

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
College of Arts & Sciences

Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion (2024)

The aim of this document is to provide guidance to Department Heads or other faculty who are responsible for preparing dossiers for candidates for tenure and promotion, including tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor for faculty hired at those ranks without tenure, and promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. It is also intended to inform faculty about the procedures that will be used in preparing their dossiers. This document is supplementary to the following official University and College documents:

The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, Chapter 6: Academic Freedom and Tenure (hereafter referred to as “the UNC Code”)

Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (“UNCG Regulations”)

University-Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (“UNCG Guidelines”)

Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion, College of Arts & Sciences (“College Regulations”)

Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion, College of Arts & Sciences (“College Guidelines”)

Reappointment Review Guidelines, College of Arts & Sciences (“Reappointment Guidelines”)

Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (“UNCG Annual/PTR Policy”)

Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review, College of Arts & Sciences (“College Annual/PTR Policy”)

Current versions of all these documents may be accessed through links on the Provost’s web site at <https://provost.uncg.edu/policies-procedures-forms/promotion-and-tenure-policies/>. In the case of any conflict, these documents take precedence. Other relevant policies mentioned in this document will be found on the Provost’s or the College web sites. **Not all procedures required by College and University policy are described in this document.**

Throughout this document: (1) “candidate” refers to a faculty member who is being, or may in the future be, considered for tenure or promotion; (2) “department” refers also to interdepartmental programs that have established tenure-track positions; (3) “head” refers also to the directors of such programs. The best practices described here cover both the period leading up to the recommendation for promotion or tenure, and the procedures to be followed in the year when the dossier is sent forward.

Best Practices in the Years Prior to Mandatory Review for Untenured Faculty

Expectations of candidates for promotion and tenure – See UNCG Guidelines; College Guidelines; College Regulations, Sect. II.

Department expectations for tenure and promotion are specified in written guidelines that address teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and service. Department policies must be consistent with College and University policies, and with the UNC Policy on Tenure and Teaching, which must be discussed with all candidates in the year of mandatory review and at reappointment.

Feedback during annual reviews

Annual reviews must follow the procedures laid out in the College's Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Reviews. The reviews must include written comments specifically evaluating progress towards tenure and promotion, identifying areas in which performance is good or excellent and pointing out those (if any) in which there are problems. Heads or senior mentors are encouraged to discuss marginal or inadequate performance and suggest ways for improvement. It is important for feedback to be consistent, both between individuals who provide it and from year to year. Faculty who believe they are hearing seriously conflicting advice from different senior colleagues, or who see contradictions in evaluations they receive in successive years, should ask for a resolution from the head. Some differences of opinion among the senior faculty on exactly what steps untenured faculty should take to make adequate progress towards tenure are inevitable, but those differences should be clearly resolved in formal feedback from the Head, using input from other colleagues. If performance in any area is inadequate, those inadequacies should be clearly identified in annual reviews.

Reappointment review – See UNCG Regulations, Sect. 3.D.ii; College “Reappointment Review Guidelines”

The third-year reappointment review provides a valuable opportunity for feedback on progress made thus far towards tenure and promotion. The review must include separate written evaluations by the tenured faculty and by the department head. When the Department's recommendation is to reappoint to a second term, feedback to the candidate should include an explicit assessment of progress towards tenure and promotion, noting any areas that may become problematic for eventual tenure.

Extensions of the probationary period (“stopping the tenure clock”) – see UNCG Regulations, Sect. 3.C.i-iii; College Regulations, Sect. V.G. Other relevant policies are “Policy on Extended Illness, Disability, and Family Leave for Faculty” and “Personal Exigency: Guidelines & Procedures” on Provost's website.

Early decisions on tenure and promotion – see College Regulations, Sect. V.H. Heads must consult with the Dean about anticipated cases of early tenure recommendations.

Full reviews for tenure are required in all cases. Every candidate for tenure has the right to a full review at the department, College, and University levels. A candidate who decides not to apply for tenure must inform the department head in writing.

Preparation of Associate Professors for Promotion to Professor

Recommendations for promotion to Professor originate with the department head or with a majority of the Professors. In addition, an Associate Professor has the right to a full review for promotion at specified intervals (UNCG Regulations, Section 3.E.iii). The UNCG Annual/PTR Policy requires all tenured Associate Professors to be given feedback on their progress towards promotion as part of their annual review.

Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers for Review

The University and College Regulations and the department guidelines describe in detail the procedures that must be followed in the preparation and review of dossiers. All those involved in the process (the candidate, head, and voting faculty) must ensure that they are familiar with these procedures before the review begins. It is good practice for the Head to discuss the procedures with new faculty shortly after hiring and again at least once before the mandatory review year. It is recommended that candidates be assigned a mentor (who may be the department head or an experienced senior faculty member) to advise in the preparation of the dossier. Even if the head and the faculty believe that they will recommend against tenure or promotion, they have an obligation to ensure that the dossier is complete and well-organized so that the candidate's case can be judged fairly.

Each year, early in the Spring semester, the Dean's Office will provide department heads with a list of mandatory tenure reviews scheduled to begin the following Fall, and an approximate timetable for the review. Heads are asked to provide the names of Associate Professors who will be reviewed for promotion and to consult with the Dean about any anticipated recommendations for early tenure review. A complete University timetable is issued by the Provost's Office, usually in August.

External review letters

External review letters are required of all candidates for tenure or promotion and should be requested early in the spring semester so as to allow for delays in getting agreements from reviewers and in receiving the letters. It is then advisable to confirm commitments obtained from reviewers early in the summer. The minimum number of external letters included in a dossier is three, although it may be advisable to get more in particular cases (for example, where a candidate's work spans more than one specialty, or where impact in addition to scholarly merit is to be assessed for a candidate with an applied or community-engaged research program). It is a good idea to request letters from at least one more person than the number of letters needed, since reviewers do sometimes fail to come through by the deadline. However many letters are requested, *all* those received must be included in the dossier – you cannot pick and choose among them. The College will not provide funds to pay honoraria to outside reviewers but departments may use their own funds for this purpose if it is typical practice in the discipline. *Letters must be requested using the template available on the College website and attached to this document as Appendix A.*

The candidate should prepare a description of his or her program of research, scholarship, or creative activity to be sent to the reviewers (in hard copy, by email, or via a shared link), together with a vita and copies of selected publications, a portfolio, or other materials as appropriate. The description assists reviewers in evaluating the candidate's record, provides a context for assessing the contributions of individual works, and also serves as a draft of the narrative description that the candidate will write for inclusion in

the final dossier (Summary of Works Accomplished). The selection of reviewers must follow the requirements of the UNCG Regulations, Section 4.B.i.c. The candidate may also request (but cannot insist) that certain individuals not be asked to provide a review because of personal animosities or other matters unrelated to professional expertise. The Head may seek other names from senior department faculty and from professional contacts such as journal editors, department heads at other institutions, and program directors at funding agencies.

Qualifications of reviewers. The reviewers who are selected must exclude anyone who there is reason to believe could not provide an objective review of the candidate (e.g., previous mentors or supervisors or close collaborators). The candidate should provide the head with a list of such individuals so that they are not contacted inadvertently. It may sometimes be difficult to find reviewers who are completely unacquainted with the candidate, particularly in cases of promotion to Professor, but it is not necessary for the candidate and the reviewers to be completely unknown to one another. The most important thing is to ensure that the reviewers are objective and have the necessary professional credentials to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's work. Each reviewer should be asked to describe his or her acquaintance with the candidate (if any) in the letter so that readers of the dossier can make their own evaluation of the reviewers' objectivity. If any reviewer has had significant prior contacts with the candidate, the dossier should explain why that person was nonetheless chosen to write a letter.

Most, if not all, of the external reviewers should be at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion and should hold academic positions at respected institutions. Such people are generally familiar with the expectations of tenure and promotion and can speak most authoritatively to the review committees who will read the candidate's file. In some cases, reviewers in non-academic positions may be better placed to evaluate a candidate's work, in which case it is particularly important to establish their credentials in the dossier. Letters from reviewers who appear unqualified will tend to weaken a candidate's case.

