



COLLEGE of  
CHARLESTON

# Tenure and Promotion Reviews of Instructional Faculty



## Expectations and Processes

May - June 2023

# Disclaimer

- These slides are updated each year
- They aim to provide just the highlights regarding performance expectations and the review process.
- If there is any inconsistency between this slide deck and the *Faculty/Administration Manual* or departmental criteria, the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and the departmental criteria shall prevail.

# Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

- Marvin Gonzalez\*, Associate Professor, Supply Chain and Information Management
- Phyllis Jestice, Professor, History
- Christy Kollath-Cattano\* (chair), Associate Professor, Health and Human Performance
- Kelley Mayer White, Professor, Teacher Education
- TBD

\*Continuing from 2022-2023 service as regular or alternate committee member

# Alternates

- Calvin Blackwell, Professor, Economics
- Jennifer Fox, Associate Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Sarah Hatteberg, Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology
- Jenifer Kopfman, Associate Professor, Communication
- Lauren Ravalico, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies



# The *Faculty/Administration Manual* is the definitive source on performance expectations and process

- Available at: <https://academicaffairs.cofc.edu/fam.pdf>
- See Part VI, sections A-D, of the *Manual*.
- Your department or program may have additional criteria approved by your dean and the provost.

## Other Essential Documents

- These slides from Spring candidate sessions, reflecting the *Manual* while highlighting performance expectations and outlining the review process
- Joint Memo, issued annually by the Provost and the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, containing:
  - Process Calendar
  - Detailed packet guidelines
  - Information regarding electronic sites
  - Packet Checklist
  - Pandemic measures

# Continuing items for 2023-2024

- Pandemic-based tenure and Senior Instructor clock modifications are continuing – deadline is July 31, 2023
- All our other pandemic measures are continuing. Please see Joint Memo.

# Continuing items for 2023-2024

These were new in 2021-2022

- Regarding research, we provided greater clarity on what “research done during review period” means
- New guidance to panel chairs regarding the solicitation of external reviews of research
- Greater flexibility and clarity on how candidates may present certain evidence as professional development or service.



# Continuing for 2023-2024

These were new in 2022-2023

- Candidates are asked to clearly mark on your CV all scholarly or creative outcomes you're presenting as evidence for this review period.
- Joint Memo now explicitly says that teaching narrative may include "information addressing how the candidate engages students in the learning process."
- Joint Memo explicitly notes that candidates "may also include manuscripts not yet submitted if they wish to demonstrate work in progress that is addressed in the narrative."
- We removed language in Joint Memo that indicated a simple list of service assignments was sufficient.

# Review Process

- List of candidates is finalized (Aug. 15)
- Process begins when candidate submits packet by announced deadline (Sept. 15)
- Review by Departmental Evaluation Panel
- Review by Dean
- Review by the Advisory Committee (third-year review cases will be reviewed only when required or requested)
- Review by Provost
- Review and final decision by the President

## Online Packets

- Candidates are required to use online packets.
- Exceptions require the Provost's approval.
- Exception requests will be considered only in cases where the nature of the bulk of the candidate's work does not allow for good presentation online.

# General Considerations

- All evaluations will involve a rigorous review of the quality of the candidate's work.
- The review does not simply consist of demonstrating that some minimum threshold has been met.
- Work in all three competency areas must be of sufficient quality: Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development (or Professional Growth and Development, for instructors), and Service.

# General Considerations – Library Faculty

- All evaluations will involve a rigorous review of the quality of the candidate's work.
- The review does not simply consist of demonstrating that some minimum threshold has been met.
- Work in all three competency areas must be of sufficient quality: Professional Competence, Research and Professional Development, and Service.



