

## General Reminders

- The expectations and scope of work for tenured/tenure track, academic professional track, AgriLife Research, and AgriLife Extension faculty are different. Please refer to the **expectations specified in your departmental guidelines and the appropriate university, college or agency guidelines** in your discussions and development of the reports.
  - For TAMU candidates, please refer to TAMU DoF [2021-2022 University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#) and the [COALS Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation](#).
  - For AgriLife Research candidates, please refer to AgriLife Research Procedures [12.99.99.A0.03 on Faculty Promotion](#).
  - For AgriLife Extension candidates, please refer to AgriLife Extension Service [Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#).

Links to these and other resources (including your departmental guidelines) can be found on the P&T page of the [AGLS Faculty Affairs website](#).

- **NEW** The departmental P&T committee is expected to **provide guidance and feedback** to the candidates on preparation of the dossier prior to its submission.
- The evaluation should take into account the candidate's **position description**. Expectations for individual faculty with the same title can differ; for example, when their relative effort in teaching, research, or service differs.
- P&T committee votes recorded in Interfolio RPT:
  - For tenured/tenure-track candidates, record only the votes of tenured committee members with rank higher than the candidate considered.
  - For academic professional track (APT) candidates, record only the votes of tenured and APT committee members with rank higher than the candidate considered.
  - For AgriLife Research and AgriLife Extension candidates, record the votes of all committee members with rank higher than the candidate considered.
  - For each case, votes for all committee members will be recorded in the table in the Department T&P Discussion Report (see last section).
- **NEW** Promotion and Tenure Committees must be composed of a minimum of 5 eligible to vote committee members. If the department does not have enough eligible faculty members, the department must develop guidelines on how faculty from other department with related expertise will be selected and added to the department committee.
- Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.
  - For questions related to format, please contact Royce Stengele ([royce.stengele@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:royce.stengele@ag.tamu.edu), 979-458-5705).
  - For questions related to content, please contact Ben Wu ([ben.wu@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:ben.wu@ag.tamu.edu), 979-450-1598).
  - Please feel free to contact Dr. David Ragsdale ([david.ragsdale@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:david.ragsdale@ag.tamu.edu), 979-845-8486) for specific questions related to AgriLife Research policies and expectations, or Dr. Dan Hale ([daniel.hale@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:daniel.hale@ag.tamu.edu), 979-845-7967) for specific questions related to AgriLife Extension Service policies and expectations.

## Reminders for Department Teaching Report

- The report should be **well-substantiated analyses** of the **quality** and **impact** of the candidate’s teaching performance.
  - To enable this analysis of teaching, departments should indicate the material they expect from the candidate in the P&T guidelines or request for applications. If the candidate does not provide the necessary materials, the P&T committee should issue a documented request.
  - Teaching should be documented and reviewed based on **course load** rather than by percent effort.
  - It’s essential to place the candidate’s impact of teaching contributions in the **context** of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations and criteria.
  - Contributions to the department, college and university efforts in **student success** are highly valued.
  - Guidance prompting **examples of evidence**, and **sample analysis questions**, for teaching reports, are available in Appendix III (pages 39-43) in [2021-2022 University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).
  - **NEW** DoF video on writing Teaching Report: <https://youtu.be/jt6qSyHwKOY> (Guidelines: pages 18-19; 20-21; 39-43)

□ The teaching report for TAMU cases **must include**:

1. **Evaluation of course materials (e.g. course syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods)**, as part of the determination of the scope, rigor, and quality of the candidate’s course offerings.

Peer reports of classroom observations are helpful, but not required by the university.

2. **Synthetic analysis of student evaluations of teaching**. Complete longitudinal summaries (chronological and in tabular form) of the student evaluations must be presented, with numerical data set in the context of departmental standards and norms.