Applied or community-engaged work. When the candidate's record includes a significant amount of applied or community-engaged work, it is important to provide evidence of its impact, whether local, regional, national, or international. This evidence may include letters from people able to assess its impact and such individuals will often be non-academics. In addition, they may be asked to assess the impact of single projects rather than evaluating the candidate's overall record. Additional evidence may include news coverage, recommendations or actions by agencies or organizations on the basis of the candidate's work, invitations to the candidate to participate in forums such as advisory bodies or working groups, and so forth. For more information about establishing the impact of community-engaged work, go to

<https://communityengagement.uncg.edu/scholarly-resources/>

Non-evaluative letters. In some cases, it may be appropriate to request additional letters to explain aspects of a candidate's work rather than to evaluate it. For example, if a significant number of publications derive from a long-term collaboration with another researcher, it would be useful to include a letter from the collaborator describing the candidate's role in the research program. When requesting letters of that type, it is important to emphasize that the writer is being asked for a description or explanation, not an evaluation (which would be inappropriate in the example just given, where the writer is

a close collaborator). Such letters should be clearly distinguished from letters of evaluation and their role in the dossier clearly explained. Do not simply include them without explanation.

External letters cannot be confidential. It is important to state clearly to potential reviewers that external letters cannot be kept confidential from the candidate. UNC system policy and NC State law both require that faculty have access to any materials in their personnel file, including external review letters. (See Appendix A)

Voting eligibility of Department faculty

Only tenured faculty may participate in decisions involving reappointment, tenure, or promotion, as follows:

- On decisions to recommend an Assistant Professor for reappointment or for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor – all tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above.
- On decisions to recommend an untenured Associate Professor for tenure – all tenured Professors.
- On decisions to recommend an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor – all tenured Professors.
- On decisions to recommend an untenured Professor for tenure – all tenured Professors.

Adjunct faculty are not eligible to vote on tenure or promotion cases. *Faculty on phased retirement* give up tenure and so are not eligible to vote on any tenure or promotion cases. If any member of the tenured faculty holds a *joint (not adjunct) appointment*, the document that established the appointment determines that individual's voting rights.

Faculty must be present at the meeting in order to vote although participation by telephone or videoconference may be arranged with the written permission of the Dean. Such an arrangement may be made, for example, for a faculty member who is on leave. Absentee and proxy ballots are not permitted.

In cases where two spouses or domestic partners hold positions in the same department, they may not participate in or be present at discussions or decisions about each other's tenure or promotion (or any other personnel matters).

Recommending both tenure and promotion for untenured Associate Professors

When a candidate who was hired as an Associate Professor without tenure is being reviewed, the department may recommend either tenure at that rank, or tenure with promotion to Professor. The department is not required to conduct a review for promotion as well as for tenure in such cases, but may do so if either a majority of the Professors or the department head decides it is appropriate. In such cases two separate votes should be taken, one on the question of tenure and one on the question of promotion, since the Professors (and the head) may hold different opinions on those two actions. It is possible for reviewers at the College or University level to endorse the recommendation for tenure but not that for promotion.

Special cases of promotion (College Regulations, Section V.F)

If the candidate being considered for promotion is the Department Head or if the department has too few faculty of appropriate rank to prepare a recommendation for promotion, the Dean will consult with the Head and with the senior department faculty and appoint an *ad hoc* committee of at least three faculty to review the case and prepare the dossier. The Dean should be advised of the need to make this appointment as soon as the need is recognized.

Assembling the Promotion & Tenure Dossier

P&T is conducted utilizing a workflow set up in Digital Measures. The workflow is established in late spring/early summer and establishes a linear pattern of preparation of the dossier materials by the candidate and then the department. An individual or group of individuals will receive an email notification from Watermark when they have a task to perform in the workflow. It is important that the faculty member being reviewed is familiar with the “Part A. Summary of Work Accomplished” report in Activity Insight and that the department is prepared to upload the departmental documentation needed in Part B of the workflow.

Materials should be prepared and edited off-line. Only the final version of each document should be uploaded to the dossier as a pdf file by the deadline indicated in Digital Measures.

