



Provost Guidelines
Promotion and Tenure Dossier Preparation
2017-2018 Review Cycle
May 5, 2017

Introduction

This document, prepared and distributed by the Provost's office, provides guidance to candidates, departments/schools, and colleges about the procedures and policies associated with promotion and tenure. **This is not a policy document.** Operating papers, the Faculty Association contract, and the *Employees Handbook* govern the review process.¹ Provisions of operating papers, the *Employees Handbook*, and/or the Faculty Association contract take precedence if there are conflicts with this guidelines document. Please direct questions regarding procedures Associate Provost for Academic Administration (APAA) David DiLalla.

General Responsibilities of the Chair/Director

The chair/director of the promoting/tenuring unit, in cooperation with the candidate, has the responsibility to verify that the dossier has been properly prepared. The chair/director should assure that the faculty member understands the format of the dossier, including the required sections.

The Chair/Director is responsible for communicating in a clear, detailed, deliberative manner her/his recommendation(s) on tenure and/or promotion. The Chair/Director's decision letter should make explicit and clear the manner in which the candidate's dossier meets or does not meet the standards for tenure and/or promotion set out in the Department / School operating paper.

If a chair/director does not hold the rank to which the candidate aspires, a chair/director designee² must be appointed to oversee the **entire** tenure and/or promotion process. If there is evidence of bias or conflict of interest that might interfere with a fair and full review, the chair/director should recuse herself/himself entirely from the process, in which case a designee should be appointed to oversee the tenure / promotion process. In cases where a chair/director designee is required it is the responsibility of the dean to appoint the designee, in consultation with the candidate.

The chair/director provides or assists in collecting documents and information for the following sections of the dossier:

- *Section II* (including copies of the pre-tenure review letters from the department and dean);
- *Section III* (position information from original hire, workload assignments, and relevant sections of operating papers);
- *Section IV(c)* (context for teaching evaluations of department and/or college norms);
- *Section V(b)* venue ratings (the chair/director must provide ratings for the venues used

¹ *Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be required to meet the standards contained in University policy, the College operating paper, and the department/school's operating paper. The standards and criteria listed in department/school and college operating papers should complement and may augment the standards and criteria set forth in University policy. The Employees Handbook otherwise provides details regarding the process for the promotion and tenure review (Section 13.04.a, Collective Bargaining Agreement).*

² *If a chair/ director designee is appointed, the designee will fulfill all responsibilities of the chair/director associated with the Promotion/Tenure process.*

- by candidate); and
- *Section V*
 - Prior to soliciting letters of review, the chair/director should ascertain whether the candidate waives his/her right to see letters of review and attain the signed confidentiality form.
 - The chair/director should solicit and upload letters of review and prepare the descriptions of the reviewers, whether or not the candidate has waived his/her right to view the letters.

General Responsibilities of the Promotion/Tenure Candidate

- a. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the remaining contents of the dossier, which will be presented for secure review in a standardized online format (via SIU Online (also known as D2L).
- b. The digital dossier in the SIU Online system shall be the official dossier considered at all levels of review.
- c. Prior to the dossier being opened for review, the candidate must sign a statement that s/he is aware of the dossier contents (with the exception of confidential letters, if relevant) and that s/he concurs that the dossier is ready to be evaluated.
- d. Candidates should include sufficient and consistent documentation in the digital dossier to make a clear case for promotion/tenure. At the same time, candidates should limit the size of the dossier to ensure that the central message and record of accomplishments are not obscured or diminished by less-relevant information.
- e. Candidates should not include in the main dossier copies of articles, chapters, screen shots, exams, syllabi, etc.; these supporting items may be included as supplemental material for review by the department/school or college, if requested. Supplemental materials, if included, should be uploaded in the designated section of the digital dossier.

Format and Preparation of Digital Dossier

- a. The chair/director, or his/her designee, will request through the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) that a dossier shell be established in the SIU Online system for each candidate once the Provost has opened the annual review period.
- b. The dossier shell parallels the standardized dossier format outlined in the *Employees Handbook* (see <http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.php> for summary of format).
- c. The candidate, chair/director, or designee, will upload non-confidential PDF documents into the appropriate sections of the digital dossier.
- d. **Only the chair/director or designee shall upload confidential materials.**
- e. The Associate Provost for Academic Administration (APAA) office, in collaboration with the CTE, will provide training through workshops and/or one-on-one assistance.
- f. Secure access to the digital dossier for the chair/director and members of the departmental/school review committee will be established by the chair/director, and access for the dean, members of the college committee, and Provost will be requested as required.

