



MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Candidates for Tenure, Promotion, Senior Instructor Renewal, or Third-Year Review in 2022-2023
Department Chairs and Departmental Evaluation Panel Chairs
Deans

FROM: Suzanne Austin, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Susan Divine, Chair, 2022-2023 Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review

DATE: June 14, 2022 – revised August 29

SUBJECT: Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review Procedures

The information that follows reflects the consensus derived from joint discussions of the provost and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review (hereafter, “Advisory Committee”). This memo does not introduce new concepts or requirements into the review process beyond those in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* (hereafter, “FAM” or “Manual”); it is intended to provide guidance in interpreting the standards set forth in the FAM and in preparing materials for review. The memo is not a comprehensive restatement of FAM standards or requirements.

This memo includes the following information:

- I. [Faculty Evaluation Calendar](#)
- II. [General Comments Regarding Expectations and Process \(including COVID-19 pandemic measures associated with tenure, promotion, and third-year review\)](#)
- III. [Candidates’ Responsibilities](#)
- IV. [Departmental Evaluation Panel and Panel Chairs’ Responsibilities](#)
- V. [Deans’ Roles](#)
- VI. [Advisory Committee’s Role](#)
- VII. [Provost’s Recommendation](#)
- VIII. [Packet Guidelines and Preparation](#)
- IX. [Security and Access Guidelines for Online Packets](#)
- X. [Packet Checklist](#)

I. 2022-2023 Faculty Evaluation Calendar

April	Provost provides to academic deans, dean of libraries, and department chairs a list of faculty members in the respective departments who are in the penultimate year for tenure consideration.
May	Standing deadline for tenure-clock modification requests is the Monday after Spring commencement. See below for summer 2022 deadline for candidates originally scheduled for review in 2022-2023.
Apr-June	Meetings held with potential candidates, Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs, and deans.
July 29	Deadline for pandemic-based tenure-clock modification requests for 2021-2022 candidates.
Aug 15*	Chairs confirm list of candidates for tenure, promotion, third-year review, and senior-instructor renewal review with appropriate dean and Office of the Provost. Any faculty member seeking to undergo early review should request permission well in advance of this date.
June-Aug	Panel chairs initiate formation of Department Evaluation Panel(s); panel chairs solicit recent graduate surveys, external reviews of research (if used by department) and extra-departmental colleague letters.
Sept 15	Candidates complete packets. Extended to Monday, September 19 for 2022-2023 candidates.
Oct 1	Evaluation panel chairs assure that all evaluation data have been collected and begin convening panels.
Oct	Departmental Evaluation Panels complete deliberations <u>on tenure and promotion cases</u> . Additional documentation may not be added to the candidate's packet after the Department Evaluation Panel concludes its deliberations, and in no case may any information be added after November 1 for tenure and promotion cases. The only exceptions are as outlined in the <i>FAM</i> and the joint memo from the provost and Advisory Committee.
Nov 1*	Evaluation panel chairs present to appropriate dean(s) the results of their panel deliberations <u>for tenure and promotion candidates</u> and ensure that all materials/packets are accessible by the appropriate dean(s).
Dec 1*	Appropriate dean provides their recommendation <u>in all tenure and promotion reviews</u> to the provost and forwards any hard copy materials to a designated room for review by the Advisory Committee and the provost. The Office of the Provost ensures that the provost and appropriate Advisory Committee members have access to designated online packets.
By Jan 15	Departmental Evaluation Panels complete deliberations <u>on third-year-review cases</u> . Additional documentation may not be added to the candidate's packet after the Departmental Evaluation Panel concludes its deliberations, and in no case may any information be added after January 15 for third-year review cases. The only exceptions are as outlined in the <i>FAM</i> and the joint memo from the provost and Advisory Committee.
Jan 15*	Evaluation panel chairs present to appropriate dean(s) the results of their panel deliberations <u>for third-year-review cases</u> and ensure that all materials/packets are accessible by the appropriate dean(s).
Jan 15-31	Deans interview each third-year-review candidate.
Feb 1*	Deans provide their recommendations <u>on third-year reviews</u> to the provost.
Dec-Feb	The Advisory Committee and the provost review <u>all tenure and promotion recommendations</u> . When requested or when stipulated by the <i>FAM</i> , the Advisory Committee will also consider third-year-review cases.
Feb 25	The Advisory Committee makes its tenure and promotion recommendations and third-year-review recommendations to the president and notifies each candidate in writing of the recommendation.
March 1	The provost makes tenure and promotion recommendations and third-year-review recommendations to the president. All pertinent evaluation materials are sent to the president.
March 15	The provost notifies each candidate in writing of the provost's recommendation.
March 15*	President informs each candidate of the final presidential decision. March 15 or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendation

** Dates marked with an asterisk are required deadlines as delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual. When any date falls on a weekend, the deadline will be the next business day after that date.*

II. General Comments Regarding Expectations and Process

- A. All levels of the review process must be conducted in a fashion consistent with the procedures, criteria, and requirements found in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and, when available, the approved departmental guidelines. The favorable recommendation of candidates for third-year-review determinations, conferrals of tenure, senior-instructor renewals, and promotions is premised on the assumption that the individual candidate clearly meets the standards and followed the procedures outlined in the *FAM*. Those who fail to follow the procedures outlined in the *FAM* compromise their chances of a favorable review.

Effective 2021-2022, our written guidance clarifies that candidates can present any manuscripts or publications on which work was done during their review period, including revisions to the dissertation resulting in the publication of articles or a book. See Section VIII.C, items 1, 3, and 6 of this memo for details.

The 2021-2022 *Faculty/Administration Manual* also reflects more explicit guidance regarding the solicitation of external reviews of research and greater clarity regarding certain professional activities that can be presented as either professional development or service.

- B. Candidates, department chairs, and deans are reminded of the College's standing tenure-clock modification policy and the April 3, 2020 memo on pandemic-associated tenure-clock modifications. Faculty members considering requesting clock modifications should review both documents, consult with their department chair or academic program director, and be mindful of deadlines for requesting tenure clock modifications.
- C. Performance expectations for a successful tenure, promotion, or third-year review have not been substantively modified. However, reviewers at all levels are asked to keep in mind that gaps in research productivity or anomalies in a candidate's instructional record during semesters affected by the pandemic and that are otherwise inconsistent with the candidate's record should not significantly impact reviewers' overall assessment of the candidate's record and performance. Reviewers are also reminded that candidates should receive full credit for research, scholarship, or creative activities that were accepted for conferences, exhibitions, or performances but cancelled or conducted virtually given public health measures associated with the pandemic.
- D. In addition to the required narrative, limited to 10 pages, candidates may include a one-page statement addressing how the pandemic has impacted their teaching; research, creative endeavors, professional development, or professional competency (for library faculty); and/or service commitments, allowing faculty members to contextualize their work and address how they may have needed to prioritize some activities over others during this extended period of uncertainty at work and at home. Candidates are reminded that these pandemic impact statements are intended to address aspects of the faculty member's performance that are otherwise inconsistent with their overall record for the larger review period. In particular, candidates who have not yet met the performance expectations for their specific review should postpone an elective review or, for a mandatory review, should request a clock modification prior to the applicable deadline, rather than relying on a pandemic impact statement to account for substantial lapses in their record.
- E. Reviewers at all levels should recognize, as conveyed in the April 3, 2020 memo from Fran Welch, then interim provost, that "In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, ... [our faculty] continue to work under unprecedented circumstances, with dynamically changing and uncertain conditions" and "that in addition to lessened time for scholarship due to fully online instruction, there are other ongoing and substantial

disruptions to faculty research and professional development programs, including curtailing of travel and of data collection with human subjects; closure or inaccessibility of laboratories, archives, and field sites; and significantly delayed review processes at some journals and presses. Additionally, for some faculty members, family or extended-family caregiving responsibilities have increased substantially.”

