

ARTS & SCIENCES

Barbara A. Schaal

Mary-Dell Chilton Distinguished Professor

Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Preparation of Cases for Consideration by the Arts & Sciences Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Personnel for AY 2017-18

One of the most important activities that we do as a faculty is to recommend promotion and tenure decisions. Preparation of the Tenure and Promotion document is central to this activity and can determine whether or not a case goes smoothly through the process and, in some cases, may even affect the outcome. Below are guidelines for preparation of the tenure document and a general outline of the timeline for the entire process. We encourage chairs to address any questions regarding procedures to the Dean's office.

Annual Tenure and Promotion Schedule

Spring through October: Departments evaluate cases for tenure. **Tenure dossiers for internal candidates are due to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty (S. Brookings 205) by the end of the third full week in October.** If this deadline is problematic, please contact the Dean's office. **If the department decides against recommending tenure, the Chair should inform the Dean's office in writing by this date.**

Spring through December: Departments evaluate cases for promotion. **Promotion dossiers (Associate to Full and Research Associate to Research Full) for internal candidates are due January 1. Send the candidate's CV to the Dean for review, prior to asking for outside letters or otherwise beginning the promotion process from Associate Professor to Professor.**

November-December: The Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Personnel (P&T committee) meets to evaluate the tenure candidate dossiers. Chairs will be asked to meet with the committee to address questions from the committee.

January – March: The P&T committee meets to evaluate candidates' dossiers for promotion (Associate to Full and Research Associate to Full) and some tenure cases. Chairs will be asked to meet with the committee to address questions from the committee.

Most internal tenure cases go to the March Board of Trustees meeting. However, there are certain circumstances, although rare, that necessitate that an internal tenure case be presented at the October, December, or May Board of Trustees meeting instead of the March meeting.

All Board of Trustees meetings are held the first Friday of the month. Tenure candidates and chairs are notified of decisions in writing on the afternoon of the Board meeting. This occurs after the Dean has presented tenure cases to the Board, the Chancellor has recommended them, the Board has voted, and the Provost's office has relayed the Board's decision to the Dean's office.

If a department wants to hire an external candidate with tenure, the department should be in close communication with the Dean's office about the timing of dossier assembly and submission in order to ensure that the tenure case is reviewed by the P&T committee as soon as possible. This will ultimately ensure that the case is presented at the first opportunity to the Board of Trustees, assuming a positive vote by the P&T committee.

Promotion cases (Associate to Full and Research Associate to Research Full) do not go to the Board of Trustees. Rather, the Dean of the Faculty submits Associate to Full promotion cases to the Provost and Chancellor for review and approval.

2017-18 dates to note:

October 20, 2017: Tenure dossiers for internal candidates are due to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty (S. Brookings 205). Departmental recommendations against tenure are also due at this time.

January 1, 2018: Promotion dossiers for internal promotions from Associate to Full and Research Associate to Research Full are due to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty (S. Brookings 205).

February 2, 2018: In advance of the March Board of Trustees meeting, the Dean submits tenure materials to the Provost for review and to Human Resources for distribution to the Board of Trustees.

March 2, 2018: The Chancellor recommends tenure cases to the Board of Trustees. After the Board of Trustees have voted on the tenure cases brought to it (usually in the early-late afternoon), the Provost's office notifies the Dean's office of the decisions, at which time the Dean's office will inform the candidate and their department Chair of the outcome of their case.

April 6, 2018: In advance of the May Board of Trustees meeting, the Dean submits tenure materials to the Provost for review and to Human Resources for distribution to the Board of Trustees.

May 4, 2018: The Chancellor recommends tenure cases to the Board of Trustees. After the Board of Trustees have voted on the tenure cases brought to it (usually in the early-late afternoon), the Provost's office notifies the Dean's office of the decisions, at which time the Dean's office will inform the candidate and their department Chair of the outcome of their case.

