

COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
Charleston, SC

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Candidates for Tenure, Promotion or Third Year Review in 2009-2010, Department Chairs, Panel Chairs, and Deans

FROM: Beverly Diamond, Interim Provost
Susan Farrell, Chair, Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review

DATE: July 27, 2009

SUBJECT: Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Evaluation Procedures

The information that follows reflects the consensus derived from joint discussions of the Provost and the faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third Year Review. This memo does not introduce new concepts or requirements into the review process; it is intended to provide guidance in interpreting the standards set forth in the *Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM)*. These explanations and suggestions are supported by President Benson who expects them to contribute to increased consistency in faculty personnel review recommendations.

This memo includes the following information:

- I. General Comments regarding the process and expectations
 - II. Summary of the responsibilities of candidates
 - III. Summary of the responsibilities of Panel Chairs and Deans
 - IV. Packet Preparation Guidelines
 - V. Evaluation Calendar
 - VI. Checklist
-

I. General Comments

- A. All levels of the review process must follow the procedures, criteria, and requirements found in the *Faculty-Administration Manual* and departmental guidelines. The approval of candidates for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions is premised upon the assumption that the individual candidate has clearly met the standards and followed the procedures outlined in the *FAM*. Those who fail to follow the manual compromise their chances of a favorable review.
- B. 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 criteria have been met. Letters should state how and to what extent the criteria have been met. The statements or letters should be written after studying the packets and before formal departmental deliberations take place. All tenured members of a department, except the chair and those being evaluated for the same purpose, must write a colleague letter. Untenured members and chairs of the department are still invited and encouraged to write a colleague letter.
- C. Panel chairs should write letters that, while maintaining the confidentiality of the meeting, summarize all of the discussion that takes place in the departmental panel meeting, including positive and negative deliberations. The panel letter must carefully 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, and 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 are responsible for ensuring that the panel letter adequately addresses these specific issues. *Beginning the Fall of 2008, all candidates will receive a copy of the departmental panel letter and will sign the copy of the letter included in the packet, indicating acknowledgement of receipt of letter (a new policy endorsed by the Faculty Senate in November, 2007).*
- D. Teaching is the most important duty and responsibility of all faculty members. Though not required by the *Manual*, information that results from classroom visitations by colleagues is helpful. Numerical summaries of Course-Instructor Evaluations (student ratings) for all sections of all courses taught by the candidate during the period of evaluation should be included. The candidate is also asked to include in their packet summary tables of Course-Instructor Evaluations, available from Institutional Research, one table per course taught as in the example table found in Section IV. These tables will indicate a candidate's average teaching scores and will help the departmental panels and the faculty Advisory Committee to more effectively judge improvements in teaching. In addition, either the chair or the candidate should ensure that the summary of Course-Instructor Evaluation scores for the department are included for each semester in the executive binder. The discussion of Course-Instructor Evaluations in the panel letter should specifically address the candidate's ratings in the context of departmental means. The Committee will also use syllabi, exams, and other course materials to examine teaching effectiveness.
- E. The Provost and the Committee regard objective validation of the quality of a candidate's research to be important. The panel letter must include a thorough assessment of the quality of a candidate's refereed or juried works, including the quality of the journals or venues in which they appear. Invited publications or creative works can also help demonstrate the quality of a candidate's scholarship; hence the panel letter should also address the quality of any invited publications or creative works.
- F. Although independent external (outside the College of Charleston) reviews of scholarly work are not required, the Committee has found such reviews helpful in the evaluation of a candidate's research and publications. (See End Note).
- G. As the *Faculty-Administration Manual* states, the criteria specified are necessary, though not sufficient, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and promotion to or retention as Senior Instructor. All candidates must meet these minimum criteria. However, even if these criteria are met, a negative tenure or promotion decision is still possible. Accordingly, candidates should be prepared to demonstrate more than the ability simply to meet the minimum criteria outlined in the manual.
- H. 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. (January 15 for Third-Year Evaluations.)

II. Candidates' Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure should follow guidelines, timetables and procedures outlined in the *Faculty-Administration Manual*, Part IV, sections J-M. It is the candidate's burden to demonstrate with their packet that they are 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 standards and criteria have been met. Please refer also to section IV of this memo, *Packet Preparation Guidelines*, below, for guidance in preparing the packet.