- F. As indicated in the *FAM*, departments and schools may develop additional criteria. These require review and approval by the appropriate academic dean and the Office of the Provost. Approval must be obtained by September 15 of a given academic year for any such criteria to be in use for that year’s reviews. In some cases, departments may specify that approved criteria will be implemented in a later academic year.
- G. Candidates are required to use online packets. Exceptions will require the provost’s approval, and requests will be considered only in cases where much of the candidate’s work would not be consistent with an effective presentation in an online format. Books and other materials that cannot be submitted online may still be submitted in hard copy (with no special permission). Detailed instructions are provided below for the creation and naming of documents in online packets. In establishing these instructions, the objective has been to provide a uniform ordering for reviewers while minimizing the number of separate documents that reviewers must open. The online packet contains the materials called the “Executive Binder” by the *FAM* along with the materials we used to require for inclusion in the “Supplemental Binder.”
- H. Generally, additional documentation may not be added to a packet at the candidate’s request after the Departmental Evaluation Panel has completed its deliberations and, in no case, after November 1 (or January 15 for third-year reviews). However, the College allows for updates to be added to the packet on the candidate’s behalf after November 1 (or January 15 for third-year reviews) regarding the status of manuscripts that were both included in the packet and submitted for publication review prior to the packet submission deadline. The College also provides opportunities for the insertion of “such other data and interviews as the panel feels would be valuable” by the Departmental Evaluation Panel; for the addition of materials at the dean's level and above to allow for new information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation; and for correction of errors of fact and/or correction of process errors at certain levels of review. See the *Faculty/Administration Manual* for details. The provost shall make the final determination regarding the need for addition of materials to the packet.

III. Candidates' Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion, tenure, and renewal should follow the guidelines, timetables, and procedures outlined in this memo and in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*. This information is contained in Part VI, sections A-D of the *FAM*.

- A. To ensure that the review process is informed, efficient, and fair, candidates should take the following actions:
 - 1) Consultations
 - a) Consult with panel chair about packet requirements, including any additional departmental criteria for major reviews.
 - b) Consult with panel chair about extra-departmental letters.

- c) Consult with panel chair about optional external review of research and professional development (required in some departments).¹ Although these independent external reviews of scholarly work are not required, such reviews are helpful in the evaluation of a candidate's research, publications, and creative works.
- d) Consult with panel chair about class visitations by departmental peers (required in some but not all departments). Candidates may encourage class visitations by departmental peers even if visits are not required, as information that results from classroom observations by colleagues is helpful.²
- e) Consult with panel chair about recent graduate surveys. These are optional for third-year reviews.
- f) Provide vote to panel chair in response to panel-prepared slate for extra-departmental panel member.
- g) Contact the Office of Institutional Research (hereafter, "IR" or "Institutional Research") to request summary tables of Course-Instructor Evaluation averages (one table for each course, for all semesters the course was taught during the period of evaluation, with comparisons to departmental averages).

Candidates should request these tables prior to August 1 using the form at:

<http://irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request> under Faculty Tenure and Promotion Report Requests.

Given that the Office of Institutional Research will be collecting them to run in batches, please understand that requests may take up to a week to fill.

2) Packet Preparation:

It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly demonstrate with their packet that the candidate is in full and complete compliance with the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion, renewal, or third-year review. Careful preparation of a packet is critical in demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards and criteria. Guidelines for packet preparation are included in Section VIII.

3) Deliberative Phase

- a) Interview with Departmental Evaluation Panel.³ The candidate will have an opportunity to respond to issues raised during the panel's deliberations.
- b) Once the Departmental Evaluation Panel has completed its deliberations, the candidate should sign and receive a copy of the panel letter. The signature of the candidate acknowledges only that a copy of the statement has been received by the candidate. The panel chair will include a signed copy in the packet.

¹ To be conducted in accordance with the *FAM* guidelines regarding external review of research (VI.A.2.b.2.ii), including revisions effective with 2021-2022 reviews.

² For 2022-2023 reviews in departments whose approved guidelines require classroom observations Departmental Evaluation Panels are provided flexibility regarding observations to account for any COVID-19 public health measures in place when observations would normally be scheduled.

³ These interviews may be conducted remotely, if necessary, to adhere to public health measures.

- c) Under current guidelines, there is a provision for corrections of errors of fact in the Departmental Evaluation Panel's letter by the panel chair or the candidate within a specified time period. Corrections should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence. At the sole discretion of the provost or the provost's designee, the Office of the Provost shall return for revision any document purporting to correct errors of fact that does not comply with the current guidelines. Only those documents that comply with the current guidelines shall be considered at subsequent levels of review.

IV. Departmental Evaluation Panel and Panel Chairs' Responsibilities

- A. To ensure that the review process is informed, efficient, and fair, panel chairs should take the following actions:
 - 1) **Panel Chair's Preliminary Work, Including Consultations with Candidate and/or Panel:**
 - a) Consult with candidate about packet requirements, including any additional departmental criteria used for major reviews.
 - b) Consult with candidate and Departmental Evaluation Panel members about extra-departmental letters.
 - c) Consult with candidate and Departmental Evaluation Panel members about conducting an optional external review of research and professional development. Although these independent external reviews of scholarly work are not required, such reviews are helpful in the evaluation of a candidate's research, publications, and creative works.
 - d) Consult with candidate about class visitations by departmental peers (required in some but not all departments). Candidates may encourage class visitations by departmental peers even if they are not required as information that results from classroom visitations by colleagues is helpful.⁴
 - e) Consult with candidate and Departmental Evaluation Panel members about recent graduate surveys. These are optional for third-year review.
 - f) Following the process in the *FAM*, work with the Departmental Evaluation Panel to establish a slate of candidates for the position of extra-departmental panel member, then solicit vote(s) from department's tenure, promotion, and third-year review candidates.
 - g) Verify that the Office of the Provost has on file any additional departmental criteria used for promotion and tenure. Such criteria must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate academic dean and the Office of the Provost by September 15 for use in a given academic year.
 - 2) **Panel Chair Solicitations:**
 - a) Solicit recent graduate surveys.

⁴ For 2022-2023 reviews in departments whose approved guidelines require classroom observations, Departmental Evaluation Panels are provided flexibility regarding observations to account for any COVID-19 public health measures in place when observations would normally be scheduled.

By mid-August, panel chairs should distribute recent graduate surveys to as wide a population as possible. As stated in the *FAM* (VI.A.1.b.4), surveys should come from either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught. In cases where there is a graduate program in the discipline, “majors” should be interpreted to include both undergraduate and graduate students in the major discipline. The candidate may, in consultation with the panel chair, add the names of additional graduates who were not selected by the random process; these additional graduates need not be majors in the department.

The Office of Institutional Research will provide the necessary information for soliciting Recent Graduate Surveys. (Requests should be submitted by the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair via <http://irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request> under Faculty Tenure and Promotion Report Requests). Institutional Research’s list of recent graduates will include all majors who have taken a course with the professor being evaluated, covering the most recent eight years, which would include all four years for most of the students who have graduated during the past five years. If a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 recent graduates, it may be appropriate to substitute surveys from non-majors who took courses with the candidate. Chairs are asked to request the lists of recent graduates by early August whenever possible. Given that the Institutional Research team will be collecting requests to run in batches, please understand that your request may take up to a week to fill.

When soliciting responses from recent graduates, the campus-wide demographic form designed and distributed by the Office of the Provost must be included along with each department’s own Recent Graduate Survey form. This form will be provided with the recent graduates list from Institutional Research and has been built into Qualtrics for use by panel chairs. If departments have demographic questions they wish to add, they may add them on their own departmental form. Effective with 2021-2022 reviews, the recent graduate survey should be conducted electronically, and a summary report must be provided to all levels of review (unless all data is qualitative) along with a compilation of the individual responses.

The Departmental Evaluation Panel chair should endeavor to collect at least 20 responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than 40 students if response rates are low.

When adding Recent Graduate responses to the packet, the panel chair should include a statement describing how recent graduates were selected to be contacted and how many responses were obtained. The panel chair should indicate when a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates and should designate which graduates (if any) were recommended by the candidate.

The solicitation of recent graduate surveys for third-year review is optional.

