by all Departmental Review and Promotion Committee members until it*

is accepted as being accurate by the entire voting committee. The Department Head cannot be at this meeting during the deliberations and vote.

Step 6: Communicating the Review and Promotion Committee's vote to the Department Head

The Review and Promotion Chair will provide a copy of the approved R& P Committee teaching, research, service and overall reports including the Department Review and Promotion Committee's vote, to the Department Head, along with all of the materials now in the record.

RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION

Introduction

None of the criteria below are meant to be absolute requirements. Rather, they are suggested to provide guidance and to serve as indicators of success. In addition, it is not expected that every faculty member going up for review and promotion will excel in every category.

Suggested Criteria for a Positive 3rd Year Review for Academic Professional Track Faculty

Teaching for Academic Professional

- Has completed 12 credit hours of teaching each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses/seminars/supervision). One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other instructional activities-i.e. EDAD, EHRD/TCMG 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.
- Has regularly met classes at the scheduled times. If online, responds to students in a timely fashion
- Has an average score for graduate student course evaluations of 3.5 on a 5 point rating scale for online courses or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 5 point rating scale and a 4.0 for face-to face classes or above on a 5 point rating scale.
- Shows evidence of using technology in classes by putting classes online or teaching courses in a hybrid format
- If relevant to the candidate's program, shows evidence of working with masters students, for example SAAHE students
- Has annually met appropriate benchmarks in teaching
- Has demonstrated evidence of continuous efforts to update and improves courses and instructional formats.
- Has attended to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by department.
- Has served as a member on master's or doctoral committees.
- Has led study away trips at state/national or international levels
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for teaching, research and service.

Research for Academic Professional Track Faculty

- Has made presentations related to scholarship of research at local/state/regional/national /international conference.
- Has published books, book chapters and peer reviewed journal articles
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for teaching, research and service.

Service for Academic Professional Track Faculty

- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Has annually met appropriate Department benchmarks in service
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Appropriately attends to all safety compliance requirements for service
- Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department's community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, serving on program, department, college and university committees etc.)

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M University.

Suggested Criteria for a Positive Review for Moving Successfully from Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor

Teaching

Has completed 12 credit hours of teaching each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses/seminars/supervision). One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other instructional activities-i.e. EDAD, EHRD/TCMG 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.

- Has an average score for graduate student course evaluations of 3.5 on a 5 point rating scale for online courses or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 5 point rating scale and a 4.0 for face-to face classes or above on a 5 point rating scale.
- Is carrying a reasonable load of master's chairing and master's committee membership, commensurate with the master's students in the candidate's program area
- Has demonstrated evidence of continuous efforts to update and improve courses and instructional formats.
- Has course syllabi that demonstrate attendance to culture/diversity issues, as applicable.
- Has attended to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by department.
- Has served as a program advisor to students as required by program.
- Has assisted in the development of grants for training or teaching activities from local, state, or national agencies.
- Has appropriately attended to all safety compliance requirements for teaching

Research

- Has made presentations related to scholarship of research at local/state/regional/national /international conference.
- Has published books, book chapters or peer reviewed articles

- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for teaching, research and service.

Service

- Updates vita at least annually and provides copy to the department.
- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Has annually met appropriate Department benchmarks in service
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Appropriately attends to all safety compliance requirements for service
- Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department’s community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, serving on program, department, college and university committees etc.)

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M University.

Suggested Criteria for a Positive Review for Moving Successfully from Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor

Teaching

- Has completed 12 credit hours of teaching each semester of full employment (the equivalent of 12 hours didactic courses/seminars/supervision). One of these courses may equal 15 credit hours of other instructional activities-i.e. EDAD, EHRD/TCMG 684, 685, and 691 course hours) or equivalent as approved by Department Head.
- Has an average score for graduate student course evaluations of 3.5 on a 5 point rating scale for online courses or above and for online and undergraduate courses is 3.0 on a 5 point rating scale and a 4.0 for face-to face classes or above on a 5 point rating scale.
- Is carrying a reasonable load of master’s chairing and master’s committee membership, commensurate with the master’s students in the candidate’s program area
- Has demonstrated evidence of continuous efforts to update and improves courses and instructional formats.
- Has course syllabi that demonstrate attendance to culture/diversity issues, as applicable.
- Receives positive evaluations from students and peers.
- Has attended to required and expected procedures for coursework as defined by department.
- Has served as co-chair or member on master’s or doctoral committees.
- Has served as a program advisor to students as required.
- Has assisted in the development of grants for training or teaching activities from local, state, or national agencies.
- Has appropriately attends to all safety compliance requirements for teaching, research and service

Research

- Has made presentations related to scholarship of research at local/state/regional/national /international conference.
- Has published books, book chapters and peer reviewed articles
- Appropriately attends to all safety and compliance requirements for research

Service

- Updates vita at least annually and provides copy to the department.
- Completes and submits annual A-1 report by the date established by department policy.
- Participates in program development/evaluation activities.
- Has annually met appropriate Department benchmarks in service
- Conducts other activities as specified by program.
- Provides and participates in community/professional endeavors.
- Appropriately attends to all safety compliance requirements for service
- Has contributed in positive and constructive ways to the Department’s community (examples of activities may include: attending program and departmental meetings, serving on program, department, college and university committees etc.)

Adjustments to these criteria can be negotiated with the Department Head and Dean for those who have served at institutions of higher education that have different kinds of expectations than typical Research I institutions and for those facing other circumstances that might deviate from Research I institutional norms. In addition, the record at prior institutions can be added to the record at Texas A&M University.

IV. A Typical Example of CEHD Promotion and Tenure Estimated Calendar Dates

January of each year	Dean Notifies Department Heads of schedule and procedures for tenure track reviews to occur in the <i>next academic year</i> .
February of year prior to review	In consultation with Department Head (DH), candidate begins preparing dossier.
March	Through the Dean of Faculties, the Provost requests Deans to initiate tenure and promotion proceedings.
March-September	Department solicits external letters and completes departmental review process.
September	Departmental Review Committee (DRC) meets to discuss candidate(s) materials and vote on its recommendation(s). DRC recommendation(s) is forwarded to Department Head.
October	DH reviews candidate(s) material and DRC recommendation. DH recommendation is forwarded to College Review Committee.
November	College Review Committee (CRC) reviews candidate(s) material, DRC and DH recommendations. CRC recommendation is

forwarded to Dean.

December	Dean reviews candidate(s) material, DRC, DH and CRC recommendations. Dean's recommendation and candidate(s) tenure and promotion packets are forwarded to the Dean of Faculties.
January of year reviewed	Deans meet and review recommendations with the Provost and Dean of Faculties.
February	Provost forwards recommendations to President. President forwards recommendations to the Board of Regents through the Chancellor of the TAMU System.
May	Board of Regents reviews recommendations and makes final decisions
September following the successful P&T and Review and Promotion Report	Tenure and Promotion decisions become effective.