Material Prepared and Uploaded by Candidate:*Part A: Summary of Work Accomplished.*

This document is generated by running the “Part A. Summary of Works Accomplished” report in Activity Insight. It is good practice for the head or a senior faculty member to work with the candidate on the preparation of this part, to provide advice on length and content, and to review a draft (or drafts) as it is written. No limits are placed on the length of the narrative, but it should not be excessively long and should be carefully edited. The College P&T committee and the Dean usually have 15-20 dossiers to review each year, and conciseness ensures that each one can be given full attention. Narratives by candidates for tenure typically average 20 single-spaced pages; those by candidates for promotion to Professor typically average 35 pages. The candidate’s material must be organized as described below and uploaded as a single pdf file, titled “Part A: Summary of Work.”

Part A.I., Teaching. The statement (Part A.I.a) should provide an overview of the candidate’s approach to teaching, describing any special innovations or significant contributions. Supervision of student research or creative work, mentoring of interns, advising, and other non-classroom instruction should all be included in this section. The list of courses taught may include brief descriptions and should say which courses were designed by the candidate. If the candidate has published textbooks or other instructional materials, they should be listed in Part A.I.e, along with any grants or awards specific to teaching.

Part A.II. Research and Creative Activity. The candidate’s statement (Part A.II.a) should be written in terms that are understandable to a general academic audience, not for specialists in the field. The readers of the dossier will not be from the candidate’s own

research specialty, or even from the same discipline. Unnecessary jargon should be avoided and necessary technical terminology explained clearly. Specialized abbreviations and acronyms should be spelled out.

Future directions. The candidate's research statement should include a description of planned future directions in research or creative activity. This establishes that the candidate has an active program that will be maintained after tenure or promotion. Works in progress may be described here and listed in the following section.

Part A.II.b. Chronological Lists of Achievements. The list of achievements is generated by Digital Measures when the Summary of Works Accomplished is run. *It is important that the candidate review this for completeness and accuracy and makes edit as needed.*

The list may include works completed before the date of appointment at UNCG or, in the case of promotions to Professor, before the last promotion. The document must make clear which works were completed before and which after those dates; for works started before appointment/promotion and completed afterwards, the candidate should briefly describe the situation. (For example: "Data collection and analysis were completed before appointment at UNCG but the article was written and published after appointment.") Complete bibliographic citations should be given for all published works, with names of journals spelled out in full.

Works listed as "in press" or "accepted for publication" must be included in the Appendix for Supporting Documentation of the dossier in manuscript form. They must be accompanied by a letter from the editor or publisher confirming their acceptance. Normally, "in press/accepted" means that no further changes will be required. If the acceptance involves any contingencies (revision of certain portions, addition of extra chapters, the necessity for further review, etc.) these should be spelled out. If a book is described as "under contract," the status of the work must be explicitly described; the fact that a publisher has contracted to publish it does not necessarily mean that the work is completed.

Copies of published books do not need to be included but the College Committee or the Dean may request to see them in the course of the review. Because of the long delays often associated with the publication of scholarly books, it may be necessary to provide the manuscript of a book that has been accepted for publication but not yet appeared in print. It is recommended to include readers' and editors' reports on books that are provided as manuscripts or that have been recently published. The reports should be discussed in the department's evaluation of the research record, together with any published reviews of books, films, or other substantial works.

In general, copies of manuscripts or grant proposals submitted but not yet reviewed should not be included in the dossier, but only listed as "under review." Little weight is given to such items because it is impossible to determine how they will be assessed by experts in the field. If there is special justification for including them, the justification should be spelled out clearly and explicitly.

Part A.II., Service. The statement of service may be quite brief, especially in the case of candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. It should focus on significant contributions to the institution or the profession, especially where their scope and importance are not immediately evident from the list of activities that follows. For

example, serving on a curriculum committee may be a relatively routine assignment in some years, but will take on special significance if a major curriculum revision occurred during the candidate's term of appointment. Work involved in external service such as society offices, editorial boards, or grant-review panels may be briefly described.

Part A.IV, Directed Professional Activity – if applicable. Directed Professional Activity (DPA) may only be included as part of the dossier if previously agreed to by a Memorandum of Understanding, which must be included in Part B, below. Part A.IV.a should describe the nature of the candidate's DPA and explain how it is distinct from other categories of accomplishment. Part A.IV.b should list the candidate's accomplishments in this category, organized as appropriate to the discipline and the candidate's profile.