- b) Solicit extra-departmental colleague letters of support, from colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions, concerning the candidate’s service. These are optional at third-year review.
- c) Optional: Solicit external reviews of the candidate’s research and professional development. If soliciting these, the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair must follow the protocol outlined in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*.

The *Faculty/Administration Manual* does not require candidates to obtain evaluations from professionals outside the College. However, objectively independent external reviews from competent professionals outside the College of Charleston can provide excellent evidence of the **quality of research and professional development**. Some departments may wish to conduct a formal external review of a candidate's scholarly work; candidates may also wish for their chairs to conduct a formal external review to address their research and professional development. The *Faculty/Administration Manual* (VI.A.2.b.ii) requires that candidates and panels who look outside the College for additional evaluation follow the procedures outlined in the *Manual*. Note that while the *FAM* states that candidates should submit the names of potential reviewers by late August, candidates and panel chairs are encouraged to begin this process earlier in the summer.

When external reviews are solicited, the chair must provide a description of the process by which the outside reviewers were selected and letters/reviews were obtained; a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair; and each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer that may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field. A brief and accurate summary of the reviewer's pertinent qualifications is sufficient. A detailed CV from the external reviewer is not typically necessary. If a CV is deemed valuable in demonstrating the reviewers' qualifications, please append it at the end of the external review file.

- d) Solicit departmental colleague letters.

All tenured members of a department, except the chair and those faculty members being evaluated for the same purpose (*i.e.*, promotion to the same rank), must write a colleague letter. Untenured members may choose to write colleague letters. Chairs are encouraged but not required to write colleague letters. Chairs should advise the Departmental Evaluation Panel members and other faculty writing letters to be candid in their written colleague statements. The statements should be evaluative and not just state whether or not the candidate meets the criteria. Letters should state how and to what extent the candidate meets the criteria. Departmental Evaluation Panel members should have access to the candidate's full packet before writing their colleague letters; this includes the confidential portions of the packet, such as graduate surveys, extra-departmental letters of support, and external reviews of research. (These letters should be written before formal departmental deliberations take place and faculty members should not see others' colleague letters before writing their own.) Chairs may remind tenured members of a department who are required to write a colleague letter and fail to do so that they may be subject to disciplinary action.

- e) Load confidential documents into Departmental Evaluation Panel Confidential Folder for each candidate's review, as outlined in instructions in Section VII, after confirming that candidate has no access to folder.

3) Panel deliberations:

- a) Panel Chair should remind Departmental Evaluation Panel members that all deliberations and all documents collected by the panel chair, including recent graduate surveys, extra-departmental letters on service, confidential peer-classroom observations, external reviews of research and professional development, and colleague letters are strictly confidential and should not be discussed with the candidate (beyond appropriate questions during the interview), shared with the candidate, or discussed or shared with any others who did not serve on the Departmental

Evaluation Panel for the given review. When panel deliberations are conducted remotely, they should not be recorded.

- b) The Departmental Evaluation Panel must fully discuss the candidate's professional record, including both strengths and weaknesses.
- c) Teaching is the most important duty and responsibility of all faculty members. Though not required by the *FAM*, information that results from classroom visitations by colleagues is helpful. The discussion of Course-Instructor Evaluations in the panel letter should specifically address the candidate's ratings in the context of departmental means. Reviewers at all levels will also use syllabi, exams, and other course materials to assess teaching effectiveness.
- d) The provost and the Advisory Committee consider important the use of objective sources of evidence of the quality of a candidate's research. The panel letter must include a thorough assessment of the quality of a candidate's refereed or juried works, including, when available, objective measures of the quality of the journals or venues in which they appear. Invited creative works and publications can also help demonstrate the quality of a candidate's scholarship; hence, the panel letter should address the quality of any invited publications or creative works.
- e) Although independent external reviews of scholarly work (*i.e.*, reviews conducted by scholars not employed by the College of Charleston) are not required, the Advisory Committee and the provost have found such reviews helpful in the evaluation of a candidate's research, publications, and creative works. If such a review is to be included, the protocol in the *FAM* must be followed (VI.A.b.2.ii).
- f) The Panel Chair will ensure that the Departmental Evaluation Panel interviews each candidate. During the interview, there should be a full discussion of any questionable issues, with an opportunity for the candidate to respond.
- g) The panel chair will conduct all necessary vote(s) via secret ballot. At least one ballot must focus clearly on the relevant action under consideration (*e.g.*, retention at third year, tenure and promotion) and shall only allow for each panel member to indicate a yes vote, a no vote, or abstention. For this vote, blank ballots, write-in ballots, and other irregular ballots are not to be included in reporting actual vote splits. Additional votes may be taken for the purposes of assigning ratings in the various areas of faculty performance and to further quantify the outcome of the deliberations. When taken, these votes should be conducted by secret ballot. Deans or panel chairs may consult with the Office of the Provost about any question relevant to the conduct or result of a secret ballot. Regarding the status of any disputed ballot, the decision of the provost is final.
- h) The panel chair will draft and take responsibility for finalizing and submitting the Departmental Evaluation Panel letter. Panelists will be given the opportunity to review and comment on the letter before it is finalized.

Panel chairs should draft letters that, while maintaining the confidentiality of the meeting(s), summarize all the discussion that takes place in the Departmental Evaluation Panel meeting(s), including positive and negative deliberations. The panel letter must address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criteria and standards in all relevant competency areas, specifically assigning and justifying a rating for each area of performance.

Please note that for tenure and promotion to associate professor, the panel letter must address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three categories of review or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development. For promotion to professor, the panel letter must address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three categories of review or significant achievement in all three areas. For promotion to or renewal as Senior Instructor, the panel letter must address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of exemplary performance in teaching. For library faculty, the panel letter must address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of exemplary performance in the area of professional competence. Deans should ensure that the panel letter adequately addresses these specific issues.

The copy of the letter included in the packet must be signed by the Departmental Evaluation Panel members and the candidate, with the candidate's signature acknowledging only that a copy of the statement has been received by the candidate. The letter should include the following:

- A thorough assessment of the quality of the candidate's teaching;
 - Discussion of the candidate's ratings on Course-Instructor Evaluations in the context of departmental means;
 - Expectations in the discipline regarding research, including the role of chapters in books and refereed proceedings, if pertinent, as well as journal articles or books;
 - Expectations and explanation of the role and value of practitioner research and of pedagogical research, where pertinent;
 - Practice in the discipline regarding multiple authorship, if pertinent;
 - Discussion and evaluation of the quality of the journals or presses in which the candidate's scholarship appears (*i.e.*, the nature and quality of the review process, number of citations, journal rankings, acceptance rates);
 - Discussion and evaluation of the quantity and quality of the candidate's research;
 - Discussion of any weaknesses in the candidate's record;
 - Discussion of candidate's responses to any concerns raised in the interview with the Departmental Evaluation Panel;
 - Explicit indication of candidate performance (*i.e.*, "exemplary," "significant achievement," "high professional competence" or "does not meet expectations") in the relevant review areas.
- i) Complete checklist (found in Section IX below) and load into online folder.
- j) Verify access to online folders as explained in Section VIII below.

V. Deans' Roles

The appropriate dean(s) should review the packet checklist completed by the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair and ensure that all materials from the Departmental Evaluation Panel level, including the confidential materials and Panel letter, have been appropriately loaded in the electronic packet.

The appropriate dean(s) shall review the faculty member's packet and the Departmental Evaluation Panel's recommendation and should ensure that the panel letter adequately addresses all specific issues. The dean shall interview each third-year-review candidate and may choose to interview other candidates. Information

concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the dean.

As with Departmental Evaluation Panel letters, the dean's letter should include an explicit indication of candidate performance (i.e. "exemplary," "significant achievement," "high professional competence" or "does not meet expectations") in the relevant review areas.

The dean shall provide the candidate and the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel a copy of the dean's assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the provost, which should also be uploaded to the candidate's dean's Confidential folder ("[Dean](#)") as a pdf file.

Under current guidelines, there is a provision for corrections of errors of fact in the dean's letter by the dean or the candidate within a specified time period. Corrections should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence. Corrections should be entered in the dean's Confidential folder.