Considerations for Department/School and College Review

- a. The Dean is responsible for communicating in a clear, detailed, deliberative manner her/his recommendation(s) on tenure and/or promotion. The Dean's decision letter should make explicit and clear the manner in which the candidate's dossier meets or does not meet the standards for tenure and/or promotion set out in the Department / School operating paper as well as the College Operating Paper and University Policy.
- b. If there are factors in the department/school or college that could interfere with a fair and full evaluation of the case, the chair/director or dean should attempt to resolve them before the review begins and clearly acknowledge them in his/her letter(s) of recommendation.
- c. If minor, possibly-correctible procedural concerns are identified during the review process, the review should be briefly paused so that these might be addressed. Questions should be directed to the attention of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration for consultation and assistance.
- d. If there are insufficient Faculty at the appropriate rank to form either the department/school or the college committee, the committee(s) shall be augmented via the procedure outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the SIUC Faculty Association (Article 13). Faculty who participate in the review of the dossier at the department/school level shall recuse themselves from participation in the review (discussion and vote) at the college level.
- e. A candidate must be reviewed according to the operating papers in effect at the time s/he was hired, unless s/he agrees to be evaluated according to criteria of the current approved operating paper(s). In the section of the dossier that includes the relevant sections of department/school and college operating papers, the date of the controlling operating paper **should be clearly specified**.
- f. The promotion and/or tenure evaluations and recommendations by committees, Faculty, and administrators are expected to be consistent with criteria of pertinent operating papers and University policies.
- g. Each reviewer has a single vote (or recommendation) on the dossier. Chairs/directors (or designees) and deans shall not include their own vote in reported votes of the department/school Faculty or review committees. Their opinions and evaluations are recorded separately in the recommendation letters they write and their formal recommendations are recorded on the Promotion and Tenure Review Form.
- h. A Faculty member shall not participate in any fashion in the promotion and/or tenure proceedings for a candidate to whom the Faculty member is related, as defined by the SIUC Nepotism Policy.

- i. The college promotion and tenure committee's discussion and vote on a candidate for promotion / tenure will be limited to those members of the committee who are from outside the candidate's department/school. A committee member shall not be present or otherwise participate in the discussion regarding a candidate from his/her home department/school.

Guidelines for Specific Dossier Sections³

Once department/school review of the dossier begins, the dossier is generally closed⁴ to the inclusion of any additional materials, with the exception of the chair/director and dean's letters of recommendation, replacement of original versions of previously-received, electronically-transmitted letters of review, and letters of rebuttal to negative recommendations, if any, written by the candidate. More information on requirements for each section of the dossier is provided in templates that have been developed by the Provost's office for digital dossier creation (see Provost's tenure/promotion webpages).

Sections I, II, and III of Dossier (Candidate Information, Letters of Recommendation and Review, Position Information):

I. Candidate Information:

*Templates for these items are available from <http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.php> under **eDossier Templates and Format Document**.*

- a. Section must include a signed and dated statement from the candidate that s/he is aware of the dossier contents (with the exception of confidential letters, if relevant) and that s/he concurs that the dossier is ready to be evaluated.
- b. Section must include a signed and dated statement from the candidate stating whether s/he has waived her/his right to see all letters of review.
- c. Section must include Basic Information data, including a current *curriculum vitae* in standard University format.

II. Letters of Recommendation and Review:

- a. The chair/director and dean's letters of recommendation are included in this

³ Detailed procedural documents and templates can be found online at <http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.php>

⁴ The same dossier (with the exception of material added by policy at each step of the process) shall be evaluated by all reviewers. University policy indicates that no additional information may be added once the dossier is transmitted from the Department/School to the College. In the event that a dossier modification is warranted during the period between the Department/School committee vote and the transmission of the dossier to the College, the Chair/Director should consult with the Associate Provost for Academic Administration.

section. In addition to offering a thoughtful, deliberative review of the case, these letters should outline the review procedures followed in the units and include written summaries of the committee deliberations and results of voting. The chair/director should also explain how reviewers were chosen and the process by which letters of review were solicited. Chair/director (or designee) or dean letters of recommendation shall not be completed before review by department/school or college committees or Faculty.