# Candidate Responsibilities

Preparation of a packet of materials demonstrating how and to what extent the standards have been met in the three competency areas:

- Teaching
- Research and Professional Development (or Professional Growth and Development, for instructors)
- Service

# Candidate Responsibilities – Library Faculty

Preparation of a packet of materials demonstrating how and to what extent the standards have been met in the three competency areas:

- Professional Competence
- Professional Growth and Development
- Service

# Candidate Responsibilities

- The burden rests with the candidate to demonstrate with the packet that she or he is in full and complete compliance with the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion, retention, or third-year retention.
- Careful preparation of a packet - including the narrative and appropriately selected supporting evidence - is critical in demonstrating that the standards and criteria have been met.

Questions about process or these general guidelines?

# Expectations for Each Level of Review (as articulated in the *Manual*)



# Third-Year Review

- Substantiates whether satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Senior Instructor has been made.
- For tenure-track faculty, must show evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service.
- Points out any weaknesses that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure or promotion decision.

Note: A positive third-year review does not determine a positive tenure decision

# Third-Year Review – for Library Faculty

- Substantiates whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made.
- Simultaneous review for promotion to Librarian II
- Must show evidence of effective professional competency, a continuing research and development program, and active participation in service.
- Points out any weaknesses that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision.

Note: A positive third-year review does not determine a positive tenure decision

# Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- Normally during the sixth year at the College.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early tenure and promotion review (and such requests must be approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost).
- Requires substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service.
  - In addition, one of the three areas must be rated exemplary **OR** the candidate must demonstrate significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research & professional development.

# Tenure – for Librarians

- Normally during the sixth year at the College.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early tenure and promotion review (and such requests must be approved by the Dean and Provost).
- Requires evidence of exemplary professional competency, a sustained quality research program and continuing scholarly commitment, and service to the community.

# Promotion to and Renewal as Senior Instructor

Promotion to (and renewal as) Senior Instructor requires:

- sustained effectiveness in teaching\*;
- clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy;
- active and sustained participation in service; and
- ...

\*revised, effective 2023-2024



# Promotion to Senior Instructor

New for 2023-2024

Promotion to Senior Instructor also requires evidence of:

- Exemplary performance in teaching; or
- Performance at the level of significant achievement in teaching and professional development.

# Renewal as Senior Instructor

New for 2023-2024

Renewal as Senior Instructor also requires evidence of:

- Exemplary performance in teaching; or
- Performance at the level of significant achievement in teaching and professional development; or
- Performance at the level of significant achievement in teaching and professional service.

# Promotion to Professor

- Eligible for review for promotion to Professor in seventh year as Associate Professor at the College.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early promotion (and such requests must be approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost).
- Requires substantial evidence of continuing high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service.
  - In addition, one of the three areas must be rated exemplary **OR** candidate must demonstrate significant achievement all three areas.

# Promotion to Librarian III or IV

- Six years in rank is normally required for a Librarian II to be promoted to Librarian III. Evidence of exemplary professional competency and significant achievement in the area of professional growth and development or service is required.
- Seven years in rank is normally required for a Librarian III to be promoted to a Librarian IV. Evidence of exemplary performance in the area of professional competence and significant achievement in the areas of professional growth and development and service is required.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early promotion (and such requests must be approved by the Dean and Provost).

# Questions about Expectations?



# PACKET\*:

## Items Supplied by Candidate

### General Items

- Curriculum Vitae;
- List of all courses taught during evaluation period;
- Latest faculty appointment letter or promotion letter (*as applicable*);
- Tenure clock modification letter (*only if applicable*);
- Annual Evaluations;
- Departmental Evaluation Panel letter from Third-Year Review (*only for reviews for tenure, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Senior Instructor*);
- Narrative (10 pages maximum);
- Pandemic impact statement (optional) – up to 1 page (or the equivalent)

Questions about these packet items?