Details can be found in Section VI.D.8-10 of the *FAM*.

VI. Advisory Committee's Role

The Advisory Committee shall review the complete packet, the recommendations from lower levels of review, and any requests for corrections of errors of fact. Information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation may be requested by the chair of the Advisory Committee from certain parties.

In accordance with the *FAM*, the "Advisory Committee shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the appropriate academic dean or dean of libraries recommendation is different from the Departmental Evaluation Panel or the Departmental Evaluation Panel vote is negative."

In all cases that they hear, including any cases involving candidates for third-year review, the Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate, chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, dean, and provost a copy of their assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the president by the announced deadlines.

Under current guidelines, there is a provision for corrections of errors of fact in the Advisory Committee's letter by the candidate within a specified time period. Corrections should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.

Details can be found in Section VI.D.11 of the *FAM*.

VII. Provost's Recommendation

In accordance with the *FAM*, the provost "shall interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the appropriate academic dean or dean of libraries recommendation is different from the Departmental Evaluation Panel or the Departmental Evaluation Panel vote is negative." In all cases in which the provost's recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the provost will provide a copy of their recommendation to the candidate, chair, dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the president's decision.

VIII. Packet Guidelines and Preparation

It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly demonstrate with their packet that the candidate is in full and complete compliance with the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion, retention, or third-year review. Careful preparation of a packet is critical in demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards and criteria. Candidates for tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year review are required to use online packets. Details, including packet requirements, access information, folder structure, and naming conventions, are provided here.

A. Access to SharePoint's online packets

The College uses the [Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review SharePoint](https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp) site (<https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp>) for the creation and review of candidate's online packets.

Details about the how to access each school, department, and candidate subsite are provided in this memo and on the [Procedures, Samples, and Resources Page](#) of our SharePoint site. The resources page also includes links to procedures, resources for packet construction, and a sample candidate packet.

The SharePoint site contains four levels of sites:

Home (cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp)

School (cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school)

Department (cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school/dept)

Candidate (cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school/dept/lastname)

 Dept. Public folder

 Dept. Eval. Panel folder

 Dept. Eval. Panel confidential folder

 Dean confidential folder

All users have access to the home, school, and department level sites, but unique permissions are given to the candidate sites and their folders (*a.k.a.* document libraries) as outlined in this memo. Users may enter the site homepage at <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp> and navigate to the chosen subsite by clicking on the school, then department subsite, then candidate subsite.

Alternatively, candidates and reviewers can go **directly** to the level they wish to access by following these directions:

1. **Home Site:** Go to <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/>.
2. **School Site:** Go to <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school> where "/school" uses the school acronym (/sota, /bus, /soe, /shs, /hss, /lcwa, /ssm, /libr).
3. **Department Site:** Go to <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school/dept> where "/school" uses the school acronym (/sota, /bus, /soe, /shs, /hss, /lcwa, /ssm, /libr) and "/dept" uses the 4-letter department or program acronym (*e.g.* /math).
4. **Candidate's Site Access:** Go to <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/schl/dept/lastname> where "/school" uses the school acronym (/sota, /bus, /soe, /shs, /hss, /lcwa, /ssm, /libr), "/department" uses the 4-letter department or program acronym (*e.g.* /math), and "/lastname" uses the candidate's last name without any spaces or special characters, except hyphens.
5. **Candidate folders (4 document libraries inside candidate's site):** See detailed permissions. Email invitations are sent.

Please note that while SharePoint sites are being constructed, candidates are strongly encouraged to create and collect all their materials in a digital file space that they control, named and organized into folders according to the conventions outlined in this memo.

B. General structure of online packets

This section provides an overview of the structure of online tenure and promotion packets and general guidelines for creating and loading documents. File naming conventions and site and folder access control are outlined in subsequent sections.

There will be a SharePoint site for each participating department, labeled by school and department (for example, *cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/hss/phil*) containing:

- 1) A subsite for each faculty member under review, indicating the review (for example, *Garcia, Alex (review for promotion to professor)*).
- 2) Any additional approved departmental standards are posted on our faculty review resource page at <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/resource> and will be accessible via a link on the departmental subsite.

General principles for loading documents are as follows:

- 1) All documents should be in PDF format and each named item below will consist of a single file. Some will be created by scanning existing paper documents; in that case, the final document submitted must be of good quality. When possible, a large single PDF document should be created, rather than many smaller PDF documents. However, in situations where a candidate is having difficulty creating a single PDF because of limitations on the size of a document created from scanned materials, we suggest splitting the larger document into several files (as described below).⁵
- 2) Books and other materials that cannot be submitted online may still be submitted in hard copy.
- 3) Additional materials included that are not listed in this document should be labeled so as to follow those listed.
- 4) Candidates are encouraged to first compile their materials in a folder on their computer or personal network drive, appropriately named, and then upload them to the SharePoint site from there.

Each candidate site in SharePoint will have four folders:

- 1) **Departmental Public Folder for use in the candidate's review** (e.g., "[Dept Public](#)"):

All members of the department will have access to this public folder, as will all higher-level reviewers. Documents in this folder will be loaded by the candidate and numbered and named as indicated below.

⁵ Photocopiers with scanning abilities and some other scanners may limit the size of scanned documents, often to 50 or 100 pages, depending on the machine. The library's KIC scanner has a much greater capacity. In situations where a candidate is having difficulty creating a single PDF file because of limitations on the size of a document created from scanned materials, please create several documents labeled as XXX Part1, XXX Part 2, etc. We will not require tables of contents for documents. The College has a site license for Adobe Acrobat Pro; candidates may contact the Helpdesk to request that this software be installed on their College computer.

2) **Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder for use in the candidate’s review** (e.g., “Dept Eval Panel”):

This folder will contain sensitive documents that are available to and loaded by the candidate, such as appointment letters, tenure-clock modification letters, annual evaluations, and Course-Instructor Evaluation reports. It will be accessible only by the candidate, members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, and higher-level reviewers.

3) **Departmental Evaluation Panel Confidential Folder for use in the candidate’s review** (e.g., “Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL”):

This folder will contain strictly confidential documents, such as recent graduate surveys, confidential peer observations, extra-departmental colleague letters, external reviews, and departmental colleague letters. Only Departmental Evaluation Panel members and authorized individuals at the higher levels of review will receive access to this folder. Candidates will not be given access to this folder or its contents. Items will be loaded by the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair.

4) **Dean’s Confidential Folder for use in the candidate’s review** (e.g., “Dean”):

This folder will contain documents reviewed only at the Dean’s level and above.

C. Packet Requirements and Naming Conventions for Candidates

This section outlines requirements for the candidate’s packet, along with file naming conventions established to ensure ease of document identification by reviewers. Candidates will prepare and load the following documents:

In Candidate’s Departmental Public Folder (“Dept Public”): All members of the department will have access to this public folder, as will all higher-level reviewers. Documents in this folder will be loaded by the candidate and numbered and named as indicated below.

- 1) Candidates should prepare a detailed and current professional curriculum vitae in the format appropriate to their disciplines. This CV should use the standard disciplinary bibliographic form for citations, including beginning and ending page numbers for articles and chapters in books, as well as volume, date, and number information for journal articles. **Candidates should clearly mark on the CV all scholarly or creative outcomes (e.g. refereed articles, juried exhibitions, performances, etc.) that they are presenting as evidence for the given review period. In identifying that evidence, candidates should not present scholarly or creative outcomes that were accepted in a prior review period and presented for that prior review.** Candidates should also indicate the title of their terminal degree thesis and the name of their thesis advisor.

The CV should be loaded as a single file using the naming convention **“01 Last Name CV”** (e.g., “01 Garcia CV”).

- 2) Candidates should include a list of all courses taught each semester during the period under review, including course numbers and titles. Course releases for administrative or other duties, sabbatical leaves, and any other modifications of teaching duties should be noted. This list should be loaded as a single file using the naming convention **“02 Last Name Course List.”** Library faculty should provide a list of professional competency contributions and achievements instead, titled **“02 Last Name**

Professional Competency List.” Instructional librarians should include their course list in their professional competencies list.