A table including the following information must be provided to the candidates and must be **included and analyzed** in the teaching report:

Year	Semester	Course Number	Course Section	Credits	Course Title	Enrollment	Candidate Rating Question 1*	Appropriate Average for Question 1*	Candidate Rating Question 2*	Appropriate Average for Question 2*

\* **Departments decide** which question(s) for the student course evaluations will be considered, and they should be the **same for all candidates**. Department and candidate should work together to determine the appropriate comparison for the candidate ratings – should compare candidate ratings to similar courses in the department or the college.

3. **Evaluation of other valuable teaching contributions** to the department, such as the direction of graduate students, undergraduate researchers and post-docs, participation in student development programs, curriculum development, development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses, textbook and other instructional materials, participation in honors programs, awards or recognition for distinguished teaching, and other teaching-related activities.

□ For AgriLife Extension cases, teaching reports should address (1) Extension Educational Delivery and (2) Academic Instruction and Student Mentoring when applicable. While academic instruction and student mentoring are applicable for candidates with partial teaching appointments, for those candidates who

have only an Extension appointment, this form of teaching may not be applicable. Please see detailed guidelines in [Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#).

- For AgriLife Research cases, teaching reports typically focus on the quality and impact of graduate student and postdoc mentoring, although some candidates may have course based teaching activities which can be evaluated, except where there is a joint appointment at another institution and evaluation of teaching is delegated to that institution.
- Other important considerations
  - Authors of the report must be listed. They should not be an active collaborator of the candidate.
  - The report should be edited to reflect the reviews of the P&T committee.
  - **Must** include a statement at the end of the report such as, “*The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee*”.
  - **Do not** include votes or signatures for the teaching report.
  - **Do not** include letter of testimonials from colleagues or students within the report (may be placed in “Other Materials & Documentation”). Quotes from these letters or testimonials may be used in the reports.

Please review the following excerpts from “[Guidance to Tenure-Track Faculty Candidates and Evaluators for Tenure and Promotion Expectations in The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences](#)”:

#### ***I. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion***

Teaching Excellence: A commitment to excellence in teaching is an expectation of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Teaching excellence is also demonstrated through mentoring of student research. Teaching should be documented, reviewed, and defined by the stated course load. Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students should be documented.

#### ***II. Guide for Internal and External Evaluators***

Teaching Evaluation: Teaching excellence can be documented by accepted performance metrics that can include: student teaching evaluations, student success in achieving learning outcomes, experimentation with and use of pedagogical approaches to improve student learning and success, responsiveness to student and peer evaluations, publication of instructional materials, evidence of both professional development in teaching and associated improvements, and evidence generated by standardized peer evaluation. Excellence in student mentoring can be documented by the successes of the student mentees, which includes quality and quantity of trainee-authored publications, job placements and time to degree.

## Reminders for Department Research Report

- Should be **well-substantiated analyses** of the scope (**quality, productivity overtime**) and **impact** of the candidate's research performance.
  - Assistant Professors seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate **independence** in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized **impact** in their field of research (which could include scholarship of teaching and learning), and be recognized as **leaders** in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status.
  - Tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor are expected to be recognized **leaders** nationally and for many fields **internationally**, who demonstrate **impact that has advanced their field**.
  - Guidance prompting **examples of evidence**, and **sample analysis questions**, for research reports, are available in Appendix IV (pages 44-46) in [2021-2022 University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).
  - Discuss/address any specific considerations, for example, any aspect of the research that is difficult, complex, innovative, or risky, and how that might relate to the productivity to date.
  - Indicate the degree to which participation in interdisciplinary and team research by the candidate has established more opportunities or greater progress for the candidate, when appropriate.
  - **NEW** If the candidate engages in interdisciplinary/collaborative research, remain flexible as you consider the best approach to ensure a fair analysis of the dossier. For example, **if the department committee lacks expertise in a discipline in which the candidate has invested significant effort, consider forming an interdisciplinary ad hoc committee to review the dossier**, or use ad hoc members as needed.
  - **NEW** DoF video on writing Research and/or Other Scholarly or Creative Activities Report: <https://youtu.be/Ztaa-u940mg> (Guidelines: pages 18-19; 21-22; 44-46)
- The research report for TAMU cases **must**:
  1. Evaluate how the candidate has **defined, developed and positioned their scholarship and field of study** throughout their career to achieve impact.
  2. Evaluate the evidence that their **leadership and impact in their field of scholarship** compares favorably to accomplishments and reputation typical of leaders in their discipline and field of study, supported by demonstrated success in securing competitive extramural funding; number, quality and impact of research publications in leading journals; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; number of citations (compared to citation norms in the field) and, where applicable, translational impacts.
  3. Include a **review of selected publications/work** (impact on the discipline, level of innovation and/or creativity) to demonstrate impact and leadership.
  4. Describe **authorship protocols** within the candidate's discipline. Address the candidate's contributions in multi-authored publications and multi-PI grants, when appropriate.
  5. Place the candidate's impact of research contributions in the **context** of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria
- For AgriLife Research cases, statewide and regional (multi-state) leadership should also be addressed. Although some candidates' work is international in scope, others are regionally and nationally recognized