# Teaching Effectiveness Standard

## (new language for 2023-2024 *Manual*)

Effective teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty, as well as the hallmark of the institution, and reflects three broad elements: a student-focused approach, appropriate disciplinary or interdisciplinary content, and reflective practices. It fosters intellectual curiosity and motivation, promotes inclusivity, encourages deep learning, and nurtures active listening, all of which promote lifelong learning. As teachers and academic advisors, faculty members are expected to meet the needs of diverse learners by designing courses with transparent expectations and in a format that is accessible and easily navigated by all types of students. Students should be exposed to current and past developments in the field if appropriate, be taught to access and analyze relevant disciplinary information, and be provided opportunities to prepare for subsequent courses in the curriculum. Instructors should engage peer and student feedback and the scholarship of teaching and learning in their disciplines, regularly reflecting on and evaluating current practices and implementing alternative approaches in response.

# Teaching Effectiveness Standard

(old language from 2021-2022 *Manual*)

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate and/or graduate work. Course materials should be well-conceived, well-organized and well-written. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. A teacher should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

# Teaching Effectiveness Standard

(principles for three-year transition period)

- In 2023-2024, 2024-2025, and 2025-2026 reviews, candidates may choose to address either standard.
- Candidates undergoing third-year review during this three-year transition period are advised to address the new standard, but are not required to do so.
- Starting with 2026-2027 reviews, candidates will be expected to follow the new standard.

# Teaching Effectiveness Standard

(new language for 2023-2024 *Manual*)

- Note that there may be some modest changes in packet guidance based on this new standard for teaching effectiveness.
- If so, those will be clearly articulated in the 2023-2024 Joint Memo.



# Teaching Expectations (as articulated in *Manual*)

- Effective teaching is the primary means by which faculty achieve tenure, promotion, and successful third-year review at the College of Charleston.
  - Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires “sustained effectiveness in teaching.”
  - Promotion to Professor requires “sustained high quality and effective teaching.”
  - Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “sustained effectiveness in teaching” and exemplary performance in teaching or ... (Note: *The new language outlined above is effective with 2023-2024 reviews*)

## Teaching – Advice to Candidates

- Use your narrative to demonstrate the quality of your teaching
- Consider addressing how you teach, explaining why you choose specific approaches, and reporting on the effectiveness of your approaches
- You may address how you engage students in learning
- Use your narrative to help reviewers at each level orient themselves in your evidence
- Be attentive to questions that your evidence may raise

# Packet Items to be Provided by Candidate

- Sample syllabi from 3 representative courses;
- Selected representative sample of teaching materials ~ assignments, exams, handouts ~ from the same 3 courses;
- Samples of graded student work from the same 3 courses (*optional*);
- Multi-term summary Course-Instructor Evaluation reports for each course taught during the evaluation period and for all courses aggregated, including comparisons of the candidate's averages to departmental averages (these reports are requested by the candidate via [irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request](http://irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request));
- Summary sheets from Course-Instructor Evaluation reports for each section taught by the candidate during the evaluation period (from Course-Instructor Evaluation software, Blue, accessible from home page in OAKS);
- Non-confidential reports of classroom observations (*optional*).

# Multi-Term Summary Course-Instructor Evaluation Reports (from Institutional Research)

These should include a table for each course taught during the review period and a table that aggregates data across all courses for the review period. Candidates should request these tables from Institutional Research online via “Submit a Request.” Please see annual Joint Memo for URL.

College of Charleston  
Term Means Summary Report of Course Evaluation Data  
All Fall/Spring Courses Evaluated between Spring 2015  
Instructor: Comparison Department

crslst=

		Term		Candidate Avg - This Course	Candidate Median - This Course	Candidate Standard Deviation - This Course	Dept Avg / All Courses
		Spring 2013					
		Section					
Organization	Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.99
	Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.07
Assignments	Assignments, tests and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.09
	Required readings/texts were valuable.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.85
Grading	Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.07
	Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.93
Learning	I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating.	4.50	4.00	4.17	5.00	1.60	4.08
	I have developed my skills and knowledge.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.99
	Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.98
	This course increased my interest in the subject.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.99
Instructor	The instructor showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.35
	The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of students.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.17
	The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.10
Overall	Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.03
	Overall, this is a good course.	4.50	4.00	4.17	5.00	1.60	3.90