- 3) Candidates should prepare a narrative summary addressing each of the three areas of evaluation pertinent to their appointment. Candidates should refer to the tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year evaluation standards found in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and reiterated below, developing a narrative that states how they believe that they have exceeded or met the minimum standards for each relevant area. The strongest narratives offer descriptive depth and avoid simply re-listing items from the CV with light annotations. This narrative of performance and self-evaluation in the three categories of review should be in a 11-point or larger font and should not exceed **ten pages total**; a shorter narrative is quite acceptable, so long as it clearly addresses how the candidate meets the criteria. The narrative should be loaded as a single file labeled as **“03 Last Name Narrative.”**

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor must demonstrate either exemplary performance in at least one of the three competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of Teaching Effectiveness and Research and Professional Development. Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate either exemplary performance in at least one of the three competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas. Specific performance criteria for each area, including criteria for instructors, senior instructors, and library faculty, are reflected below.

Tenured and tenure-track instructional faculty should review the list of possible “professional activities” listed in the *FAM*, Section VI.A.2.b.5 and decide, in consultation with the Departmental Evaluation Panel chair, which activities they would like to include under the area of Research and Professional Development and which they would like to include under Service.

For tenured and tenure-track instructional faculty, the relevant categories are as follows:

a) Narrative Summary of Teaching

Teaching is the primary responsibility of instructional faculty at the College of Charleston. Effectiveness in teaching is the primary means by which College of Charleston faculty achieve tenure, promotion, and successful third-year review (*FAM* VI. A.1.a.).

Promotion to or renewal as Senior Instructor requires “sustained exemplary performance in teaching” and “clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.” Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires “sustained effectiveness in teaching.” Promotion to Professor requires “sustained high quality and effective teaching.”

The narrative description of teaching should include the candidate’s teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments (*FAM* VI.A.1.b.3). Candidates may include discussions of class goals and procedures; descriptions of teaching materials and assignments; and other information addressing how the candidate engages students in the learning process. Candidates may also include an assessment of their teaching experiences and of steps taken to improve the courses they teach.

b) Narrative Summary of Research and Professional Development

Promotion to and renewal as senior instructor requires a “sustained program of quality (professional) development.” Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires “clear evidence of high promise for continued high quality scholarship and professional activity.”

Promotion to professor requires “clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship” and “sustained professional activity.”

Three fundamental principles guide the review of research for tenure-track and tenured instructional faculty: quantity of outcomes, appropriate quality, and evidence of an ongoing research or creative program. Work accepted for publication may be considered as part of a candidate’s record for the review period, regardless of whether it was been published. Work conducted during the review period that has not yet been submitted or accepted for publication may also be included in a candidate’s evidence and addressed in the narrative. For each manuscript, publication, or creative activity presented, the candidate’s narrative should clearly indicate its status and describe the work that was done on the item during the review period. The candidate’s research record may include publications emerging from revisions to a dissertation.

Candidates should indicate publication co-authorship in the order cited in the publication. Some disciplines do not order authorship by significance to the publication. Candidates should indicate the practice in their discipline and, when authorship is not ordered by significance to the publication, describe the candidate’s own contribution.

A description of the candidate’s overall research program and plans for future research should be included in the narrative.

c) Narrative Summary of Service

Promotion to and renewal as senior instructor requires “evidence of quality service to the community.” Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires “active and sustained service to the College or ... in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.” Promotion to professor requires “active and sustained service to the College,” and “leadership should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.”

A description of the candidate’s service activities to the department, the College, and where appropriate, the community during the evaluation period should be included in the narrative. Candidates should indicate what each service activity entailed and may also distinguish among areas of service (*i.e.*, to the department, the College, and the community, including professional and academic associations). Plans for future service commitments are also welcome. Candidates in 2021-2022 and beyond should take note of revisions to Section VI.A.2.b.(5), indicating how items in that professional development list may be counted as Service.

The categories for library faculty differ slightly from those for instructional faculty. Instead of a narrative of teaching, library faculty compose a narrative of professional competence. And instead of a narrative description of research and professional development, library faculty compose a narrative of professional growth and development.

All faculty should refer to the comprehensive overview of each area provided in the FAM.

- 4) Candidates may also submit a one-page statement addressing how the pandemic has impacted their teaching; research, creative endeavors, professional development, or professional competence (for library faculty); and/or service commitments, as outlined in item II.B on page 3 of this document. If

this is included as a separate document, it should be named **“03 Last Name Pandemic Impact Statement.”**

- 5) Syllabi and *sample* teaching materials from no more than three representative courses, as outlined below:

Materials for each course are to be loaded as a single file, named as **“04 Last Name Course Name Materials”** (e.g., “04 Garcia ENGL 110 Materials”), **“05 Last Name Course Name Materials,”** and **“06 Last Name Course Name Materials,”** each containing the following:

- A representative syllabus,
- Examples of specific assignments or other materials from the same course. Candidates should include evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*. (Candidates for tenure, promotion and third-year review should consult VI.A.1.b.6; candidates for promotion to or renewal as senior instructor should consult VI.B.2.b.6),
- Any other evidence from the same representative course that illustrates teaching and learning approaches outlined in the narrative, and
- When appropriate, other evidence from the same representative course that indicates how the candidate engages students in the learning process. Samples of graded materials, for example, may be appropriate.

Note: While candidates should provide material for just three courses here, representative syllabi from all other courses [but not each section] taught during the review period must be included in the supplementary folder, as outlined below.

Note: Library faculty should use these items to demonstrate professional competencies, using the name of any non-instructional professional competency in place of a course name in the file naming conventions here.

- 6) The evidence for professional accomplishments must include refereed scholarly books or refereed scholarly journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts) that are to be evaluated rigorously during the review process at the College (FAM VI.A.4.a.2). The overall quality and substance of a candidate's research and publication or creative works record, during the period of review, is of primary importance in tenure and promotion evaluations.
- a) Candidates for tenure and promotion should include here no more than three sample publications (e.g. reprints, off-prints) or equivalent creative works for the period under review. (All other additional publications or equivalent creative works will be included in the supplementary folder, as outlined below.) Normally these scholarly works should be directly related to the candidate's area of professional research and/or teaching expertise. For senior-instructor promotion and renewal candidates, evidence of professional development activity should be substituted.
 - b) At the time of packet submission to the Departmental Evaluation Panel, all articles, books, etc. presented as evidence of refereed publications must already be published or must have already been accepted for publication. If the work has been accepted but not yet published, a

copy of the acceptance notification should be included with the manuscript.

- c) Proof of the refereed nature of the work must be provided. Candidates for tenure and promotion should include a copy of the masthead of each journal (or an equivalent statement from the publisher or editor or other information, such as that included on the web site for the journal) that indicates how and to what extent the journal is refereed. Candidates submitting books for consideration should also indicate how and to what extent the book was reviewed. Evidence of journal quality (e.g., acceptance rate, published journal ranking within discipline, etc.) should also be included. In the case of artistic performances or exhibitions, there should be clear evidence of professional evaluation.
 - d) Candidate should load publications and supporting documentation, as outlined above, for three select publications, as a single document for each publication and named **"07 Last Name Type of Research Work 1"** (e.g., "07 Garcia Publication 1" or "07 Garcia Creative Work 1"), **"08 Last Name Type of Research Work 2,"** and **"09 Last Name Type of Research Work 3."** Library faculty should name these files according to the type of research or professional growth and development.
- 6) Candidates may include any (optional) additional documentation of service activities that is not contained in the candidate's narrative, labeled as **"10 Last Name Service."**
 - 7) If the candidate is submitting any materials in hard copy, such as books or other materials that cannot be submitted online, they should include a list of such materials, labeled **"11 Last Name Hard Copy Submissions."**
 - 8) Candidates should have a supplementary folder titled **"Dept Public Supplementary Materials"** containing any supplementary materials submitted. It should contain the following materials (except those marked "optional") but is not limited to these. Items should be uploaded and files named according to the naming conventions outlined here.
 - a) Candidate should submit a representative syllabus from each course [but not each course section] taught during the review period, submitted as a single file and labeled **"01 Last Name Supp Syllabi."** Library faculty should use the convention **"01 Last Name Supp Professional Competence"** for non-instructional competencies.
 - b) For the remaining files, numbering should continue sequentially, depending on how many of each type are loaded, as designated by ## below.
 - c) Candidate may submit additional course materials for the representative courses included in the main file. These materials should be presented together for each course and labeled according to the convention **"## Last Name Course Name Materials."** For non-instructional duties, library faculty should use the name of their professional competency here, rather than a course name.
 - d) The candidate must submit all additional publications or creative works for the period under review, including materials documenting the review process for each. These should be submitted as a single file for each publication or creative work and named according to the convention **"## Last Name Supp Type of Research 1,"** (e.g., "02 Garcia Supp Publication 4", continuing numbering as needed.) For library faculty, **"Type of Research"** should be type of research or type of professional growth and development work.