leaders given the scope of the field of their research. Translational impacts of candidates' work are important.

- AgriLife Extension faculty are expected to engage in applied research and other scholarly work in support of their Extension program. Applied or translational research and comprehensive and intensive program evaluations are important components for Extension faculty. Please see detailed guidelines in [Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#).
- Other important considerations
  - Authors of the report must be listed. They should not be an active collaborator of the candidate.
  - The report should be edited to reflect the reviews of the P&T committee.
  - **Must** include a statement at the end of the report such as, *"The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee"*.
  - **Do not** include votes or signatures for the research report.

**Please review** the following excerpts from "[Guidance to Tenure-Track Faculty Candidates and Evaluators for Tenure and Promotion Expectations in The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences](#)":

### ***I. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion***

Research: Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate independence in scholarship, demonstrate meaningful and nationally recognized impact in their field of research (which could include scholarship of teaching and learning) and be recognized as leaders in their field of study, or be on a strong and sustained trajectory to attain national leadership status. Collaborative work is encouraged where each member of the group documents their major and independent contribution to the impact of the research. Documentation of the individual contributions to collaborative studies is particularly important for tenure-track faculty. Tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor are expected to be recognized leaders nationally, and for most fields internationally, who demonstrate impact that has advanced their field. It is incumbent on applicants for tenure and promotion to clearly define their "field" of research/scholarship and its relevance, value and impact for the department, TAMU/TAMUS, the state of Texas, the nation and the world. Candidates should provide specific examples where s/he have advanced their field forward nationally and internationally; activity alone is not a sufficient measure of impact. Leadership and impact in a field should grow and broaden in scope throughout the career of the candidate.

### ***II. Guide for Internal and External Evaluators***

Research Evaluation: In general, candidates should be evaluated with respect to: 1) how the candidate has defined, developed and positioned their scholarship and field of study throughout their career to achieve impact and 2) evidence that their leadership and impact in their field of scholarship compares favorably to accomplishments and reputation typical of leaders in their discipline and field of study. This impact should be supported by demonstrated success in securing competitive extramural funding from federal, private and corporate funders; number, quality and impact of research publications in the leading journals accessible to leaders in the field; prestigious external awards and seminar invitations; number of citations and, where applicable, translational impacts. Leadership, impact and reputation in the candidates' field should also be documented through peer evaluation letters from leaders in the same or closely related field from leading academic institutions. Leadership and impact should be demonstrated mainly from analysis of the content of the candidate's work and how it has affected the field. Candidates and department heads should cultivate a network of potential arm's length evaluators during their entire careers who can directly speak to the candidates' impact and leadership in his/her field. Department Heads and committees should be prepared to read and evaluate the impact of the candidate's work in the context of the norms of excellence for their discipline.