Candidate's Vita: A complete vita, covering the candidate's entire career and formatted according to the practices of the discipline should be uploaded to the dossier. It should be indicated on the CV which accomplishments are under the time frame for consideration. The CV and the Statement of Accomplishments should be carefully reviewed to remove any inconsistencies.

Appendix for Supporting Materials

The Appendix includes any materials relevant to review of the candidate's record that are not included elsewhere in the dossier. To the extent possible, all materials should be available in electronic form, either as files uploaded to the Digital Measures workflow, or as a link to a website where the materials are stored.

Material Prepared by the Department:

Part B: Department Documentation Form.

This part is prepared by the department head or member(s) of the voting faculty and uploaded by an assigned Department Administrator into Activity Insight. Some sections are required, others optional. Comments below pertain to only some of the sections of this part.

Statement of Context. In addition to the information specified, the following should be included here:

- If the department changed its expectations for tenure or promotion during the period under review, both sets of guidelines should be included and the evaluation should explain how the candidate's work was evaluated according to the different standards. Departments are expected to apply recently adopted new guidelines in a reasonable manner when evaluating a candidate's work.
- If a candidate for tenure has been granted an extension because of personal exigency, that fact should be noted in the Statement of Context.
- Any agreement to include the category of Directed Professional Activity in the dossier should be included as part of the Statement of Context.
- Information in the candidate's COVID Impact Statement should be referenced to allow reviewers, including those external to the department and UNCG, to

have a better understanding of a dossier that may differ from expected norms of the discipline.

B.I.a – Summary of Student Teaching Evaluations. At the beginning of this section, describe the procedures used to evaluate teaching in the department, such as the frequency of collecting student ratings, frequency and procedure for peer reviews, and any other information that will help readers interpret the evidence provided. Be sure to explain any rating scales used – an average rating of 4.8, for example, is not meaningful in itself. Numerical scores should be given a statistically appropriate presentation; in particular, avoid using averages of averages to summarize scores. Discussion of student evaluations should include comparisons with those of other faculty teaching similar courses and information on trends, if any, in the candidate’s own ratings. Remember that those reading the dossier will not be members of your department so it is helpful to describe the courses taught (large lecture course, small seminar, part of an especially demanding sequence in the major, lab, studio, etc.) rather than simply referring to them by course number. Especially for candidates for promotion to Professor, where student ratings may have been collected over many years, interpreting them in terms of changing curricula and course assignments, or new evaluative instruments may be helpful. Departments are asked to provide this information using the template in Appendix B.

The College does not require that student comments from the evaluation forms be included in the dossier. If the department elects to include comments, all of the comments from a sample of courses should be provided, and the method of selecting the sample explained. The comments from the selected courses should be included in the Appendix, and summarized and discussed in this section. The department must keep all student comments available in case they are requested by the College or University committees. Letters written by current or former students, whether solicited or unsolicited, may be included in this section in a separate scanned file.

B.I.c – Peer Reviews of Teaching. All peer reviews of teaching since appointment or since the last promotion should be included in the dossier. They should be arranged chronologically and combined into a single file. Each review should include the course number and title, the year, and the semester. (If this information was not included when the review was written, it should be added.) Peer reviews must be carried out regularly as described in the College’s policy.

B.II.a – External Letters for Research/Creative Activity. Each external letter should be uploaded as a separate file named, for example, “Review letter from Dr. Emily Expert.” It is preferred that the letters be written on letterhead and signed by the reviewer. Letters in the form of email messages are acceptable but not encouraged. The dossier must include either a CV or a brief biographical sketch of each reviewer. Biographical sketches are helpful in explaining to those unfamiliar with the field why the reviewer’s opinion is considered to be authoritative. If there are unusual features of any reviewer’s qualifications or relationship to the candidate, they should be explained here. A single example of the letter sent to reviewers should be uploaded as a file named “Letter requesting reviews.” If some reviewers were sent different letters, the variants should be included and the reason for the differences explained.

B.II.b – Additional Evidence of Research Impact. This section may include explanatory letters from collaborators, or letters or other evidence documenting the impact of particular applied or community-engaged research projects. The purpose of documents

in this section should be explained in a separate document (“Explanation of Additional Evidence”) and, if appropriate, copies of the letter(s) used to request them included.