- e) Candidate should submit copies of any manuscripts currently under submission, but not yet accepted, that are referenced elsewhere in the packet (*e.g.*, in the candidate’s research narrative), included as a single file for each manuscript under review, including a description of the candidate’s contribution if a co-authored work, continuing numbering from above and named as “## Last Name Supp Manuscript 1.” Candidates may also include manuscripts not yet submitted if they wish to demonstrate work in progress that is addressed in the narrative.
- f) Candidates should submit externally funded grant proposals, included as a single document per proposal, named “## Last Name Supp Grant 1.”

Note: No additional documentation of service activities beyond that in the main folder is necessary.

In Candidate’s Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder (“Dept Eval Panel”): All members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel for this candidate will have access to this folder, as will all subsequent reviewers (*e.g.*, dean, Advisory Committee members). The folder will contain the following items, to be loaded by the candidate:

- 1) Candidates undergoing third-year, tenure, or senior instructor promotion reviews should include their letter of appointment and any additional letter(s) awarding extensions of the tenure/probationary period, loaded as a single file and labeled “01 Last Name Appointment.”
- 2) Candidates undergoing other promotion reviews or senior instructor renewal reviews should load the letter(s) from their last promotion, as a single file named “01 Last Name Promotion Name,” (*e.g.*, “01 Garcia Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor”).
- 3) Candidates should load all annual evaluations conducted during the review period, presented in a single file in chronological order as “02 Last Name Annual Evaluations.”
- 4) Candidates undergoing review for promotion to Senior Instructor or for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should load the Departmental Evaluation Panel letter from their third-year review, labeled “03 Last Name Dept Panel Third-Year Review.”
- 5) Candidates should load Course-Instructor Evaluation reports from the Office of Institutional Research, followed by numerical summary tables from each course section downloaded from Blue®, compiled as a single file in the order listed below and labeled “04 Last Name Course-Instructor Evaluations.” (Candidates may access Blue® reports at coursereview.cofc.edu; via the link on OAKS; or via the link on the Faculty tab in MyCharleston.)
 - a) Reports from the Office of Institutional Research consisting of a table for each course, covering all semesters the course was taught during the period of evaluation, along with candidate averages, candidate medians, and departmental averages.

These tables are produced by Institutional Research at the request of candidates (see section II.A.1.g. above) and are as illustrated below:

	Term 1 Sect 1	Term 2 Sect 1	Term 2 Sect 3	Candidate Avg – this course	Candidate Med – this course	Candidate Std Dev – this course	Dept Avg All courses
Question 1							
Question 2							
Question 3							

- b) Numerical summary tables for Course-Instructor Evaluations for each section taught by the candidate during the period of evaluation. (Reports containing written student comments, when appropriate, may be included in the supplementary folder within the candidate's Departmental Evaluation Panel folder.)
- 6) Peer reviews of classroom performance normally provided to the candidate, if any, may be submitted, loaded as a single file labeled **"05 Last Name Peer Review Classroom."**
 - 7) Candidates should have a supplementary folder titled **"Dept Eval Panel Supplementary Folder"** containing any sensitive supplementary materials submitted.
 - a. The folder should contain any sensitive optional materials that the candidate would like to submit, including optional commented Course-Instructor Evaluation reports. Items should be uploaded and files named according to the naming conventions outlined here.
 - b. Candidates may submit optional commented Course-Instructor Evaluation reports, containing student free-response comments, loaded as one document per course, and named as **"## Last Name Supp Name of Course Course-Instructor Evaluations,"** (e.g., "06 Garcia Supp Engl 110 Course-Instructor Evaluations").

D. Packet Requirements and Naming Conventions for Departmental Evaluation Panel Chairs

Panel chairs should load the following items, following the guidelines and naming conventions outlined here.

In Candidate's Departmental Evaluation Panel Confidential Folder ("Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL"):

- 1) Required extra-departmental letters on service (optional at third-year review), loaded as a single file labeled **"01 Last Name Extra-Dept on Service"** (e.g., "01 Garcia Extra-Dept'l on Service")
- 2) Optional peer reviews of classroom performance not normally provided to the candidate, if any, loaded as a single file labeled **"02 Last Name Peer Review Classroom."**
- 3) The panel chair should include recent graduate surveys as a single file, labeled **"03 Last Name Graduate Surveys"** and containing the following, in order:
 - a) A statement describing how recent graduates were selected to be contacted and how many responses were obtained. This statement or the list of graduates should indicate which (if any) students were contacted at the candidate's request. Additionally, the panel chair should indicate when a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 recent graduates.
 - b) A description of the method of solicitation and/or copy of the letter of solicitation.
 - c) A summary of all survey responses, followed by the completed individual responses.⁶

⁶ Effective with 2021-2022 reviews, a summary table will be required.

The chair should endeavor to collect at least 20 responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than 40 students if response rates are low.

- 4) When optional external reviews of the candidate's performance in research and professional development are solicited, the panel chair must provide the following documents, loaded as a single file named "**04 Last Name External Reviews of Research**," containing the following items, in order:
 - a) A description of the process by which the outside reviewers were selected and letters/reviews were obtained;
 - b) A copy of the letter of solicitation from the panel chair;
 - c) Each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer that may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field (as outlined in Section IV.A.2.c above); and
 - d) The confidential outside letters/reviews.

Note: While external reviews are optional, as indicated in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, if such reviews are conducted, all of these elements are required.

- 5) All departmental colleague letters, loaded as a single file labeled "**05 Last Name Colleague Letters**."
- 6) The Panel Chair should load the signed Departmental Evaluation Panel letter as "**06 Last Name Dept Panel Letter Type of Review**" (e.g., "06 Garcia Dept Panel Letter Tenure Review").
- 7) The panel chair should complete the checklist and load it in this folder as "**07 Last Name Checklist**."

IX. Security/Access Guidelines for Online Packets

Access to folders will be assigned as follows (and is outlined in more detail in a table on the next page):

- The Office of the Provost and department chairs will have ownership access to their candidates' folders and will share responsibility for assigning security access.
- The candidate will have write/view access to the candidate's Departmental Public folder until the deadline for the submission of packets. At that time, candidate access will be changed to "view only" and access will be provided to all departmental faculty members who have no conflict of interest.
- The candidate will have write/view access to the candidate's Departmental Evaluation Panel folder until appointment/promotion letters, evaluations and past reviews, and course evaluation materials have been uploaded (by the candidate, chair or both). At that time, candidate access will be changed to "view only" and access will be provided to all members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel who are serving in the candidate's review.
- **The candidate will not be provided any access to the Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL folder.** All confidential materials (those not routinely provided to the candidate) will be uploaded to this folder by

the panel chair after the panel chair has confirmed that the candidate has no access. Departmental Evaluation Panel members serving in the candidate’s review will be given access to this folder and reminded of strict confidentiality requirements.

- The Office of the Provost will control write/view access for deans and higher levels of review, assigning this access at the departmental folder level (since Advisory Committee membership may vary from one candidate to another).

Access Schedule for Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

The following table outlines accesses for specified time periods in the tenure, promotion, and third-year review schedule. Please note that the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel and several Office of the Provost staff members will have full control over access throughout. This table is followed by instructions for each chair’s verification of folder accesses.