# Summary Sheets from Course-Instructor Evaluation Reports for Each Section Taught (from Blue)

First-Year Seminar for ( )

College of Charleston Course-Instructor Evaluations

Raters	Section
Responded	
Invited	
Response Ratio	-%

## Summary

Question	Section			Department			Overall		
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Course materials were well-prepared and carefully explained.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.3	4.0	0.9	4.2	5.0	1.0
Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	4.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	1.0
Assignments, tests, and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course.	4.6	5.0	0.9	4.2	4.0	1.0	4.4	5.0	0.9
Required readings/texts were valuable.	4.4	5.0	0.9	4.0	4.0	1.1	4.1	4.0	1.0
Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	5.0	1.1	4.3	5.0	0.9
Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.	5.0	5.0	0.0	4.2	5.0	1.0	4.2	4.0	1.0
I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating.	4.8	5.0	0.4	3.9	4.0	1.2	4.2	4.0	1.0
I have developed my skills and knowledge.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.1	4.0	1.1	4.2	4.0	1.0
Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.	5.0	5.0	0.0	4.4	5.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	1.0
This course increased my interest in the subject.	4.2	4.0	0.8	3.8	4.0	1.2	3.9	4.0	1.2
The instructor showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.7	5.0	0.6	4.6	5.0	0.7
The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of the students.	4.6	5.0	0.9	4.5	5.0	0.8	4.4	5.0	0.9
The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.5	5.0	0.8	4.4	5.0	0.9
Overall this instructor is an effective teacher.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	5.0	1.0	4.3	5.0	1.0
Overall, this is a good course.	4.8	5.0	0.5	4.0	4.0	1.2	4.2	4.0	1.0

Questions about teaching expectations or  
required packet items addressing teaching?



# Professional Competency Expectations for Librarians (as articulated in *Manual*)

- The successful librarian contributes to the education mission and priorities of the College and the Library by providing and promoting quality services and operations to the academic community. Professional competency includes a mastery of requisite professional skills and knowledge within each librarian's specific job description. Professional competency for librarians is the achievement of and commitment to intellectual freedom, accessibility of information, and supporting the curricular and research efforts of the academic community.

Questions about librarians' professional competency expectations or associated required packet items?

# Research and Professional Development Expectations (as articulated in *Manual*)

A record of consistent productivity is an indicator of promise for continued high quality scholarship and professional activity.

- 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.”
- Promotion to Senior Instructor (or retention as Sr. Instructor) requires “clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.”

# Professional Growth and Development Expectations for Librarians (as articulated in *Manual*)

Librarians are expected to conduct research or engage in other creative forms of professional growth and development. Professional growth and development involves the various professional activities that increase the librarian's knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise.

# Research and Professional Development Expectations for Tenure and Promotion in Professorial Ranks (as articulated in *Manual*)

Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality. The evidence [for professorial ranks] must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts).

# Research and Professional Development – Advice to Candidates

- Clearly mark which scholarly or creative outcomes (e.g. refereed articles, juried exhibitions, performances, etc.) are being presented as evidence of having met the expectations.
- Use the narrative to describe your evidence and connect it to your CV.
- Be attentive to quality as well as quantity.
- Provide the requested evidence, as outlined in Joint Memo and on the following slides.
- For work that was not fully produced during your review period, clearly indicate what was done during the review period.



# PACKET\*:

## Evidence to be Provided by Candidate

(for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor)

- 3 sample publications to be included in primary area of packet;
- For co-authored publications, candidate should clearly articulate their contribution;
- For each publication, provide evidence of the nature of any peer refereeing or other review for publication;
- Provide evidence about the quality of each journal or press.