B.III.a. Letters of Commendation for Service. Documentation of service may include letters from committee chairs or others in a position to assess the candidate’s service. If possible, these should be requested at the time the service is performed, rather than when the dossier is being compiled, and candidates are encouraged to maintain documentation of their service contributions. Do not include pro forma letters of appointment – if a service assignment is listed in the dossier, it will be assumed that the appointment was made.

B.V.a. Annual Reviews. Follow instructions on the UNCG P&T Form.

B.V.b. Reappointment letter. The documents required are the evaluative letter written by the department head, the written evaluation by the faculty and any response by the candidate, and the letter written by the dean. The formal letter of reappointment from the Provost should not be included.

Materials for late inclusion in a dossier.

Each year, a deadline is set by which departments must complete the preparation of dossiers, generally around October 1st. Occasionally it is necessary to add materials after the deadline has passed and these should be sent to the Dean’s Office for inclusion. Late materials are limited to the following: signed copies of external letters to replace e-mail communications; notification that an article or book under review has been accepted or rejected for publication; notification that a grant proposal under review has been approved or rejected for funding; notification of an unanticipated prize or award. If relevant materials arrive after the College’s review of the dossier is complete, the Head should send them to the Dean, who will request that they be included in the dossier for review at the University level.

Evaluation of the Dossier by the Faculty and the Vote on a Recommendation

All faculty voting on a recommendation for tenure and promotion will have read the dossier carefully before discussing it during the meeting at which the vote is taken. However, it is important that the written evaluation, included as Part C.I.a of the dossier, consist of more than simply a summary of the discussion that takes place during the meeting. It should provide a careful evaluation of the candidate’s record, the external letters, and other evidence to inform readers beyond the department of the strong and weak points of the case, to interpret important features of the record that may not be apparent to non-specialists, and to explain the basis for the faculty’s recommendation, whether positive or negative. A separate summary of the faculty’s deliberations, and a record of the vote taken, must be included on the form provided for Part C.I.b.

The following procedure is recommended and should be followed unless there are good reasons to proceed differently (see also College Regulations, Sect. VIII.E):

1. Well before the meeting at which the vote is taken, each of the main sections of the candidate’s dossier (normally teaching, research, and service) is assigned to a voting member of the faculty. It is best if these individuals are selected by the

voting faculty (since the faculty's evaluation must be independent of the head's), but the head should ensure that the assignments are made and completed in a timely manner. If the department has a formal mentoring system for junior faculty, the mentor(s) may be given some or all of these assignments.

2. Each person prepares a summary evaluation of their assigned section in draft form, identifying both the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The head ensures that the summary evaluations, together with all of the material to be included in the dossier, are made available to the entire voting faculty to read well in advance of the meeting.
3. During the meeting, the entire dossier must be available for the faculty to consult so that any disagreements over its contents can be resolved. If any last-minute additions need to be recognized (for example, acceptance of a paper or award of a grant) the head should provide these during the evidence-gathering phase. The head leaves the meeting before the faculty begin their deliberations.
4. During the meeting, faculty may propose changes to the written evaluations and those endorsed by a majority of the faculty must be included in the final version.
5. When the deliberations are concluded, the elected chair calls for a vote by secret ballot and ensures that all faculty who voted sign a Signature Sheet.
6. It is the elected chair's responsibility to report the faculty's vote to the head and to prepare a summary of the discussion, including the opinions pro and con that were arrived at as a result of the deliberations. This does not mean that the summary must mention every comment or opinion expressed in the course of the meeting. Views may change during the discussion but the report must include adequate representation of the opinions on which the final vote was based.
7. The chair should distribute the summary to the faculty for comment and possible correction before uploading the final version to AI (Part. C.I.b).

The evaluation of teaching must consider but should not be limited to student ratings and peer observations. Evaluation of course syllabi and class assignments, assessment of pedagogical innovations, and descriptions of contributions to course and curriculum development should also be included. In addition to classroom teaching, it is important, where appropriate, to evaluate activities such as advising, thesis and dissertation supervision, and work with students in research, studio, clinical, or internship settings, as well as professional accomplishments by former students and the impact of teaching innovations on this campus or elsewhere. If the candidate has published textbooks or other instructional materials, those should be evaluated as well.