Folders / Time Periods	Departmental Public Folder (“Dept Public”)	Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder (“Dept Eval Panel”)	Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL Folder (“Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL”)	Dean’s Folder (“Dean”)
July - Sept 15	<p>Candidate has <i>Contribute</i> access.</p> <p>Will change Candidate access to <i>Read</i> access once the candidate has completed uploading documents.</p>	<p>Candidate has <i>Contribute</i> access.</p> <p>Will change Candidate access to <i>Read</i> access once the candidate has completed uploading documents.</p>	<p>Candidate <i>never</i> has access to this folder.</p> <p>Folder is empty.</p>	<p>Candidate <i>never</i> has access to this folder.</p> <p>Folder is empty.</p>
Sept 16 – Oct 1	Transitions in access	Transitions in access	Panel chair confirms that candidate has no access to this folder.	No changes.
Oct. 1 until completion of Departmental Evaluation Panel deliberations and finalization of panel letter	<p>Candidate now has <i>Read</i> access only.</p> <p>Departmental members group containing faculty with no conflicts of interest have <i>Read</i> access.</p> <p>Departmental Evaluation Panel with members serving in this review is populated into the group and have <i>Read</i> access.</p>	<p>Candidate now has <i>Read</i> access only.</p> <p>Departmental Evaluation Panel with members serving in this review is populated into the group and have <i>Read</i> access.</p>	<p>Panel chair uploads confidential documents to this folder.</p> <p>Departmental Evaluation Panel members serving in this review is populated into this group and now have <i>Read</i> access.</p>	

Folders / Time Periods	Departmental Public Folder ("Dept Public")	Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder ("Dept Eval Panel")	Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL Folder ("Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL")	Dean's Folder ("Dean")
Starting Nov. 1 with no preset end date [For third-year review: Starting on or before Jan. 15]	Dean has <i>Contribute</i> access.* (and will contribute only for manuscript status updates)	Dean has <i>Contribute</i> access.* (and will contribute only for requests for corrections of errors of fact in Departmental Evaluation Panel letter)	Dean has <i>Contribute</i> access.* (and will contribute only for requests for corrections of errors of fact in Departmental Evaluation Panel letter, if stored here)	Dean has <i>Contribute</i> access.*
Starting Dec. 1 with no preset end date [For third-year review: Starting on or before Feb. 1]	The appropriate Advisory Committee* group is populated and has <i>Read</i> access. Provost has <i>Read</i> access*	The appropriate Advisory Committee* group is populated and has <i>Read</i> access. Provost has <i>Read</i> access*	The appropriate Advisory Committee* group is populated and has <i>Read</i> access. Provost has <i>Read</i> access*	The appropriate Advisory Committee* group is populated and has <i>Read</i> access. Provost has <i>Read</i> access*

As indicated (by * above), the Provost, Dean, and Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review will have read access throughout the process but will not access packets until they have formally reached those reviewers according to the calendar set out above.

Instructions for Chair's Verification of Access to Folders⁷

Using the instructions provided below, we will rely on *Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs* to do three things:

- (A) Verify that access permissions to folders on the department's SharePoint site are established as expected.
- (B) Confirm that candidates' **folder-level permissions** are correctly established. This is critical to ensuring appropriate confidentiality.
- (C) Manage two or three SCHL-DEPT group memberships for their department by adding/removing people.

To do all three, please follow the directions here.

(A) Verify that access permissions to folders on the department's SharePoint site are established as expected.

1. Go to your department's site at <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/school/dept> where "school" is replaced with the acronym for the school and "dept" is the 4-letter acronym for the department or program.
2. On your department's site, click **Settings** , and click **Site settings**. If you don't see **Site settings**, click **Site information**, and then click **View all site settings**.

⁷ Please ensure that you are using the latest version of this document, as these access control directions were updated in May 2020.

3. On the **Site Settings** page, under **Users and Permissions**, click **Site Permission**. You will see a list of all the individuals and groups who have access to the site, as well as the level of permissions that they have.

(B) Review the unique permissions for all four folders (*a.k.a.* Document Libraries) on a candidate's subsite:

In SharePoint, permissions at the site level are propagated to lower level subsites or folders (document libraries) via *parental inheritance*, or alternatively, the parental inheritance may be broken to give each lower level object its own *unique permissions*. In building candidate subsites, the parental inheritance from the candidate subsite to the candidate's four folders (document libraries) is removed before the candidate is emailed their subsite URL, and each of the four folders is granted unique permissions. Chairs **must not** revert the permissions on a candidate's folders (document libraries) back to the parental inheritance. Please review the unique permissions outlined below and confirm that each candidate's document libraries have the correct groups and permission levels. (The next section discusses how to populate members into your department's *SharePoint Groups*.)

1. Go to your department's site.
2. Open your candidate's subsite.
3. Open the selected document library (*e.g.* "Dept Public") from quick launch menu (left-hand side).
4. Choose **Settings**  from the top menu (right-hand side) and then **Library settings**.
5. On the **Settings** page, under **Permissions and Management**, click "**Permissions for this document library.**"
6. Review the people and/or *SharePoint Groups* listed. Use their checkboxes to select one or more, and use the "Edit Permissions" and "Remove Permissions" options in the menu to make updates. (Alternatively, click "Check Permissions" and then search for a user or group by entering the name.)

Repeat steps #1 - 6 for each of the four Document Libraries on the candidate's subsite. Permissions should be set as follows:

Candidate folders' (document libraries') unique permission settings:

"Dept Public" folder

Access to each tenure and promotion candidate's Dept - Public folder should include:

- 1 T&P Provost – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Advisory Committee Chair – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Contributors – *contribute* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Designers – *design* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Hierarchy Managers – *manage hierarchy* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Owners – *full control* (always)
- Advisory Committee SCHL-DEPT – *Read* access (always)
- SCHL Dean – *Contribute* access (always)
- SCHL-DEPT Chair (DEPT Site Designer) – *Design* access (always)

And the following unique permissions:

- **Candidate** – *Contribute* access (changes to *Read* after Sept 15)
- **SCHL-DEPT Department Members** – *Read* access
- One of the following **SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel...** groups – *Read* access

- SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Non-Professor Reviews (for third-year, tenure, and instructor/senior instructor reviews) **OR**
- SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Professor Reviews (only for promotion to professor reviews)

“Dept Eval Panel” folder

Access to each tenure and promotion candidate’s Dept Eval Panel folder should include*:

- 1 T&P Provost – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Advisory Committee Chair – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Contributors – *contribute* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Designers – *design* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Hierarchy Managers – *manage hierarchy* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Owners – *full control* (always)
- Advisory Committee SCHL-DEPT – *Read* access (always)
- SCHL Dean – *Contribute* access (always)
- SCHL-DEPT Chair (DEPT Site Designer) – *Design* access (always)

And the following unique permissions:

- **Candidate** – *Contribute* access (changes to *Read* after Sept 15)
- SCHL-DEPT Department Members – *no* access
- One of the following SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel... groups – *Read* access
 - SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Non-Professor Reviews (for third-year, tenure, and instructor/senior instructor reviews) **OR**
 - SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Professor Reviews (only for promotion to professor reviews)

“Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL” folder

Access to each tenure and promotion candidate’s Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL folder should include*:

- 1 T&P Provost – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Advisory Committee Chair – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Contributors – *contribute* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Designers – *design* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Hierarchy Managers – *manage hierarchy* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Owners – *full control* (always)
- Advisory Committee SCHL-DEPT – *Read* access (always)
- SCHL Dean – *Contribute* access (always)
- SCHL-DEPT Chair (DEPT Site Designer) – *Design* access (always)

And the following unique permissions:

- **Candidate** – *no access*
- SCHL-DEPT Department Members – *no access*
- One of the following SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel... groups – *Read* access
 - SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Non-Professor Reviews (for third-year, tenure, and Instructor/Senior Instructor reviews) **OR**
 - SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Professor Reviews (only for promotion to Professor reviews)