Two key dossier components for Chairs' attention

Chair's letter:

- Make a strong and complete case for your candidate's tenure.
- Write for an academic but non-specialist audience.
- Place the candidate's achievements in the broader context of the field.
- Assess teaching, research and scholarship, service and leadership.
 - If a candidate's teaching evaluations are not strong, explain what the candidate has done to improve her/his teaching (mentoring by senior colleagues, work with the Teaching Center, etc.)
 - If a candidate's research specialization is not well understood by academics outside of the area of specialization, explain the importance and impacts of the research, and place the specialization within the broader field.

External review letters:

- Solicit letters from experts in the candidate's field (both in the candidate's specialized area and in the candidate's broader field). Senior and endowed professors at peer institutions with well-regarded departments and high standing in the candidate's field should be the primary writers.
- It is useful to have letters from people who have worked with the candidate, AND the dossier must also include letters from knowledgeable people who have **not** worked with the candidate.
- The minimum number of letters is six. However, more than the minimum are expected, and a low number of letters may be viewed as weak support.

Notes on dossier preparation

- Completed dossier checklist must be at the front of the dossier. **Page numbers for each dossier component must be included on the checklist.**
- Include **only** 3-5 representative syllabi from the past five years.
- Be careful to scan documents so they are legible and complete. Avoid blurred and/or askew pages.
- Peer-reviewed publications must be clearly indicated, and the total number of peer-reviewed publications must be noted.

- Internal tenure candidates should be given teaching evaluations consistently throughout their career. These periodic classroom observations should be made annually by senior faculty, and the observer's findings should be summarized in a letter to the Chair. **At least one review per year, based on a classroom visit, is expected.** In the Chair's letter in the dossier, the Chair should confirm that these observations have taken place and include a brief summary of the evaluations, noting strengths and highlights, as well as steps that were taken to address and improve any issues that may have been raised. This confirmation and summary **must** be included in the section on teaching evaluation.
 - **Neither the Dean nor the tenure committee will be privy to the written evaluations of junior faculty by senior colleagues. These letters should be held in strict confidence within the department and should not be included in the dossier.**

PREPARATION OF THE DOSSIER (5 sections):

1) **CHAIR'S LETTER:** addresses candidate's teaching, research/scholarship, and service/leadership

General:

- Make a strong and complete case for candidate's tenure
- Explicitly address any negative aspects of the case, particularly possible problems raised by the external letters or the teaching record.
- Write for an academic but non-specialist audience
- Place the candidate's achievements in the broader context of research in the field.
- **State the recommendation of the department, including all votes in the department. If the vote is not unanimous, please explain potential reasons that were brought up in discussions for negative votes or abstentions. The departmental discussion and vote must be conducted in-person at an official department meeting.**

Assessment of Teaching:

- Address the quality of candidate's teaching, including:
 - sufficient evidence to support judgment on the quality of teaching
 - how department routinely assesses teaching effectiveness
 - summary of senior colleagues' annual classroom observations of candidate
 - development as a teacher, noting strengths, weaknesses, and efforts to improve, including participation in workshops or Teaching Center
 - how the candidate was mentored for teaching and how the candidate responded to any issues raised during this mentoring
 - discussion of course evaluations
 - innovations in courses/curriculum
 - supervision of student research, both undergraduate and graduate
 - how the candidate's teaching fits the department's needs and plans

Assessment of Research and Scholarship:

- Address the candidate's specific contributions to the field of research.
 - Summarize principal scholarly achievements, including what the candidate has accomplished and the significance of those accomplishments to the field.
 - Evaluation may refer to candidate's research statement, but should read as an independent assessment.
 - Indicate candidate's role in multi-author publications in the context of the discipline's conventions for co-authorship.
 - Address candidate's research trajectory over time.

- Discuss how candidate's research fits the department's needs and plans and how candidate's interests affect the balance of the department
- Address the conventions of funding for a discipline and whether the candidate's external support was at an appropriate level for the field. Explain any gaps in support.
- Explain how the opinions of external referees have influenced the department's independent judgment of the merits of the candidate's case, but avoid quoting external letters extensively.
- Criticisms from referees should be addressed directly.