The evaluation of research should include an explanation of practices and conventions of publishing or exhibiting in the discipline that may not be clear to outsiders. For example, multi-authored papers and collaborative research projects are common in the sciences but relatively rare in the humanities. Conversely, publication of books and scholarly monographs is often expected in the humanities but would be quite unusual in the sciences. Explanation and evaluation of the different forums for exhibition in the visual arts is especially important. In addition, information on the following points is very helpful:

- The prestige and selectivity of the venues in which the candidate has published, performed, or exhibited. Impact factors or citation analyses may be included but are not required since such measures are not available in many disciplines. If acceptance rates are available for journals or presses, those should be included.
- The availability of external research grants in the candidate's specialty and the competitiveness of the sources from which funding has been received.
- Contributions made by the candidate to books or articles with multiple authors, especially when these make up a large fraction of the total work submitted.
- When a candidate's work includes a significant applied or community-engaged component, documentation of its impact should be properly explained and evaluated.

The evaluation of service. Service activities outside the University should be explained and assessed – the significance of serving on grant review panels or exhibition juries will not be obvious to every reader. The work of Editorial Board members or Associate Editors varies very much from one journal to another and the dossier should provide explanations. It is quite appropriate to request letters commenting on the candidate's service, especially if this has been significant – for example from a committee chair, an officer of a professional society, a journal editor, or an officer of a funding agency.

Candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have provided substantial service to the University as well as to the department, College, and profession.

The head's independent evaluation

All materials, except for any comments written by the candidate (see below), must be available for the head to write his/her independent evaluation, which may agree or disagree with the faculty's evaluation.

Comments by the candidate

After the dossier (including outside letters, the faculty's evaluation, the head's evaluation, and any dissenting opinions) is completed the candidate must indicate that s/he has reviewed all the material included in it. The candidate may also, but need not, write a brief statement commenting on the dossier or on opinions expressed in it. This statement is not the place to include new evidence or information, which the candidate should have included in the appropriate narrative section. It provides an opportunity to draw attention to points that the candidate believes have been overlooked or given inappropriate emphasis, to rebut negative evaluations, or to correct errors of fact.

April 6, 2003; most recent revision, March 23, 2024.

Appendix A – Letter Requesting External Review

Dear [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an evaluation to assist in our review of [candidate's name] for [tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or other action being contemplated]. University regulations require that every candidate for tenure or promotion be externally reviewed regardless of the Department's assessment of the merits of the case and that all cases, whether or not supported at the department level, be sent forward for review by the College and University. I have enclosed a copy of the Department of XXX's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and ask that you provide your evaluation in relation to the expectations described in that document. You may also consult the College and University promotion and tenure documents at the following locations:

[Insert URLs here]

We would appreciate your candid assessment of the candidate's qualifications and any other information you can provide that will help us in making a wise decision. We are especially interested in your assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications [and/or creative work] and his/her national reputation and relative standing in the field. I enclose a copy of [candidate's] vita, a description of his/her program of research/creative activity, and a representative sample of his/her work. As part of your letter, please indicate how long you have known the candidate and in what capacity. I will be glad to provide you with additional material on request.

Please note that State law and University regulations require that candidates be given the opportunity to review all the materials in their dossier, including unredacted outside letters of evaluation, before it is sent forward from the department.

I need to receive your review no later than [date]. If you anticipate any problems in meeting this deadline, please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you again for your assistance with this important task.

Sincerely,

Appendix B – Template for B.I.a Summary Statement of Student Evaluation of Teaching

In XX Department, student evaluations are conducted (insert frequency). Insert description of how evaluations are collected/if there were changes in the evaluation form during the faculty members review... A xx point scale is used (indicate what the #s on the scale represent). The evaluations listed below indicate the average rating given for question XX which is “...”

| Semester | Course | # of students who submitted evaluation | # of students enrolled | Average of question #? Overall the quality of the course (or instructor was) | Department Average |
|-------------|---------|--|------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Fall 2019 | XXX 101 | 15 | 20 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Fall 2019 | XXX 205 | 20 | 30 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| Spring 2020 | XXX 525 | 5 | 8 | 3.9 | 3.6 |