- b. Written reports from review committees (e.g., Departmental or College Promotion and Tenure Committees) should **only** be included in the dossier if inclusion of such reports is required by a controlling operating paper. In such cases, the report(s) should be included in Section II of the dossier.
- c. The chair/director and dean's letters must be shared with the candidate at each level of review. Only in the case of a negative recommendation does the candidate have the right to respond through a letter of rebuttal/response using the process outlined in the Faculty Association contract (see Article 13). The letter(s) of rebuttal should be addressed to chair/director or dean as appropriate and provided to that individual. Letter(s) of rebuttal to the chair/director or dean's letter must be added to the dossier before it proceeds to the next level of review.
- d. For candidates who do not yet hold tenure, the dossier must include a copy of each annual pre-tenure review letter that was transmitted to the candidate by the chair/director and/or dean. Such annual review letters are placed immediately after the chair/director's recommendation letter.

III. Position Information:

- a. Include copies of the advertisement and position description for the search that resulted in the hire of the candidate, as well as copies of the letter of offer or related side letters to the candidate.
- b. Include copies of annual workload assignments, along with a summary of workload assignments over the entire probationary period. Candidates who already hold tenure and are applying only for promotion should **only** include annual workload assignments and related summary since the time of prior promotion.
- c. Include sections of the department/school's and college's operating papers that pertain to promotion and/or tenure, ensuring that the department/school name and the date of the controlling operating paper are clearly included on the excerpt. **Do not submit entire operating papers.**

Section IV (Teaching):

- a. The candidate provides a brief reflective statement (two-page maximum) on teaching

that describes teaching philosophy, goals, and approaches used to obtain learning outcomes.

- b. Include a summary table of Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE) scores or scores from a comparable evaluation instrument accepted within the unit. **Do not include raw data in this section.** The summary table should include the mean ICE score for each course and section, the semester in which the class was taught, the number of enrollees, and the number of respondents. It is desirable to include a mean score for all classes taught during the evaluation period.
- c. In order to contextualize and allow interpretability of ICE scores, the chair/director should ensure that the dossier includes information on departmental/school and/or college ICE norms and expectations.
- d. If the candidate chooses to include student support letters, the number of letters should be limited to five (5). Include **only** those from former, *not current*, students and those that best describe teaching effectiveness of the candidate. Confidentiality of letters is preferred; letters should be solicited by and delivered directly to the chair/director or designee.
- e. Include a list of undergraduate and graduate students advised and the specific role that the candidate played (e.g., committee member, chair, undergraduate research sponsor).
- f. Include written evaluations of teaching and student mentorship by at least two departmental/school or college peers that are senior to the candidate. Preference should be given to evaluations resulting from direct observation of classroom teaching. Letters should be solicited by and delivered directly to the chair/director or their designee.
- g. List any teaching awards and honors, if any, along with other indirect teaching contributions not mentioned elsewhere.

Section V (Research and Creative Activity):

- a. The candidate provides a brief reflective statement (two-page maximum) that summarizes the nature or focus of research and creative activity.
- b. Items included in the Research and Creative Activity summary should be clearly identified on the “Evidence and Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity” chart, found on the APAA Promotion and Tenure page (<http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.php>), and the chart should include an estimated summary of the percent contribution by the candidate on any multi-authored or co-produced/performed project(s) listed.
 - 1) The “Evidence and Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity” chart **should only**

include publications and other works that have occurred during the probationary period, unless specifically identified as part of the hiring process, or since the last promotion *[other works are taken into consideration via their inclusion on the CV].*

- i. Papers and other works accepted unconditionally for publication, presentation, or production may be listed, but they should be clearly labeled as such.
- ii. Works submitted, but not yet unconditionally accepted, and/or other items in progress, should not be listed on the chart, though it may be appropriate to include these on the CV.

2) **The chair/director must complete the “Evidence and Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity” chart by rating the venue of each entry.** The quality or rating of venues for scholarly work in the discipline is provided by the chair/director, in consultation with unit Faculty and the candidate.