Assessment of Service and Leadership:

- Describe in detail the nature and quality of candidate's service and/or leadership in the department, the university and the candidate's major field
 - The nature and amount of service/leadership for Assistant Professors will, understandably, not be as robust as for Associate Professors. However, a reasonable amount of service commensurate with the Assistant Professor role is expected, as this activity helps to integrate the candidate into his or her academic community at many levels and helps to instill the values of service and leadership that will be expected at an increased level post-tenure.
- For promotion to Full Professor, service is one of the key aspects of promotion, in addition to research and teaching
 - Significant service and/or leadership to the promotion candidate's department, the university, and the candidate's field is expected.

Any other aspect of the candidate that was not covered above

2) CV AND RELATED INFORMATION

- C.V. must be fully updated at time of submission.
- Provide a complete chronology of all positions held by the candidate with dates, since the Bachelor's degree
- Publications listed must include the full name of the journal, book, or other venue (standard abbreviations allowed), the full title of publication, the beginning and ending page numbers, and the names of all co-authors as they appear in the publication.
- Peer-reviewed publications. **Please indicate on the list of publications which ones are peer-reviewed, and note the total number of peer-reviewed publications. Include this page number on the checklist.**

Related materials should include the following:

- A list describing the quality and stature within the candidate's field of each journal and book publisher (i.e. submission acceptance rates, ranking of journal, reputation of publisher, etc.)
- An indication of the three or four most significant publications, in chronological order (oldest first, newest last), regardless of length of publication list
- When important publications are co-authored, candidate's relationship with co-authors should be indicated; external letters from co-authors may provide that information, or the Chair may describe the relationships and independent contributions of the candidate.
- Provide information on the extent to which chapters or other material in books overlaps with other publications in journals, edited volumes, or other outlets.
- For external grant support, indicate the nature of the selection and whether candidate was the principal investigator or a co-investigator.
 - Candidate's role (e.g., PI, co-PI, collaborating investigator, consultant) and % of effort committed to project (e.g., as per PARs certification) must be clearly indicated in reporting grant activity.
 - Provide dollar amount and the dates of the grant periods

- It is **not** necessary to include the candidate's grant applications. However, if the candidate requests that they be included as part of the dossier, place them with the supplemental materials. Do **not** include them in this section ("CV and related information") of the dossier.
- Names of graduate students for whom the candidate has served as dissertation supervisor
 - If the department does not normally permit non-tenured faculty to serve as dissertation supervisor, please indicate
- Information on undergraduate advising and participation of undergraduates in research
- Pertinent information on curriculum development
- Candidate's 2-3 page statement of research direction, written for a non-specialist audience

3) TEACHING EVALUATION

Please provide a complete evaluation of the candidate's teaching record and skills, including:

- Candidate's 2-3 page statement of teaching methods and interests
- Chronological summary of all courses taught during candidate's career (as of 2012-13, departments can generate this spreadsheet online – see attached instructions)
- 3-5 representative syllabi from the past five years
- All course evaluations from the past five years, including student comments (see attached instructions)
- If a candidate did not teach during any semester(s) during the past five years, it is not necessary to go back further. Only include evaluations from the past five years.
- A summary of classroom teaching observations by senior departmental colleagues. **At least one evaluation per year, based on a classroom visit, is expected for Assistant Professors. This is required.**
- Any relevant supplementary information, such as:
 - teaching fellowships that supported additional instruction and supervision
 - participation in meetings/conferences specifically concerned with teaching
 - descriptive and analytic letters from graduate students and advanced undergraduates may be included—these letters are particularly helpful when the writers represent a random sampling of the full range of student opinions on the candidate's teaching

In cases of appointment from outside the university, as close of a fit as possible to the dossier teaching evaluation instructions should be sought. Most important would be letters evaluating teaching from members of candidate's present department and student evaluations from their current university.

