

**Suggestions to Improve P&T Dossiers**  
**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences**  
**Texas AgriLife Research**  
**Texas AgriLife Extension Service**

The purpose of this document is to provide some general guidelines and best practices related to the preparation of dossiers for promotion and tenure consideration by the Agriculture and Life Sciences Peer Review Committee and the Offices of the Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the Directors of the Texas AgriLife Research and Texas AgriLife Extension Service. The intent is to provide a resource that can be used by candidates and their mentors to assure that all the necessary information is provided in a format that is easy to interpret and allows for consistent evaluation.

The first step in beginning this process for candidates administratively located in the College is to review the guidelines provided by the Dean of Faculties office at <http://dof.tamu.edu/admin/tp/>.

**The following guidelines and best practices are organized according to the recommended content outline of the dossier:**

**Item 1. Candidate's statement on teaching, research, extension and service**

- Should be a “statement on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphases,” written in first person.
- **SHOULD NOT be an abstract, recap or summary of one’s activities and program.**
- **Best practice: Although up to 3 pages are allowed, 1 to 2 pages should suffice.**

**Item 2. Candidate's curriculum vitae (with signed acknowledgement of correct, up-to-date content)**

*The acknowledgement that the CV being submitted is the most current, and is correct as of the date of the signature, may be combined with the Verification of Contents (Item 3). See example attached.*

Position Description

- Include an explicit description of position responsibilities and expectations. This should be consistent with the position description used for annual reviews. The division of teaching, research, and extension responsibilities should be defined by the position description and not by the salary sources.

Teaching

- List undergraduate and graduate courses taught and frequency.
- Teaching evaluations must be included and broken down by the course. Show trends over time. Provide evidence from peer reviews.
- **Teaching evaluations - departmental average should be presented for comparison.**
- **Do not include copies of student evaluation forms;** if you want the information included in the packet, insert a page or two of typical comments in “Item 13 - Other Materials and Documentation.”

- Put syllabi, exams, etc. in “Item 13 - Other Materials and Documentation”; however, many reviewers do not look at syllabi and/or exams.

#### Research and Scholarly Work

- **“Scholarly work”** is most easily demonstrated by refereed publications.
- Other forms of scholarly work should be documented and explained.
- **Refereed publications must be truly refereed or peer-reviewed**
  - publication must have a rejection rate
  - editor-reviewed does not qualify as peer-reviewed
  - **abstracts cannot be included under refereed publications**
  - “submitted” should be listed separately, and university rules do not allow them to be counted
  - **“accepted’ and “in press” must be accompanied by a letter of verification from the editor or journal**
- Copies of articles (reprints) probably need not be included, and if included, should be in “Item 13 - Other Materials and Documentation”; these items are not forwarded out of college.

#### Extension Program Impacts

- Summarize and quantify the focus and diversity of educational programs (number, topic, products, strategies, etc.)
- Present evaluation results (i.e., customer satisfaction, outcome evaluation data) of extension programming
- Indicate number or magnitude of clientele contacts
- **Indicate programming effectiveness by verifying clientele acceptance, use, or behavior change**
- **Applied research studies published (peer reviewed differentiated from reports published by agency)**

#### Grants and Contracts

- **Must indicate \$s allocated to the candidate’s program.**
- List chronologically by year(s) or since last promotion so a track record can be determined.
- Reference to the grant or contract should include all investigators listed in the order that they appear on award, name of the agency or private company that is the source of the award, the duration of the award, the dollar amount allocated to candidate’s program, and the total award.
- Indicate “internal” versus “external” competitive funding.
- Except in special cases, do not list proposals that were submitted, but not funded.

### **Item 3. Candidate's list and signed verification of what he/she has submitted to the departmental review committee**

- *See example format in Appendix.*
- The candidate must include a signed statement: (1) acknowledging that the CV being submitted is the most current, and is correct as of the date of the signature, and (2) verifying what materials he/she has submitted for departmental review for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion consideration.



**Item 4. Departmental evaluation of quality of teaching**

- These evaluation reports are written by faculty who are members of the department's promotion and tenure committee. Authorship of each report should be made clear, and a statement should be included at the end of each report reading, "The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee."
- The report should evaluate the record, and not advocate or repeat information in the CV.
  - The report should be concise, one or two pages.
  - The report should reference evidence from the curriculum vitae and outside letters to support the evaluation.
  - The report should be cognizant of promotion criteria in the area being assessed.
  - The report should be objective, mentioning positive factors, but not omitting negative aspects of the record. Explain any seemingly negative points in outside letters.
  - The report should highlight evidence of peer acceptance; regional, national and international reputation and impact; and the value of the program to society, the State, the University, and the Texas A&M University System.

**Item 5. Departmental evaluation of quality of research**

- See Item 4.

**Item 6. Departmental evaluation of quality of extension**

- See Item 4.

**Item 7. Departmental evaluation of quality of service**

- See Item 4.