## Reminders for Department Service Report

- Should be well-substantiated analyses of the **quality** and **impact** of the candidate's service performance.
  - Guidance prompting **examples of evidence**, and **sample analysis questions**, for service reports, are available in Appendix V (pages 47-49) in [2021-2022 University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#).
  - **Impact** of the candidate's service efforts on **student success** should be valued and addressed when appropriate.
  - **NEW** DoF video on writing Service Report: [https://youtu.be/or5dSVwz\\_N4](https://youtu.be/or5dSVwz_N4) (Guidelines: pages 18-19; 22; 47-49)
- The service report **must**:
  1. Go beyond restating the activities listed by the candidate in their CV.
  2. Explain the candidate's involvement, contributions, **quality** and **impact** of their service activities.
  3. Document how the service activities **contribute to national and international reputation and recognition** for the candidate and Texas A&M University or the AgriLife agencies.
  4. Place the candidate's impact of service contributions in the **context** of the specific departmental mission, goals, expectations, and criteria.
- For AgriLife Research candidates, please refer to AgriLife Research Procedures [12.99.99.A0.03 on Faculty Promotion](#).
- For AgriLife Extension candidates, please refer to AgriLife Extension Service [Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#).
- Other important considerations
  - Authors of the report must be listed. They should not be an active collaborator of the candidate.
  - The report should be edited to reflect the reviews of the P&T committee.
  - **Must** include a statement at the end of the report such as, *"The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the P&T committee"*.
  - **Do not** include votes or signatures for the service report.
  - **Do not** include letter of testimonials from colleagues or students (may be placed under "Other Materials & Documentation"). Quotes from these letters or testimonials may be used in the reports.

**Please review** the following excerpts from "[Guidance to Tenure-Track Faculty Candidates and Evaluators for Tenure and Promotion Expectations in The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences](#)":

### ***I. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion***

Outreach/Service: A commitment to service is an expectation of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. This includes service within the institution and externally. Leadership and impact of external service should grow throughout the career of the candidate.

### ***II. Guide for Internal and External Evaluators***

Service and Outreach: Excellence in Service and Outreach should document how their service activities contribute to national and international reputation and recognition for themselves and Texas A&M.

## Reminders for Department Extension Report

### (For AgriLife Extension candidates only)

- Should be well-substantiated analyses of the candidate's **quality of work, productivity over time, and impact in the area of Extension**, based on the following evaluation criteria (excerpts from [Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#)):
  - Faculty are expected to develop disciplinary and interdisciplinary programming efforts as appropriate to adequately address the priority issues of the clientele. A variety of peer and clientele inputs should be used to guide the content, quality, priority, and emphasis of the Extension faculty member's leadership within their subject-matter discipline. Guidance should reflect the assimilation and synthesis of information from county, regional, and statewide program development committees, clientele needs assessments, trend data, clientele organizations, and key industry leaders relative to the strategic plans of the unit/department, college, and agency.
  - Timely and effective coordination, cooperation, and scheduling of activities with colleagues and personnel within and outside of Extension, including but not limited to District Extension Administrators, Regional Program Leaders, Associate Department Heads/Program Leaders, other departmental or unit faculty/staff, county Extension agents/staff, and external agencies/organizations are required for programs and responsibilities with mutual audiences.
  - Financial and material support to advance and sustain a faculty member's programmatic efforts should be sought through grants and contracts, fee-based programming, and innovative linkages with other agencies, industry, or organizational groups.

## Reminders for Department T&P Discussion Report

- The committee’s **Discussion Report and Recommendations**
  - Address **research, teaching, and service**, and **extension** for AgriLife Extension cases.
    - Not merely repeat the synopses of the research, teaching, service, and extension reports.
    - For APT (except for research titles) cases, address teaching first.
    - For AgriLife Extension candidates, address extension first.
  - Summarize the **most relevant issues** brought up in the discussion which will explain the outcome of the vote. Do not use direct quotes, minutes, transcripts, etc. of proceedings.
  - Discuss **mixed/negative votes**, with both the candidate’s performance and the committee’s concerns; discuss minority or dissenting views, if any.
  - Discuss the **external reviews** and address **any negative comments**.
  - Discussion and recommendation **must correlate with the vote**.
  - Recommendations must be **consistent with evidence** of performance as documented in the dossier, and reflect conclusions of teaching, research, and service reports.
  - Make it clear that the recommendation was based on written and widely circulated departmental P&T guidelines.
  - **NEW** DoF video on writing Committee Discussion Report and Recommendation: <https://youtu.be/T6EimZUTwAk> (Guidelines: pages 23-25)