A. Overview

Candidates should prepare a detailed and current curriculum vitae in the format appropriate to their disciplines. (The CHE vita is not the preferred format.) The candidate should denote which publications were completed while in rank at the College of Charleston (i.e. use color coding, or a separate section, etc.). Candidates should indicate the title of their thesis and the name of their thesis advisor in their CV. The CV should also include a list of courses taught by semester for the period under review. Course releases for administrative or other duties, sabbatical leaves, and other irregularities that modify teaching duties should be noted.

Candidates should prepare a narrative summary addressing each of the three areas of evaluation: Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Professional Service to the Community. Candidates should refer to the tenure, promotion 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. 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 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.

B. Teaching

Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “sustained exemplary performance in teaching” and “clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy”; promotion to Associate Professor requires “sustained effectiveness in teaching”; promotion to Professor requires sustained high quality and effective 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. The evidence for evaluating teaching comes from three sources: self assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment.

Candidates should include evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in the *Faculty-Administration Manual* (IV.J.1.b.) and this memo.

Candidates may encourage class visitations by departmental peers.

In the narrative discussion of teaching philosophy and methodology (*Faculty-Administration Manual* IV.J.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.

C. Research and 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”. Promotion to Senior Instructor requires a “sustained program of quality (professional) development”. Candidates must have internal departmental colleague letters that address their Research and Professional Development (the chair will collect these letters and add them to the executive binder).

Some departments may also wish to conduct a formal external review of a candidate’s scholarly work. Candidates may also wish for their chairs to solicit external colleague letters (extra-departmental CofC faculty or colleagues at other institutions) to address their Research and Professional Development. Note that an *external review* of scholarly work is a form of evidence distinct from an *external colleague letter* on research. Accordingly, when an *external review* is conducted, the protocol provided at the end of this memo and in the *Faculty-Administration Manual* must be followed.

The evidence for professional accomplishments typically 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 (*Manual* IV.J.4.a.(2) and IV.J.4.c.(2)). The overall quality and substance of a candidate’s research and publication record, during the period of review, is of primary importance in the Tenure and Promotion evaluations.

Candidates should indicate clearly and unambiguously the specific refereed books, journal articles, juried exhibitions, etc, that they believe fulfill the criteria. Normally these scholarly works should be directly related to the candidate’s area of professional research and/or teaching expertise. Candidates should submit copies of all books, articles, etc. under consideration for the period under review. (Three representative publications should go in the Executive Binder; the remainder should be included in the Supplementary Binder.) 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 as evidenced by a letter from the editor.

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. In addition, faculty should use complete standard disciplinary bibliographic form for citations (including beginning and ending page numbers for articles and chapters in books).

Proof of the refereed nature of the work must be provided. In the case of artistic performances or exhibitions, there should be clear evidence of professional evaluation. Candidates should include copies of journal mastheads for their published journal articles in the packet. The information on the journal masthead (or an equivalent statement from the publisher or editor or other information, such as that included on the web site for the journal) should indicate 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. When available, evidence of journal quality (e.g., acceptance rate, published journal ranking within discipline, commentary about journal quality in colleague letters, etc.) should also be included.

D. Service

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires “active and sustained participation in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community”. Promotion to Professor requires “active and sustained participation in a leadership capacity in service to the College and, where appropriate, to the community”. Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “evidence of quality service to the community”.

Candidates should clearly distinguish among areas of service: 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.

III. Panel Chairs' and Deans' Responsibilities

In addition to the responsibilities outlined in the *Faculty-Administration Manual*, the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review believe that the suggestions that follow will ensure that the review process is informed, efficient, and fair. As a result, deans and panel chairs can assist candidates to show full and complete compliance with standards and criteria by including the following items in the packets:

Panel Chairs

A. Recent Graduate Opinions

Panel chairs should distribute Recent Graduate Opinions to as wide a population as possible (a random sample of no fewer than 40 graduates). Opinions should not be limited to recent graduates chosen by the faculty member under evaluation, although candidates *may* request to include additional graduates in consultation with the panel chair. (See the *Faculty-Administration Manual* J.1.b.(4).) When soliciting responses from recent graduates, the campus-wide demographic form shall be included along with each department's own Recent Graduate Evaluation form. The Office of Institutional Research will provide all of the necessary information for soliciting recent graduate opinions. Their list of recent graduates will include all majors who have taken a course with the professor being evaluated, covering the most recent 8 years, which would include all four years for most of the students who have graduated during the past 5 years. If departments have demographic questions they wish to add, they may add them at the bottom of the page or in their own departmental form.