4) EXTERNAL LETTERS

Basic information:

- Minimum of six external letters with 8 -10 being typical. A low number of letters may be viewed as weak support. All letters received must be included in dossier.
- External evaluators should be contacted to determine their willingness to evaluate the candidate. Individual declines to such requests should not be construed as negative.
- If the tenure dossier is being submitted for a new hire at an Associate or Full Professor level, the letter should say, "We are considering an appointment of this candidate as Associate Professor/Professor with tenure," or something similar. **Do not state that an offer has been made or the candidate has been hired.**
- Letters should be solicited from experts in the candidate's field (senior and endowed professors, when possible), at peer institutions with a well-regarded department in the candidate's field. Letters should be sought from experts in both the specialized area of research and from the broader field.
- Writers should write in language that is appropriate for a non-specialist academic audience.

- It is useful to have letters from people who have worked with the candidate.
- AND the dossier must also include letters from knowledgeable people who have **not** worked with the candidate.
- When selecting potential referees, both the department and the candidate should independently develop lists. If there is a great deal of overlap between the two lists, the department should expand its list and indicate those people who have been added after comparison of the lists. Although some of the external referees may be taken from the list suggested by the candidate, at least half of the letters should be selected from the non-overlapping department's list. The candidate may choose to provide a list of up to three potential referees who should not be contacted.

External referees should be asked to provide analytical evaluations of the candidate's contributions to his/her field of scholarship. They should assess the candidate's standing in the field, including comparisons with individuals at a similar stage of career. Writers should be informed that their comments will be read not only by members of the department but also by the Dean and members of the faculty-wide tenure committee who are not necessarily familiar with the candidate's scholarly discipline. Attached are two examples of letters of solicitation that were used by department chairs in the past. In the case of an appointment of a candidate from outside the university, external letters should, if possible, also address the quality of teaching by the candidate. For cases of those candidates currently on the University faculty, the candidate's home department (and program in the case of a joint appointment) should evaluate the teaching, as explained above in the "Teaching Evaluation" section.

Communicating with external reviewers:

- Acknowledge receipt of a letter of recommendation for a tenure case with a letter of thanks. Provide no further information on the process.
- If information is requested on the status of a case, it should be given only after the Board of Trustees has conferred tenure.
- Chairs may write again to thank letter-writers and provide outcome after Board approval.
- If a solicited referee does not agree to submit a letter, please include documentation of the correspondence in the External Letters section, along with the letters that have been submitted.

Please include all correspondence with referees that is relevant to the case, including electronic correspondence.

The material submitted to the Advisory Committee should include a statement about each referee: the method of selection; the relationship, if any, of the referee to the candidate; and the nature of the referee's expertise and position in the field. Please submit electronic copies of referees' C.V.s. These should be included as a folder on the travel drive. No hard copies of referees' C.V.s are necessary.

OTHER EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Please include all reviews of the candidate's books, information about the reviewers, and information about the journals that published the reviews. If readers' reports are available for unpublished work, those reports should be provided. If the author of the report is known, provide information about his/her academic standing.

5) SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

For internal tenure candidates, supplemental materials must include ALL of the candidate's publications, as well as documents that are in the publishing process . (Books, selected papers, unpublished manuscripts, etc.)

For senior internal candidates being considered for promotion from Associate to Full Professor and senior external candidates being considered for appointment as Associate or Full Professor, only copies of the top ten (10) publications should be submitted.

DOSSIER ORGANIZATION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL

One (1) complete hard copy and one (1) complete electronic copy of the full dossier and supplemental materials (including books, selected papers, unpublished manuscripts, and any supporting material) are required. The electronic copy should be submitted as PDFs on a travel drive. (Please use short titles for PDF files.)

The hard copy and electronic copy must mirror each other. (Either printing the electronic copy or scanning the hard copy and saving it as an electronic copy will help ensure this.)

- ALL pages in the dossier (both hard and electronic copies) must be numbered.
- Dossier Checklist must be complete and include page numbers for all dossier components.
- Submit hard copies of supplemental materials in a separate binder. Both the hard copy and electronic copy should be organized in the following order and labeled:

Dossier Checklist

- 1. Chair's Letter** (one PDF)
- 2. CV and Related Information** (combined in one PDF)
- 3. Teaching Evaluation** (combined in one PDF)
- 4. External Letters** (combined in one PDF)

Supplemental materials (These documents may be included as separate PDFs or combined as one. If combining documents into one PDF, the publications should be ordered from most to least significant. If submitting separate PDFs, create a folder for them and number the PDFs from most (#1) to least significant.)