- Present the **votes** (at the beginning of the report) in this table format:

Yes	No	Absent	Recuse	Total Eligible	Appointments
					TAMU - Tenured
					TAMU- APT
					AgriLife Research
					AgriLife Extension
					Total committee

- All votes (Yes, No, Absent, Recuse) should add up to the total eligible.
- Explain absences and recusals; minimize absence – absence must be justified.
- Votes must agree with those entered in Interfolio.
- A table listing the committee members, their titles, and confirmation that they agree with the content of the letter (must be all those who voted) must be placed immediately after the Discussion report.
- For TAMU candidates, signature page(s) or email confirmation(s) of agreement (for all TAMU voting committee members who voted) are required. These should be placed under “Other Materials & Documentation”.

## Reminders for External Review Letters

- **Candidates:**
  - Supply names of nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline as external reviewers (ask Head or P&T Chair for number needed).
  - **Do not** contact individuals whose names have been submitted.
  - Can submit a Do Not Contact List.
  - Complete the “Candidate External Reviewer Checklist”.
- **Requirements for external reviewers and letters**
  - See the Key Elements in Guidelines for External Review Letters (2021-2022) table on the next page.
  - **NEW There were seven non-AAU institutions approved as aspirant institutions for COALS in 2019 (see the last page). We can use them as aspirational institutions in this cycle.**
  - **IMPORTANT:** In some fields, it may be difficult to find appropriate reviewers who have not collaborated in some way with a candidate (e.g. being part of a large research consortium which published together). In such a case, the department head must first consult with and get **approval from the dean or director**. If approved by the dean or director, the justification and approval by the dean or director must be included in the dossier.
- **External Reviewers Chart**
  - Must be submitted as an **Excel file**.
  - Specify which are from the candidate list and department list.
  - List all whom were contacted, in the appropriate sections: arm’s length, non-arm’s length, declined.
  - Specify which letters were or were not received. Provide reason for declination, if known.
  - List reviewers in each section in alphabetical order by last name.
  - Ensure the name of the candidate is written exactly as in the candidate CV.
  - The Department and College name must be spelled out, no acronyms.
  - The “Rank Sought” must be the exact title.
- **Candidate & Department External Reviewer Checklists**
  - If any of the boxes are not checked, provide explanations in the Comments box.
- **External Reviewer Letter Request**
  - Include **one** example of the letters requesting outside reviews.
- **External reviewer biographies**
  - Provide the name, title/rank, affiliation, contact information, and a **short (½ page max)** biography for each of the reviewers listed on the chart, in alphabetical order by last name.
  - In the biography, highlight specific qualifications and accomplishments showing that they are nationally or internationally respected and recognized leaders in the discipline.
- **External reviewer letters**
  - If uploading the letters, arrange them in alphabetical order by last name.
  - Only include the arm’s length letters. Any non-arm’s length letters or testimonials can be included under “Other Materials & Documentation”