# PACKET\*:

## Evidence to be Provided by the Candidate

### Professional Development (for Senior Instructors)

- Participation in workshops, conferences, etc.;
- Production of scholarly or creative works that are pedagogical in nature (or that otherwise inform the candidate's teaching);
- Chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
- Serving as an officer or board member of a professional organization.

Questions about research and professional  
development expectations or required  
packet items?

# Service

- Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires “active and sustained participation in service to the College or active and sustained service in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.”
- Promotion to the rank of Professor requires “active and sustained service to the College. **Leadership** should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.”
- Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “active and sustained participation in service to the College.”
- Promotion to Librarian IV requires **leadership** in active and sustained service to the College or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.

## Service – Advice to Candidates

- Use your narrative and your CV to clearly indicate your service contributions.
- Be attentive to articulating your notable contributions through your narrative or via briefly annotated entries on your CV.
- For instance, you are encouraged to provide a clear descriptive account of the service or your specific contributions.

Questions about service expectations or  
required packet items?



## Required & Optional Supplementary Materials

- Sample syllabi for all other courses taught during review period;
- Additional selected representative course materials, organized by course;
- Additional publications or creative works, including documentation of review;
- Manuscripts addressed in your narrative;
- Externally funded grant proposals;
- Written comments from Course-Instructor Evaluations (if only selected comments are included, the selection process should be explained; the objectivity of selection has recently been the subject of discussion by the Advisory Committee)

Questions about required and optional  
supplementary materials?

# Notes on Additional Documentation

- Additional documentation generally may not be added to the candidate's packet after the departmental panel has completed its deliberations and, in no case, after the deadline for forwarding packets to the dean.
- The only exceptions are:
  - To allow for updates on the status of manuscripts that were both included in the packet and submitted for publication review prior to packet submission.
  - At the dean's level and above, requests for information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
  - Requests for correction of errors of fact in Panel letter, Dean's letter, or Advisory Committee's letter.

# Requests for Correction of Factual Errors

- If the written letter provided to the candidate by the Panel, Dean, or Advisory Committee contains an error of fact, the panel chair, Dean, or committee chair may correct this error through an addendum to the original letter (with notice to the candidate).
- **OR** the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation.
- The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.

Questions?

## Panel Chair Responsibilities - Summary

- Solicit and collect Recent Graduate Surveys (undergraduate and graduate) for tenure, promotion, and Senior Instructor renewal reviews;
- Arrange for an appropriate external member to serve on *all* of the department's panels according to the protocol in the *FAM*;
- Arrange for optional External Review of research according to the *FAM*;
- Solicit extra-departmental colleague letters (required regarding service for tenure and promotion reviews);
- Collect colleague letters;
- Conduct the interview of the candidate with the Panel;
- Draft and finalize the Department Evaluation Panel letter;
- Provide candidate with a copy of the Departmental Evaluation Panel letter (*All* candidates must sign panel letter); and
- Provide requests for correction of errors of fact in panel letter submitted by candidate or panel chair.



# Panel Chair Responsibilities - Recent Graduate Surveys

- By August 1, a minimum of 40 surveys should be sent out. As of 2014-2015, panels must endeavor to receive at least 20 responses from recent graduates.
- 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.
- Recent graduate surveys are optional in third-year reviews.
- These surveys should be administered electronically.\*
- All departments must use the uniform demographic form, available in Qualtrics, along with questions that solicit feedback on the candidate’s performance.

\* Effective with 2020-2021 reviews.

# Panel Chair Responsibilities - Recent Graduate Surveys

- Recent graduate responses should be provided in both summary form and as individual responses, rather than being provided only as a collection of individual responses.\*
- Panel chairs should include (in the Confidential Materials portion of the candidate's packet) an explanation of how Recent Graduate Opinions were collected.
- Panel Chairs should also include a list of graduates contacted, identifying any that were added to the list by the candidate.

