



MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Candidates for Tenure, Promotion, Senior Instructor Renewal, or Third-Year Review in 2017-2018
Department Chairs and Departmental Evaluation Panel Chairs
Deans

FROM: Brian McGee, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Vijay Vulava, Chair, 2017-2018 Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review

DATE: July 13, 2017

SUBJECT: Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Evaluation 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](#)
- 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](#)

COLLEGE of CHARLESTON

2017-2018 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.
April	Meeting held with potential candidates, panel and/or department chairs, and deans.
Aug 15*	Chairs confirm list of candidates for tenure, promotion, third-year, 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 departments) and extra-departmental colleague letters.
Sept 15**	Candidates complete packets.**
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 FAM and the joint memo from the Provost and Advisory Committee.
Nov 1*	Evaluation Panel Chairs present 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 his/her 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. Office of the Provost ensures that 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 FAM and the joint memo from the Provost and Advisory Committee.
Jan 15*	Evaluation panel chairs present 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 FAM, the Advisory Committee will also consider third-year review cases.
Feb 25	The Advisory Committee makes its tenure and promotion recommendations and third-year evaluation 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 evaluation recommendations to the President. All pertinent evaluation materials are sent to the President.
March 15	The Provost notifies each candidate in writing of his/her recommendation.
March 15*	President informs each candidate of the final presidential decision. Or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendation

**The candidate packet deadline has been moved to Friday, September 22 for the 2017-18 review year due to Hurricane Irma.

* Dates marked with an asterisk are required deadlines as delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual.

Note: 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.
- B. As the *FAM* states, the criteria specified are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and promotion to or renewal as Senior Instructor. All candidates must meet these minimum criteria. However, even if these criteria are met, a negative tenure, promotion, or retention decision is still possible. Accordingly, candidates should be prepared to demonstrate more than the ability simply to meet the minimum criteria outlined in the *FAM*.
- C. As indicated in the *FAM*, departments and schools may develop additional criteria. These require review and approval by the appropriate academic dean and the Provost's Office. 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.
- D. 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 the establishment of 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."
- E. Generally, additional documentation may not be added to the candidate's packet after the departmental panel has completed its deliberations and, in no case, after November 1 (or January 15 for third-year reviews). The only exceptions are to allow for updates to be added to the packet regarding the status of manuscripts that were both included in the packet and submitted for publication review prior to the packet submission deadline; opportunities at the dean's level and above to request information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation; and opportunities for correction of errors of fact at certain levels of review. See the *Faculty/Administration Manual* for details.

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 they are not required, as information that results from classroom visitations by colleagues is helpful.
 - 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, Planning, and Information Management (hereafter, "IRPIM") 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 IRPIM 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 the packet that she or he is in full and complete compliance with the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion, renewal, or third-year evaluation. 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 VII.
- 3) Deliberative Phase
- a) Interview with departmental evaluation panel. 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.
 - 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.

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 panel members about extra-departmental letters.
 - c) Consult with candidate and 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.

¹ To be conducted in accordance with the FAM guidelines regarding external review of research (VI.A.2.b.2.ii).

- 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.
- e) Consult with candidate and 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.

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. 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, Planning, and Information Management will provide all of the necessary information for soliciting Recent Graduate Surveys. (Requests should be submitted by the panel chair via <http://irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request> under Faculty Tenure and Promotion Report Requests.) IRPIM'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 these by early August, whenever possible. Given that IRPIM will be collecting them to run in batches, please understand that requests 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 Academic Affairs must be included along with each department's own Recent Graduate Survey form. This form will be provided with the recent graduates list from IRPIM and has also 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 (regardless of whether solicitation is electronic or via paper).

The panel chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than forty 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 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 panel chair must follow the protocol outlined below.

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) now 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 which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field.

- 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 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. 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.)

- 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 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.
- b) The Departmental Evaluation Panel should 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 should 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 should conduct all necessary vote(s) via secret ballot.
- h) The Panel Chair should draft and take responsibility for finalizing and submitting the Departmental Evaluation Panel letter. Panelists should have 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 of the discussion that takes place in the departmental 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 three competency areas: teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, 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 professional competency areas 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 professional competency areas or significant achievement in all three areas. Deans should ensure that the panel letter adequately addresses these specific issues.

The copy of the letter included in the packet should be signed by the 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 panel;
 - Explicit indication of either: the area(s) in which the candidate demonstrates exemplary performance or that the candidate demonstrates significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development (for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) or significant achievement in all three areas (for promotion to Professor).
- 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.

Just as with Departmental Evaluation Panel letters, whenever possible, the Dean's letter should include an explicit indication of either: the area(s) in which the candidate demonstrates exemplary performance or that the candidate demonstrates significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development (for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) or significant achievement in all three areas (for promotion to Professor) The Dean's letter should also acknowledge any interview with the candidate.