## Key Elements in Guidelines for External Review Letters (2021-2022)

University/College	AgriLife Research	AgriLife Extension
Minimum 5, and preferably 7, arm's length letters from distinguished scholars who are not: graduate or postdoctoral advisor, collaborator or coworker (last 5 years), business or professional partner, or any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative	<b>Minimum of 5, and preferably 7</b> , arm's length letters from clear leaders who are not: graduate or postdoctoral advisor, collaborator or coworker (last 5 years), business or professional partner, or any family relation such as spouse, sibling, parent or relative	5-6 arm's length letters from clear leaders who are not: co-author or co-PI on a publication or grant (last 5 years); not a previous advisor, mentor, committee member or mentee
<b>Letters are expected to be from peer or aspirational institutions.</b> If letters from top academic programs or preeminent experts at other institutions or outside the academy are requested, an explanation of why the program and/or reviewer are appropriate must be included; <b>and units should strive to request a balanced number of letters from peer or aspirational programs/universities and other eminent programs and scholars.</b>	<b>Letters are expected to be obtained</b> from clear leaders in peer or aspiring institutions (as described in University P&T Guidelines), or from other land grant institutions; if letters from outstanding leaders outside academy are requested, an explanation of why the reviewers are appropriate must be included. <b>Units should strive to request a balanced number of letters from peer or aspirational programs/universities and other land grant universities.</b>	At least 4 of the arm's length letters must be obtained from AAU land grant institutions, other leading land grant institutions, or institutions with outstanding leaders in the candidate's field of expertise; letters from appropriate senior government scientists and specialists may be requested, but only when necessary and upon approval from the Director
<b>Letters should be from scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate.</b> If letters are requested from associate professors (for promotion to associate), a balance of letters from tenured associate and full professor should be sought.	<b>Letters should be from scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate.</b> If letters are requested from associate professors (for promotion to associate), a balance of letters from associate and full professor should be sought.	Letters should be from Professors; Associate Professors may serve as reviewers for candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, but only when necessary and upon approval from the Director
<b>Select and contact at least 7 external reviewers, with about equal number of them from the candidate and department lists.</b> The dossier must include at least 3 letters from the department list.	About 50% of the letters from reviewers in candidate's list and about 50% in department list	About 50% of the letters from reviewers in candidate's list and about 50% in department list
Not more than 1 from same institution; cannot be from candidate's "do not contact" list	Not more than 1 from same institution; cannot be from candidate's "do not contact" list	Not more than 1 from same institution; cannot be from candidate's "do not contact" list
Must use University Standard External Review template; must obtain approval from DoF for any modification	Modify the University Standard External Review template to make an appropriate template	Modify the University Standard External Review template to make an appropriate template

For more detailed directions, please refer to the following university and agency guidelines:

[2021-2022 University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines](#)

[Texas A&M AgriLife Research 12.99.99.A1.03 Faculty Promotion](#)

[Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Professorial Career Ladder for AgriLife Extension Specialist Faculty](#)

**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences  
Texas A&M University  
Approved Peer or Aspirant Institutions  
2019-2020 Promotion and Tenure Cycle**

**Peer AAU Public Institutions from Vision 2020**

Georgia Institute of Technology  
Ohio State University  
Pennsylvania State University  
Purdue University  
University of California Berkeley  
University of California Davis  
University of California Los Angeles  
University of California San Diego  
University of Florida  
University of Illinois Urbana Champaign  
University of Michigan  
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill  
University of Texas Austin  
University of Wisconsin Madison  
University of Minnesota

The highlighted non-AAU institutions below, along with all AAU institutions, are considered as peer and aspirational institutions for COALS, for the 2021-2022 cycle. (You can check the "From a peer or aspiring institution" box for these in the reviewer checklists.)

**Aspirant Institutions for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences**

Auburn University  
Colorado State University  
Cornell University  
Iowa State University  
Johns Hopkins University  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Michigan State University  
North Carolina State University  
Northwestern University  
Rutgers  
Stanford University  
University of Arizona  
University of Chicago  
University of Georgia  
University of Maryland College Park  
University of Missouri

University of Nebraska  
University of North Carolina Chappell Hill  
University of Pittsburgh  
Vanderbilt University  
Virginia Tech  
Washington State University

Other Ivy League schools:  
Brown University  
Columbia University  
Dartmouth College  
Harvard University  
University of Pennsylvania  
Princeton University  
Yale University

**Note:**

There are outstanding faculty who are leaders in their field in institutions that on face value may not be recognized as peers. We expect to tap these experts and external letter requests from leaders including National Academy members, Wolf Prize winners, or Nobel laureates at institutions other than those listed above will be approved by the Dean.