Panel chairs should include with the packet an explanation of how they collected the Recent Graduate Opinions and a list of graduates contacted. The panel chair should indicate when a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 recent graduates. In these cases, it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors who took courses with the candidate.

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

B. Checklists

The faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review has developed a checklist for packets. The panel chair should ensure that all the items on the checklist have been included and that the packet adheres as closely as possible to the **Packet Preparation Guidelines**.

- C. Panel chairs should ensure that colleague evaluation letters be completed as required in the *Manual* (IV.M.6.b).
- D. Panel chairs should solicit extra-departmental colleague letters that address a candidate's service or, when appropriate, teaching or research and professional development.

- E. Panel chairs should solicit any external colleague letters requested by the candidate and approved by the departmental evaluation panel.
- F. Panel chairs should ensure that the department evaluation panel interviews each candidate.
- G. Panel members should conduct a secret ballot.
- H. Panel chairs should write the panel evaluation letter, discussing all deliberations and including results of the vote, and ensure that panel members and the candidate sign the copy included in the packet.

Please refer to the *Faculty-Administration Manual* and to the *Packet Preparation Guidelines* for other items to be included.

Deans

The Dean will review the Department Panel Evaluation Recommendation and the Candidate's Packet and will make an independent evaluation of the candidate's case. The Dean may interview the candidate.

IV. Packet Preparation Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review for Instructional Faculty

A complete packet will normally consist of two parts: An **Executive Binder (I)** and a **Supplementary Materials Binder (II)**.

NOTE: As a general rule, please do not use plastic sheet protectors, especially to insert multiple pages (other than items such as article offprints). Removing multiple items from sheet protectors in order to examine them is time-consuming and adds to the bulk of the packets. Also please use binders in which rings close tightly.

I. The **Executive Binder** should contain the following items:

A. **Items supplied by the candidate in the order of listing:**

- (1) Appropriate professional curriculum vitae using the standard disciplinary bibliographic form for citations, including beginning and ending page numbers for articles and chapters in books and volume date and number information. Candidates should indicate which publications were completed during the current period of evaluation. Candidates should indicate which courses were taught since the time of last review. Candidates should indicate the title of their terminal degree thesis and the name of their thesis advisor.
- (2) Letter of appointment for cases of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Senior Instructor.
- (3) Letter of last promotion for cases of promotion to Professor or retention as Senior Instructor;
- (4) All annual evaluations conducted during the evaluation period.
- (5) Departmental Evaluation Panel letter from Third-Year Review for cases of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Senior Instructor.
- (6) Candidate's narrative for the three areas of teaching, research and professional development, and service. (*NOTE:* The candidate's narrative of performance and self-evaluation in the three areas of professional competency should not exceed **ten pages total**; a shorter narrative is quite acceptable.) The description of teaching should include the candidate's teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments. The 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. A description of the candidate's overall research program and plans for future research should be included in the narrative. The discussion of service may consist simply 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.)

- (7) Syllabi from no more than three representative courses (Note: a representative syllabus from all other courses (not sections) taught during the review period should be included in the Supplementary Binder.)
- (8) Examples of specific assignments from the representative courses.
- (9) Samples of graded materials, when appropriate, from the representative courses.
- (10) In the interest of greater efficiency in the work of the various evaluative bodies & individuals, tables that summarize the teaching evaluation scores already included in the packet, one table for each course, for all semesters the course was taught during the period of evaluation. These tables are produced by Institutional Research for candidates and are as follows:

Example Table: Course 101

	Fall 2006	Spr 2006	Fall 2007	Spr 2007	Dept* Avg for all courses	Candidate avg for this course
Well prepared	5.8	5.5	3.1	5.6	5.5	5.0
Understandable way	5.5	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3
Express themselves	5.5	5.1	4.9	5.3	5.3	5.2
Helpful	5.7	5.4	5.1	5.5	5.3	5.4
Constructive evaluation	5.4	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3
Effective Teacher	5.5	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.3	5.3
Critical Thinking	5.6	5.4	4.8	5.5	5.2	5.3
Positive Rating	5.3	5.0	3.7	5.2	5.2	4.8

* an average value over several semesters is fine here

- (11) Numerical summaries of student evaluations for all sections of all courses taught by the candidate during the period of evaluation. (Written comments, when appropriate, may be included in the Supplementary Materials.) Departmental teaching evaluation summary sheets should also be included.
- (12) For candidates for tenure and promotion, no more than three sample publications (reprints, off-prints, or accepted typescripts only) or equivalent creative works from the evaluation period, including evidence of peer review for each (all other additional publications or equivalent creative works should be included in the supplementary materials). Include a copy of the masthead of each journal or other evidence of peer review and evidence of the quality of the journal. For senior instructor and retention candidates, evidence of professional development activity should be substituted.

(NOTE: In the case of articles or books that have been accepted for publication but have not yet appeared in print, a copy of the acceptance letter should be included with the publication.) For Senior Instructor and retention candidates, evidence of professional development activity should be substituted.

B. Items supplied by the evaluation panel chair in the order of listing:

- (1) Departmental evaluation panel letter, which should include:
 - Explicit evaluation of the quality of teaching
 - Expectations in the discipline regarding research, including the role of chapters in books and refereed proceedings, as well as journal articles
 - Expectations and explanation of the role and value of practitioner research and of pedagogical research
 - Practice in the discipline regarding multiple authorship
 - Discussion and evaluation of the quality of the journal in which the scholarship appears
 - Discussion and evaluation of the quality of the research
 - 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).
- (2) Colleague letters (which should be evaluative);
- (3) Peer reviews of classroom performance, if available;
- (4) External reviews of the individual's performance in the area of research and professional development, if available (including a description of the selection of external evaluators);
- (5) Recent graduate opinions (surveys);
- (6) Extra-departmental colleague letters, which may be either internal or external to the College, that address a candidate's service or, when appropriate, teaching, or research. (These extra-departmental letters are optional for third-year reviews.)

In addition, the panel chair should verify that Academic Affairs has on file any additional departmental criteria used for promotion and tenure.

C. Dean's independent evaluation of the candidate

Include items in Parts B and C in a secure folder in the front of the Executive Binder.

II. The Supplementary Materials Binder should contain but is not limited to:

- (1) All additional course syllabi for the period under review;
- (2) All additional publications or creative works for the period under review, including materials documenting the review process for each;
- (3) Any manuscripts currently under submission, but not yet accepted, that are referenced elsewhere in the packet (e.g., in a candidate's research narrative).
- (4) Additional course materials for the representative courses included in the Executive Binder;
- (5) Externally funded grant proposals;
- (6) When appropriate, written comments from student evaluations.

No additional documentation of service activities beyond that in the Executive Binder is necessary.

End Note: Protocol for a Formal External Review of Research and Professional Development

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. The *Faculty-Administration Manual* now requires that candidates and panels who look to outside the College for additional evaluation follow the procedures outlined below:

Candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College by late August. Evaluation panel chairs, in consultation with departmental panel members, should present to the candidate additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two and no more than five independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The candidate's suggested reviewers may be sources of additional reviewers independent of the candidate's list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements.

After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments. A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the *Faculty-Administration Manual* about research and professional development (currently, IV. J. Introduction, IV. J. 2., and IV. J. 4.) as well any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To ensure that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) 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, (3) a copy of the letter of solicitation by the panel chair, and (4) the confidential outside reviews.

This language, endorsed by the Faculty Senate during the 2006-07 academic year, can also be found in the *Faculty-Administration Manual* (currently in IV.J.2(2), on pp. 73-74).