If a PDF of a candidate's book is unavailable, a second hard copy of the book should be submitted.)

External reviewers' CVs (May be separate PDFs or combined as one—if submitting separate PDFs, create a folder for them. Do **not** submit hard copies of external reviewers' CVs.)

CHAIR'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

The Dean's office will contact the chair when the meeting has been scheduled for the candidate's case. For tenure cases, during the meeting, after preliminary confidential discussion by the committee, the chair will be called to briefly answer questions. For cases of promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor, the chair might be called during the meeting to answer questions. The chair is permitted to bring one other member of the department who is more knowledgeable about the candidate's subfield. If the appointment is also joint with a program, the program director will also be asked to attend. The Dean and committee will ask questions about specific points that they feel would clarify the case. The chair should be prepared to respond to these questions in a manner understandable to a non-specialist.

After the question and answer process ends, the Dean may ask the chair if they would like to add any other comments concerning the discipline's culture or any unexpected or novel issues that the chair thinks might be useful. This is not expected to occur often, as all known information should have been included and explained in the dossier; however, it is understood that there are exceptions and it may be necessary for the chair to address an issue that did not exist prior to submission of the candidate's dossier and about which the committee has no knowledge.

It is imperative that all discussion during the committee meeting be held in strict confidence.

SAMPLE LETTER A

Dear Professor:

_____, who is an assistant professor in our department, is being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure. As part of our review we are seeking assessments of his/her scholarly work and reputation from established scholars in the field. I hope you will be able to serve as an outside referee.

Could you take time to provide an assessment of _____'s work and professional contributions? What has he/she accomplished? What effect has this work had, or is it likely to have, on the field? How would you compare him/her with other scholars at a similar stage in their career? Please mention such scholars by name and institution. How will he/she rank, do you think, in another decade or so?

The more specifically and analytically you can speak to his/her work and particular professional contributions, the more helpful it will be to us. Your letter will be read not only by the department but also by the Dean, and the Dean's advisory committee made up of faculty from across Arts and Sciences; letters that avoid specialized language are most useful.

I am enclosing a copy of _____'s CV, copies of his/her publications, and a copy of one of his/her manuscripts currently under journal review.

Your letter will be held in strict confidence and made available only to the tenured members of our department and the various review bodies of the faculty and administration. If you are able to undertake this evaluation we would be most grateful. We would appreciate receiving your evaluation by _____. Please also include a copy of your CV. If you choose to send your evaluation by e-mail, we request that you also send us a signed hard copy of your letter for our records.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE LETTER B

Dear Professor:

This department is considering the promotion of _____ to associate professor of _____ with tenure. Letters from established scholars outside the university are a required part of the accompanying materials, and I hope that you would be willing to serve as an external referee.

Referees are asked to provide us with an estimate of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments and standing in his/her field. In particular, we would appreciate your evaluation of how Professor _____ stands with regard to other scholars of his/her generation. Detailed analytical comments with regard to specific pieces of scholarship are crucial to our deliberation and are most appreciated. For your information, I would be happy to send you PDF copies of any of his/her major writings to which you may not have access. I am also enclosing a copy of Professor _____'s Curriculum Vitae.

Your letter will be made available to the tenured members of our department as well as to various review bodies of the faculty and administration, all of whom are pledged to maintain the strictest confidence. It is most helpful to the evaluation process if referees recognize that these bodies include scholars with little or no familiarity with the field; accordingly, analytical evaluations directed to the non-specialist have an important role in the process.

I know that this request arrives at a busy time for the consideration of such matters. However, we are anxious to move rapidly with this evaluation. We would greatly appreciate receiving your evaluation by _____. If you choose to send your evaluation by email, we request that you also send us a signed hard copy of your letter for the record.

As the evaluation process involves people far removed from your field, we request a copy of your CV.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me collect at your convenience.
Thank you.

Sincerely,