\* Effective with 2021-2022 reviews.

# Panel Chair Responsibilities - Optional External Reviews of Research

- The *Manual* outlines the procedure to follow for soliciting external reviews of research.
- Reviewers must be asked to identify their relationship (if any) to the candidate.
- The panel chair should describe in the panel portion of the packet how the external reviewers were chosen.
- The panel chair should provide the letter used to solicit the reviews.
- Panels should avoid using close collaborators or thesis advisors of the candidate as external reviewers.

Questions?

# PACKET\*:

## Items Supplied by Panel Chair

### Confidential Portion of Electronic Packet

- Recent Graduate Surveys – both summary data and individual responses (*optional for third-year review*);
- Peer Reviews of Classroom Performance (*optional*);
- Explanation of how Graduate Surveys were solicited (*these surveys are optional for third-year review*);
- Extra-departmental Colleague Letters addressing the candidate's performance in the area of Service (*optional for third-year reviews*).

# PACKET\*:

## Items Supplied by Panel Chair (continued)

### Confidential Portion of Packet (continued)

- External Reviews of Research (*optional*);  
To be accompanied by explanation of how external reviews of research were solicited, including:
  - the creation of panel and candidate lists of potential reviewers,
  - specific process for selecting reviewers from those two lists,
  - copies of the solicitation letters, and
  - reviewers' credentials.



# Panel Responsibilities - Colleague Letters

Chairs should advise Departmental Evaluation Panel members that:

- Letters written by individual panel members should be evaluative;
- Letters should explain how and to what extent the criteria have been met;
- Colleague letters should be written after studying the packet and before formal departmental deliberations take place;
- A separate colleague letter by the department chair is optional (though welcome);
- Colleague letters by untenured faculty members are optional.

# Panel Responsibilities - Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter

The Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter should:

- Summarize all the panel discussion, positive and negative;
- Address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criteria in each competency area, paying attention to the specific criteria for each rank; e.g. the criterion of leadership in service for promotion to Professor;
- Discuss how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of exemplary performance in at least one specified competency area, or significant achievement in both Teaching and Research (for tenure), or in all three areas (for promotion to Professor);
- Include a thorough assessment of the quality of a candidate's refereed or juried works;
- Include an assessment of the quality of a candidate's invited publications or creative works;
- Include discussion of external (to the College) evaluations of scholarly work, when solicited.

Questions?

# Dean's Role

- Conducts independent evaluation of the candidate.
- May request additional factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
- Interviews third-year review candidates and may choose to interview other candidates.
- Provides the candidate and the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost.
- Provides correction of errors of fact in Dean's letter (by candidate or Dean).

# Advisory Committee's Role

- Makes an independent assessment of the candidate's record.
- Reviews all evidence and all prior level recommendations.
- May request additional factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
- Makes a written recommendation to the President with copy to candidate.
- Provides corrections of errors of fact in Advisory Committee's letter submitted by the candidate.

# Recommendation of the Provost

- When the Provost's recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide the candidate a copy of his/her recommendation to the President.
- Without exception, and in the spirit of creating greater transparency in the tenure and promotion process, since 2014-2015, each candidate has received a copy of the Provost's recommendation to the President.



# Calendar

- By **August 15**: List of candidates undergoing major review is finalized
- By **September 15**: Candidates' packets are due.
- By **November 1**: Panel deliberations *for tenure and promotion candidates* are finished, panel letters are signed and packets are made available to the Dean.
- By **December 1**: Deans complete their reviews and letters *for tenure and promotion candidates* and make packets available to Provost.
- By **January 15**: Panel deliberations *for third-year review cases* are finished, panel letters are signed and packets are made available to the Dean.
- By **February 1**: Deans complete their reviews and letters *for third-year review cases* and make packets available to Provost.
- By **February 25**: Advisory Committee gives recommendations to the Provost and the President.

Questions?