**Item 8. Statement on qualifications of outside reviewers; All letters received (indicate candidate selection or dept. selection); Copy of solicitation letter**

- The outside letters requested should be truly "outside" letters. Most outside reviewers should be from peer institutions or better, but letters from clear leaders in the field are also acceptable. If not obvious, include explanation of why it is appropriate.
- Request 5 to 7 letters. No more than one reviewer per institution.
- Outside letters should not be from the candidate's former major professor, fellow classmates in graduate school, former students, or collaborators.

**Item 9. Departmental committee summary report and recommendation**

- The committee report should include a summary evaluation of the candidate, referring to the "Evaluation of Quality" reports.
- The report should explain the reasons for any negative votes by the P&T Committee.
- The report should also describe the membership of the P&T Committee and how selected.
- Explain the voting process and results. Separate the votes for tenured and non-tenure track faculty.
- **Item 10. Recommendation of Department Head and/or Resident Director** The recommendation should be objective and analytical, outlining strengths and weaknesses and impacts and not repeating other information reported in the dossier.
- Letters from the heads/directors of units in which the candidate holds a joint appointment should be included here.

- Letters from intercollegiate faculties or interdisciplinary programs, of which the candidate is a member, should be included here.

#### **Item 11. College Committee summary report and recommendation**

- The committee report should explain the reasons for any negative votes by the Agriculture Peer Review Committee.

#### **Item 12. Recommendation of Dean**

- The recommendation should be objective and analytical, outlining strengths and weaknesses and impacts and not repeating other information reported in the dossier.

#### **Item 13. Other materials and documentation (optional)**

- This section is for any materials deemed pertinent to the case, but not appropriate for placement elsewhere. This might include letters from students or peers that were not part of a structured evaluation process, or letters from TAMU faculty members.
- Supportive materials such as the teaching portfolio (if utilized) and copies of books or articles should be retained in the college, and not sent to the Office of the Dean of Faculties with the T&P package.
- **Best Practice:** Minimize the material included in this section.

#### **General Comments**

- The dossier should be organized so it is readable and the information is easy to find.
- The dossier should be reviewed by “mentors” or “senior faculty” to aid in organization and presentation.
- A successful “template” for that department might be a good model to follow.
- Seriously consider use of **summary tables or bullets** to highlight items such as teaching evaluations, scholarly publications, grants, clientele contact, etc.; possible formats are on the following pages.
- **SPELL CHECK**
- **DO NOT submit an excessively long dossier, i.e. should be less than 100 pages.**
- **Departmental Votes:** must be justified if you want them to carry weight; should be consistent across multiple candidates
- Each reviewer is spending days combing through dozen of packets. Make the Dossier of a reasonable length, well written and easy to read, organized so the key information is easy to find; use summary tables or bulleted lists to highlight major accomplishments, etc. **In other words, market yourself clearly, concisely and therefore effectively.**
- A few “constants” when it comes to information to be considered:
  - **Publications:** Refereed publications are “no brainers” to demonstrate scholarly work. Other forms of scholarship must be explained.
  - **Excellence:** Must demonstrate “excellence” in at least one area (teaching, research or extension), and probably a “strength” in another.
  - **Money:** Must procure sufficient funds to maintain a quality program; therefore the exact dollar amount varies with the program.
  - **Professor Rank:** Must demonstrate national and/or international recognition.

## **General Process Suggestions**

- Inclusion of a detailed position description in CV, consistent with position description used for annual evaluations, is highly recommended.
- Department processes for promotion and tenure should be reviewed. Who votes at the department level? We need to be clear about what constitutes the department's P&T Committee. Is it all faculty at the rank of professor? Is it a smaller committee? How is the committee selected? We need to record the votes from tenured and non-tenure track faculty separately, but only the vote of the department's officially designated P&T Committee should be reported.
- Continuing work is needed to clarify the criteria and expectations for promotion and tenure for College faculty and for promotion for Research and Extension faculty.

### **Committee Members:**

David Baltensperger  
Ronnie Edwards, Chair  
John Nichols  
Greg Reinhart  
Chris Townsend

A special acknowledgement is extended to the members of the Agriculture Peer Review Committee, who shared their observations and suggestions for this document.

**Appendix**  
**Candidate's Acknowledgment of CV and**  
**Verification of Submitted Dossier Contents**

1. I hereby acknowledge that the curriculum vitae, included in this dossier, is the most current, and is correct as of the date of the signature.
  
2. I hereby verify that the following is a complete list of the materials that I submitted to the department head for evaluation by the outside reviewers and by the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion consideration:
  - The list of materials might include such things as: Candidate's Philosophy Statement(s), Curriculum Vitae, Articles, Books, Portfolios, Student Evaluations and other materials submitted by the candidate.
  
  - This list should not include departmental reports, outside letters, or other materials not submitted by the candidate.

*(list of items)*

4. No other materials or documentation were submitted.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date