The Dean shall provide 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, which should also be uploaded to the candidate's Dean's Confidential folder (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 reappointment, 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 his/her 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

Packet Preparation: It is the candidate's responsibility to explicitly 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 evaluation. 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.

To access the SharePoint site built for the creation and review of these packets, candidates and reviewers may go to the following sites:

SharePoint Sites by Department:

Reviewers may access the department's site at <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/DEPT/default.aspx>, where **DEPT** is replaced with the four-letter acronym for your department.

SharePoint Sites by Candidate:

Candidates may access their folders directly by going to their applicable review site below. Before going to the site, candidates should replace the bolded words in the URL. Replace **DEPT** with the candidate's department's four-letter acronym and **LASTNAME** with the candidate's last name.

Third-Year Reviews: <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/DEPT/thirdyearLASTNAME/Forms/allitems.aspx>

Tenure/Promotion: <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/DEPT/tenurepromLASTNAME/Forms/allitems.aspx>

Professor Reviews: <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/DEPT/profLASTNAME/Forms/allitems.aspx>

SharePoint Main Site:

Reviewers with broader access may visit the umbrella site at <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/default.aspx>.

Off-Campus Access to SharePoint sites:

Users must log into their Pulse VPN account before going to any of the Sharepoint sites listed above. Prior to off-campus use, candidates and others reviewing packets must obtain a Pulse VPN account by completing the form at <http://it.cofc.edu/network/documents/remote-access-request-form.pdf>, securing their department chair's signature, and submitting the signed form to Helpdesk@cofc.edu. Applicants will be notified via email once their remote access is activated. Additional details about connecting remotely with VPN are available at <http://vpn.cofc.edu>.

A. 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, "HSS_ENGL") containing:

- 1) A tab for each faculty member under review, indicating the review (for example, "PromProfGarcia"), and
- 2) Any statement of additional departmental standards for tenure and promotion, loaded by Academic Affairs, named as "**DEPT Standards for Tenure and Promotion**," where DEPT is the four-letter department acronym.

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 file 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).²

- 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 collect their materials in a folder on their network drive or computer, appropriately named, and then upload them to the SharePoint site from there.

Each candidate folder will have four sub-folders:

- 1) **Departmental Public Folder for use in the candidate's review** (e.g., "GarciaDeptPublic"): 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.
 - 2) **Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder for use in the candidate's review** (e.g., "GarciaDeptPanel"): 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., "GarciaDeptPanel - 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., "GarciaDeanConfidential"): This folder will contain documents reviewed only at the Dean's level and above.
- B. **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: 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. The candidate should clearly denote which publications were completed while in rank at the College of Charleston. Candidates should also indicate the title of their terminal degree thesis and the name of their thesis advisor.

These items should be loaded as a single file using the naming convention "**01 Last Name CV**" (e.g., "01 Garcia CV").

² 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) 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.” Librarian 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: Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Service. Candidates should refer to the tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year evaluation standards found in the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and develop a summary that states how they believe that they have exceeded or met the minimum standards for each relevant area. This narrative of performance and self-evaluation in the three areas of professional competency should be in a 10-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.

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 and descriptions of teaching materials and assignments. 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.”

The candidate’s narrative description of research and professional development should specify clearly which publications or creative works are based solely or substantially on work completed during the current evaluation period. Candidates should indicate clearly and unambiguously the specific refereed books, journal articles, juried exhibitions, etc., that they believe fulfill the criteria.

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, provide an indication of their 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."

The discussion of service may consist of an annotated list of committee assignments and miscellaneous contributions to the department, the College, and where appropriate, the community during the evaluation period, with annotations indicating what the duty entailed. In cases of significant service contributions, a more detailed narrative might be appropriate. Candidates should clearly distinguish among areas of service (i.e., to the department, the College, and the community, including professional and academic associations). Whenever uncertainty arises as to whether a particular professional activity counts as service rather than as teaching or research, a candidate should solicit the counsel of the Department Chair.

4) 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) A representative syllabus.
- b) 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).
- c) Samples of graded materials, when appropriate, from the same representative course.

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 should be included in the supplementary folder, as outlined below.

Note: Librarian 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.

- 5) 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 (reprints, off-prints, or accepted typescripts only) or equivalent creative works for the period under review. (All other additional publications or equivalent creative works should 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. used to meet these criteria must already be published or accepted for publication. If the work has been accepted but not yet published, a copy of the acceptance letter 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) which 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**.” Faculty librarians 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, s/he should include a list of such materials, labeled “**11 Last Name Hard Copy Submissions**.”
 - 8) Candidates should have a supplementary folder titled “**DeptPublic Supplementary Folder**” 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**.” Faculty librarians 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 should be presented together for each course and labeled according to the convention “**## Last Name Course Name Materials**.” For non-instructional duties, faculty librarians should use the name of their professional competency here, rather than a course name.
 - d) The candidate should 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 faculty librarians, “**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**.”
 - f) Candidates should submit externally funded grant proposals, included as a single document per proposal, named “**## Last Name Supp Grant 1**.”