2009-10 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.**
- August 15*** Chairs confirm tenure list to appropriate Dean and Provost. Chairs confirm list of faculty to be considered for promotion, third-year evaluation, and any special evaluation to Dean and Provost.
- August** Panel chairs initiate formation of department evaluation panel(s); panel chairs solicit recent graduate evaluations, external reviews of research (if used by departments) and extra-departmental colleague letters.
- September 15** Candidates submit completed packets to department or panel chair.
- October 1** Evaluation Panel Chairs assure that all evaluation data have been collected and begin convening evaluation panels.
- October** Department evaluation panels complete deliberations *on tenure and promotion cases*. 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.
- November 1*** Evaluation Panel Chairs present results of their panel deliberations *for tenure and promotion candidates* and all materials/packets used to the appropriate Dean.
- December 1*** Appropriate Dean forwards Evaluation Panel materials for *tenure and promotion cases* and candidate packets to a designated room for review by the Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion and the Provost. The appropriate Dean provides his/her recommendation on Tenure and Promotion candidates to the Provost.
- Nov.-Jan. 15** Department evaluation panels complete deliberations *on third year review cases*.
- Jan. 15*** Evaluation Panel Chairs present results of their panel deliberations *for third year review cases* and all materials/packets used to the appropriate Dean.
- Jan 15-31** Deans interview each third year candidate and confer with each Panel Chair individually concerning third-year evaluations.
- Feb 1*** Deans provide their recommendations on *third-year review* to the Provost.
- Dec.-Feb.** The Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion and the Provost review all *tenure and promotion recommendations* from evaluation panels. When requested or when stipulated by FAM, the Advisory Committee will also review third year review cases.
- Feb 25** The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion 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 and notifies each candidate in writing of the recommendation. All pertinent evaluation materials are sent to the President.
- March 15* or within two weeks of receipt of the recommendation** President informs each candidate of the final presidential decision.

*** Dates marked with an asterisk are required deadlines as delineated in the Faculty-Administration Manual, or first business day thereafter.**

Checklist for Tenure/Promotion

Chair of panel:

I. Preliminaries:

- Consultation with candidate about packet requirements.
- Consultation with candidate about extra-departmental/extramural evaluation letters.
- Consultation with panel members about extra-departmental/extramural evaluation letters.
- Consultation with panel about recent graduate letters.
- Consultation with candidate about recent graduate letters.

II. Before the panel begins deliberation:

- Solicitation of extra-departmental/extramural letters.
- Solicitation of recent graduate letters.
- Selection of extra-departmental panel member.

III. Inclusions to the packet:

- In addition to those items included in the Packet Preparation Guidelines, please include:
 - A statement of additional department standards for tenure/promotion, if any.
 - A written statement describing how recent graduates were selected to be contacted, how many were selected and how many responses were obtained.
 - A written statement describing how external research reviewers and extra-departmental colleagues were selected.
 - Copies of solicitation letter(s) written to extra-departmental/extramural evaluators.
 - Colleague letters: All tenured members of a department, except the chair and those faculty members being evaluated for the same purpose, must write a colleague letter. Untenured members and chairs of the department are still invited and encouraged to write a colleague letter.

IV. Deliberation phase:

- Full discussion of any questionable issues by the panel.
- An interview with the candidate by the assembled evaluation panel. During the interview there should be a full discussion of any questionable issues with opportunity for the candidate to respond.
- Secret ballot.
 - A letter reflecting the deliberations of the departmental evaluation panel and stating the results of the secret ballot. This letter must be signed by all members of the panel and by the candidate, who should receive a copy.

Candidate:**I. Preliminaries:**

Consultation with panel chair about packet requirements.

Consultation with panel chair about extra-departmental/extramural colleague letters.

Consultation with panel chair about recent graduate letters.

Input into selection of extra-departmental panel member.

II. Packet Preparation:

In addition to those items included in the Packet Preparation Guidelines, please note:

An annual evaluation, in addition to all others, must be included for the year prior to the candidate's consideration for promotion/tenure/third year evaluation. All tenure candidates and candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor must include their third-year evaluation.

If it is the department's policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of these procedures should be on file in the Office of the Provost. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as a part of the packet, having explained in his or her narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included.

III. Deliberative phase:

Interviews with evaluation panel with opportunity for candidate to respond to issues raised during the panel's deliberations.

Notification of panel recommendation.

Rev 07/27/2009