“DEAN” folder

Access to each tenure and promotion candidate’s Dean folder should include:

- 1 T&P Provost – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Advisory Committee Chair – *read* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Contributors – *contribute* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Designers – *design* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Hierarchy Managers – *manage hierarchy* (always)
- 1 T&P Site Owners – *full control* (always)
- Advisory Committee SCHL-DEPT – *Read access* (always)
- SCHL Dean – *Contribute access* (always)
- SCHL-DEPT Chair (DEPT Site Designer) – *Design access* (always)

And the following unique permissions:

- Candidate – *no access*
- SCHL-DEPT Department Members – *no access*
- SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel... groups – *no access*

Important Notes:

- ☑ Please ensure that the candidates themselves do not have access to their “Dept Eval Panel CONFIDENTIAL” folder or the “Dean” folder.
- ☑ Please be attentive to appropriately limiting the permissions of regular Departmental Evaluation Panel members who have a conflict of interest (either because they are undergoing a like review or because of a familial relationship).
- ☑ Access to each third-year review candidate’s folders should be as above, except that the Advisory Committee SCHL-DEPT access is not necessary. If a third-year review case is sent to the Advisory Committee, access for the committee will be established at that time.
- ☑ **TIP:** Chairs and site owners can add “/_layouts/15/user.aspx” to the end of any dept or candidate’s subsite URL to go directly to the Permission Settings

**Members of the Office of the Provost have access via 1 T&P Site Owners to each subsite and all document libraries for overall site administration and to ensure that our access is robust for potential troubleshooting.*

(C) Manage the membership of your SCHL-DEPT SharePoint Groups

Reviewers’ access to candidates’ online packets is managed mostly via a person’s membership in a *SharePoint Group*. Chairs must manage the membership of the following *SharePoint Groups*:

- **SCHL-DEPT Department Public Members** group should contain all permanent faculty in the department who are not tenured and who do not have a conflict of interest.
- **SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Non-Professor Reviews** group should include all members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, except those undergoing the same review as other candidates, those with a familial relationship with a candidate, and those who have any other conflict of interest.
- **SCHL-DEPT Department Evaluation Panel for Professor Reviews** group, when it is being used, should include all members of the *Departmental Evaluation Panel for Non-Professor Reviews* except those who are undergoing reviews for promotion to Professor.

Beyond these distinctions, if your department has tenured faculty who should be on some cases but not others, we can help you set up two Department Evaluation Panel groups in SharePoint using a standard naming convention that we have established for such cases.

To manage your site's *People and Groups*:

1. On your department's site, click **Settings** , and click **Site settings**. If you don't see **Site settings**, click **Site Information**, and then click **View all site settings**.
2. On the **Site Settings** page, under **Users and Permissions**, click "**People and Groups**." (Alternatively go directly to https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/_layouts/15/groups.aspx).
3. On the **People and Groups** page, in the Quick Launch (left-hand menu), click the name of the group that you want to view or edit. (Or, if you don't see the group that you need to edit, first select "More..." to see an expanded list of all of your groups and then click the name of the group that you want to view or edit.)
4. Review the displayed list of the group members and edit the group as needed.
 - To add a member, Select **New** and **Add Users**. Enter the users and click **Share**. (By default, an email invitation is sent to the newly added user. Click "Show Options" to uncheck this option.)
 - To remove a member, select the check boxes next to the users who you want to remove, click **Actions**, and then click **Remove Users from Group**. In the confirmation window, click **Ok**.

X. Packet Checklist

Candidate's Name: _____

NOTE: *Departmental Evaluation Panel chairs should complete this checklist throughout the review process; then sign and upload it as directed. Candidates may also use this checklist when preparing or finalizing their packet.*

Additional documentation may not be added by the candidate to their packet after the Departmental Evaluation Panel has concluded its deliberations, and generally, no information may be added by the candidate after November 1 (or January 15 for Third-Year Reviews). The only exceptions are outlined in the joint memo. Each item on this checklist should be entered as a single PDF unless it exceeds 50MB and must be split into multiple PDFs. Items should be labeled and numbered as indicated in the joint memo. Numbers are included below for convenience.

Candidate's Departmental Public Folder

- 01 - CV
- 02 - Course list
- 03 - Narrative
- 03 - Pandemic impact statement (*optional*)
- 05 - Course 1 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- 06 - Course 2 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- 07 - Course 3 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- 08 - Sample Publication or Creative Activity 1 to include:
 - the work itself (or a statement that it is being submitted in hard copy),
 - all evidence of peer review / publication quality, and
 - if co-authored, an explanation of the author's contribution
- 09 - Sample Publication or Creative Activity 2 to include:
 - the work itself (or a statement that it is being submitted in hard copy),
 - all evidence of peer review / publication quality, and
 - if co-authored, an explanation of the author's contribution
- 10 - Sample Publication or Creative Activity 3 to include:
 - The work itself (or a statement that it is being submitted in hard copy),
 - All evidence of peer review / publication quality, and
 - If co-authored, an explanation of the author's contribution
- 11 - List of service activities with brief explanation of duties involved in each (*optional list for information not included in CV or narrative*)
- 12 - List of materials being submitted in hard copy (*if applicable*)
- DeptPublic Supplementary Folder (*containing items outlined in the Joint Memo*)
 - Single file containing a representative syllabus from each course taught
 - Any additional publications referenced elsewhere in packet
 - Any additional manuscripts referenced elsewhere in packet

Candidate's Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder

- 01 - Letter of appointment or letter of last promotion and, if applicable, documentation of any extension of probationary period
- 02 - All Annual Evaluations for the evaluation period in chronological order
- 03 - Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter from third-year review (*for cases of tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to senior instructor*)
- 04 - Course-Instructor Evaluation reports, including:
 - Summary tables produced by Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management,

- Blue® generated summary sheets for each section taught during the evaluation period
- 05 - Teaching Observations provided to the candidate (*optional*)
- Dept Eval Panel Supplementary Folder

Access Management

Please advised of the following access management dates:

June – Sept 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Candidate has access (“Contribute”) to their Departmental Public and Departmental Evaluation Panel folders.
Sept 16 – Oct 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chair confirms that candidate access their Departmental Public folder is “Read only” and that candidate no longer has any access to Departmental Evaluation Panel folder.
Oct. 1 (approx)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access (“Read only”) to candidate’s Department Public folder granted to all faculty members with no conflict of interest. ▪ Appropriate Departmental Evaluation Panel access (“Read” only) granted to Departmental Evaluation Panel and folder.

Candidate’s Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL folder

The chair should upload the following to the candidate’s Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL folder only **after confirming that the candidate has no access to this folder.**

- 01 - Extra-departmental colleague letters addressing service (*optional at third-year review*)
- 02 - Peer reviews of classroom performance not normally provided to the candidate (*optional*)
- 03 - Recent graduate surveys (*optional at third-year review*), to include:
 - Statement regarding recent graduate surveys, as outlined above (*required if recent graduate Surveys are solicited*),
 - Description of method of solicitation and/or copy of letter of solicitation, and
 - Actual responses from recent graduates
- 04 - External Reviews of Research (*optional*). If an optional external review of research is conducted, then the following is required, followed by the actual letters:
 - Description of process by which outside reviewers were selected and letters/reviews were obtained,
 - Copy of letter of solicitation to external reviewers, and
 - Brief summary of pertinent credentials of each external reviewer
- 05 - Colleague letters (from all tenured members of the department who have no conflict of interest)
- 06 - Departmental Evaluation Panel letter, signed by all panel members and the candidate
- 07 - Chair’s checklist

General

- All documents are in PDF format and are of good quality for viewing
- Items are in the correct sections and labeled and ordered as requested
- Hard copy materials have been forwarded

Access Updates and Notifications

- Confirm that all departmental and panel access has been removed once Departmental Evaluation Panel deliberations have concluded.
- Panel chair notifies dean and Office of the Provost that the packet is formally leaving the department for the dean’s office and ensures that dean has access.
- Panel chair signs and loads this updated checklist in “07 - Chair’s checklist” as outlined above.

Signature of Departmental Evaluation Panel chair

Date