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

In Candidate's Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder (e.g., "GarciaDeptPanel"): All members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel for this candidate will have access to this folder, as will all subsequent reviewers (e.g., 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 Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management (IRPIM), followed by numerical summary tables from each course section downloaded from Blue (inside OAKS, from the Faculty tab in MyCharleston, or coursereview.cofc.edu), compiled as a single file in the order listed below and labeled **"04 Last Name Course-Instructor Evaluations."** For semesters prior to Fall 2010, in place of the Blue-housed reports, candidates should include copies of their summary report for each section, along with at least one departmental summary report.

- a) Reports from the IRPIM Office 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 IRPIM 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 provided, loaded as a single file labeled **"05 Last Name Peer Review Classroom."**
- 7) Candidates should have a supplementary folder titled **"DeptEvalPanel 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").

The Provost has repeatedly indicated that commented Course-Instructor Evaluation reports are very helpful to the review process and has strongly encouraged their inclusion in the supplementary folder.

- C. **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:

- 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) Actual graduates' responses.

The chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than forty 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 which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field; 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 below):

- Academic Affairs and department chairs will have ownership access to all 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 s/he 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.
- Academic Affairs will control write/view access for deans and higher levels of review, assigning at the departmental folder level (since Advisory Committee membership may vary from one candidate to another).

The following table outlines accesses for specified time periods in the tenure, promotion, and third-year review schedule. Please note that the Chair and several Academics Affairs staff members will have full control over access throughout. As indicated (by * below), 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.

This table is followed by instructions for chair’s verification of folder accesses.

Folders / Time Periods	Departmental Public Folder	Departmental Evaluation Panel Folder	Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL Folder	Dean’s Confidential Folder
July - Sept 15	Candidate has write and view access. Will change candidate access to “view only” once s/he has completed uploading documents.	Candidate has write and view access initially. Will change candidate access to “view only” once s/he has completed uploading documents.	Candidate never has access to this folder.	
Sept 16 – Oct 1	Transitions in access	Transitions in access	Panel chair confirms that candidate has no access to this folder.	
Oct. 1 until completion of Departmental Evaluation Panel deliberations and finalization of panel letter	Candidate has “view only” access. Departmental faculty members with no conflicts have “view only” access.	Candidate has “view only” access. Departmental Evaluation Panel members serving in this review have “view only” access.	Panel chair uploads confidential documents to this folder. Departmental Evaluation Panel members serving in this review have “view only” access.	
Starting Nov. 1 with no preset end date [For third-year review: Starting on or before Jan. 15]	Dean*	Dean*	Dean*	Dean*
Starting Dec. 1 with no preset end date [For third-year review: Starting on or before Feb. 1]	Advisory Committee* and Provost*	Advisory Committee* and Provost*	Advisory Committee* and Provost*	Advisory Committee* and Provost*

Instructions for Chair’s Verification of Access to Folders

We will rely on department chairs to: (1) verify that access permissions to folders on the SharePoint site are established as expected, and (2) manage two SCHL_DEPT group memberships for your department. To do so, please:

- Log on to the T&P SharePoint site at <http://society.cougars.int/sites/promotionandtenure/default.aspx>.
- Choose the Tab for your department. While on that announcements page you will see a box in the upper right that says *Site Actions*. Choose the drop-down arrow. Select *Site Settings*. Toward the left you will see *Users and Permissions*. There are two options, *People and groups* and *Advanced permissions*.
- To see the permissions for the site, choose *Advanced permissions*. You will see a list of all of the individuals and groups that have access to the site as well as the level of permissions that they have.

It is critical that panel chairs confirm that permissions are correct at the individual folder level as well. Permissions at the site level may be propagated to the individual folders or each folder can have its own permissions. To view folder permissions:

- Choose the tab for a faculty member. You should then see a screen with the four folders.
- Hover over the name of one of the folders and notice that a drop-down arrow appears. Click on the drop-down arrow.
- Choose *Manage Permissions*. This screen looks similar to the site permissions screen but shows the permissions for this folder.
- Most access at the folder level should be managed via groups, rather than via individual accesses.
- Access to each tenure and promotion candidate's DeanConfidential folder should include:
 - Advisory Committee SCHL_DEPT - Read Only
 - SCHL_DEPT Dean - Contribute
 - SCHL_DEPT Owners - Design or Full Control
 - Promotion and Tenure Site Owners
 - Promotion and Tenure Site Administrators
 - There are also a number of Provost's Office colleagues on the folders to ensure that our access is robust in case access is needed for trouble-shooting.
- Access to each tenure and promotion candidate's DeptPanel folder should include
 - Same accesses as to DeanConfidential folder, plus candidate with Contribute access
- Access to each tenure and promotion candidate's DeptPanel-CONFIDENTIAL folder should include
 - Same accesses as DeanConfidential, plus SCHL_DEPT Evaluation Panel with Read Only access
 - **The candidate should not have access to this folder.**
- Access to each tenure and promotion candidate's DeptPublic folder should include
 - Same accesses as Dean Confidential, plus SCHL_DEPT Evaluation Panel with Read Only Access and candidate with Contribute access.
- 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.
- **Please ensure that the candidate herself/himself does not have access to the Departmental Evaluation Panel CONFIDENTIAL folder or the Dean's Confidential 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 family relationship).**

Most importantly, chairs are responsible for managing membership of two groups: SCHL_DEPT Evaluation Panel and SCHL_DEPT Department Members. Here SCHL is one of the following three- or four-letter codes: BUS, EHHP, HSS, LCWA, SOTA, and SSM, and DEPT is the four-letter department abbreviation used in Banner. The SCHL_DEPT Evaluation Panel group should include all members of the Departmental Evaluation Panel, except those who have a conflict of interest (and those undergoing the same review as other candidates). If your department has tenured faculty who should be on some cases but not others, we can help you set up two evaluation panel groups in SharePoint, using a standard naming convention that we have established for such cases. The SCHL_DEPT Department Members group should contain all permanent faculty in the department who are not tenured and who do not have a conflict of interest.

To check and revise group memberships, from your department tab, choose *Site Actions*, then *Site Settings*, then click *Users and Permissions*. Alternatively, open the Groups list in the Quick Links column and click on the group that you would like to edit. Once on the group's membership page, to add users, click *New*, then *Add Users*. Once the Add User box has opened, enter users' login IDs and click the *Check Names* icon/check-mark. Select *Give Users Permission Directly* and then select the

appropriate permission, as outlined above. Click or unclick *Send Welcome Email* (your preference), complete subject line and message if you're sending an email, and then click *OK*. To remove users, select the users to be removed, then select *Actions*, then *Remove Users from Group*. Click *OK*.

X. Packet Checklist

Candidate's Name: _____

Additional documentation may not be added to the candidate's packet after the departmental evaluation panel concludes its deliberations, and generally, no information may be added after November 1 (or January 15 for third-year reviews). The only exceptions are outlined above.

Each item on this checklist should be entered as a single PDF document unless document size requires splitting scanned documents. Items should be labeled and numbered as indicated in the joint memo. Numbers are included below for convenience.

Departmental Folder

___ Statement of additional departmental standards for tenure and promotion (if any)

Candidate's Departmental Public Folder

- ___ 01 CV
- ___ 02 Course list
- ___ 03 Narrative (covering teaching, research, and service)
- ___ 04 Course 1 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- ___ 05 Course 2 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- ___ 06 Course 3 materials (sample syllabus and teaching materials: assignments, exams, optional graded student work, etc.)
- ___ 07 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
- ___ 08 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
- ___ 09 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
- ___ 10 List of service activities with brief explanation of duties involved in each (*optional list for information not included in CV or narrative*)
- ___ 11 List of materials being submitted in hard copy (*if applicable*)
- ___ DeptPublic Supplementary Folder (*containing items outlined in text above*)

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, and
 - ___ Section summary sheets and departmental summary sheets (only for courses taught prior to Fall 2010)
- ___ 05 Teaching Observations provided to the candidate (*optional*)
- ___ DeptEvalPanel Supplementary Folder

(continued)

Access

July – Sept. 15: Candidate has view/write access to his/her **Departmental Public** and **Departmental Evaluation Panel** folders.

Sept. 16 – Oct. 1:

___ Chair confirms that candidate access his/her **Departmental Public** folder is “view only” and that candidate no longer has any access to **Departmental Evaluation Panel** folder.

Oct. 1 (approx.)

___ Access (view only) to candidate’s **Department Public** folder granted to all faculty members with no conflict of interest.

___ Departmental Evaluation Panel access (view only) granted to **Departmental Evaluation Panel** folder.

Candidate’s Departmental Evaluation Panel Confidential folder: The chair should upload the following to the candidate’s Departmental Evaluation Panel Confidential folder **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

___ Credentials of external reviewers

___ 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

Access

___ All departmental and panel access turned off once Departmental Evaluation Panel deliberations have concluded.

___ Panel chair loads updated checklist in location outlined above.

___ Panel chair notifies Academic Affairs and Dean that the packet is formally leaving the Department for the Dean’s Office and ensures that Dean has access.

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

Signature of Departmental Panel Chair

Date