- c. Funded research projects, as recognized by the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, should be listed using the “Funded Research” chart, found on the APAA Promotion and Tenure page (<http://pocaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.php>). Entries should highlight the principal investigator (PI), any co-PIs, project title, and a brief description of the purpose of the project, to include the duration of the project, financial support received, and the sponsoring agency. Candidates should also identify estimated percent contribution on the project if multiple investigators were involved.
- d. Patents and other key distinctions should be listed along with the appropriate reference number or other designation.
- e. List any research or creative activity awards and honors, if any.

External Evaluations (included within Section V):

Originating units should solicit external letters of evaluation from appropriate reviewers. Although there is no standard requirement regarding the number of external review letters included in the dossier, five to six thoughtful letters of assessment are typical and will suffice in most cases. All letters that are solicited and received must be included in the dossier; neither the candidate nor the chair/director is permitted to exclude, censor, or edit any solicited letters.⁵

- a. While the selection process will vary according to disciplinary standards and the operating papers of each department/school and college, careful thought and attention should be applied in choosing external reviewers. The chair/director should consult with the candidate while identifying a pool of potential reviewers. Letters should be

⁵ Unless specified in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, pursuant to the University’s Promotion Policies and Procedures for Faculty (Section III.A.)

sought from individuals who:

- 1) are knowledgeable about the candidate's field of study and who are recognized, even acclaimed, authorities in the discipline;
- 2) hold academic rank or equivalent that exceeds the current rank of the candidate;
- 3) should be from peer research universities or higher; and
- 4) should be capable of providing an informed and objective appraisal of the work.

Avoid soliciting or including letters from those for whom a potential bias or conflict of interest exists (e.g., co-authors, co-PIs, personal friends, former advisors, etc.).

- b. Candidates shall be given the opportunity to waive or not waive the right to see the letters of review. This decision must be made *prior to solicitation* of letters of review. A signed statement shall be included in the dossier to affirm the individual's decision to waive or not waive this right to confidentiality and should be completed by the candidate *prior to the solicitation* of all letters. The chair/director should make clear to the solicited reviewers that the candidate either has or has not waived the right to review the letters within the formal letter of solicitation.
- c. Chairs/directors or their designees, *not candidates*, request external letters, and response letters should be addressed to the chair/director. Letters should be requested far enough in advance to be received before departmental/school evaluation of the dossier begins and should be included in the dossier before evaluation by committees and unit Faculty commences.
- d. The solicitation letter should include:
 - 1) the candidate's vita, along with, for research/creative activity evaluation, two to five examples of research/creative activity (e.g., publications; reproductions of creative work, etc.), jointly agreed upon by the candidate and the chair/director;
 - 2) a statement informing the reviewer of the candidate's right and decision to waive or not waive confidentiality;
 - 3) a copy of the department/school and college promotion and tenure guidelines (unless otherwise directed by department/school and/or college operating papers); and
 - 4) an explanation of what is expected of the reviewers; they should be asked to critique the candidate's work in the context of the discipline.
 - a. **Reviewers must be instructed that they are NOT to assess whether the candidate would merit promotion/tenure at the reviewer's home institution.**
 - b. **Reviewers must NOT be asked to provide a recommendation on promotion/tenure at SIU (this being a campus decision).**
 - 5) Reviewers should also be asked to disclose or describe any personal or professional relationship with the candidate.
- e. Regardless of whether the candidate chooses to waive confidentiality, each reviewer should be coded and referred to by a letter or number (e.g., Reviewer A) so that reviewer names and institutions are excluded from the letters of evaluation submitted by the chair/director and dean.

The dossier should include a short paragraph that introduces each reviewer and describes his or her home institution and professional credentials. *Do not include the complete vitae of reviewers.* A sample letter sent to one of the reviewers and a list of materials that accompanied the letter should be included in the dossier.

Section VI (Professional Service):

- a. The candidate provides a brief reflective statement (two-page maximum) that summarizes the roles and commitment to departmental/school, college, university, professional, and community service.
- b. Include a list of service activities organized by:
 - 1) Service to the University (e.g., department/school, college, and university committees);
 - 2) Service to the Profession (e.g., professional memberships, offices held, grant review panels, and editorial boards); and
 - 3) Service to the Community (e.g., service organizations and volunteer activities undertaken in a professional capacity).

It is well understood that expectations regarding level of service will vary depending on the academic rank of the candidate and requirements of the department/school and college.

- c. Evidence of outcomes related to professional service might include a list of recognitions and awards received and a limited number of letters (i.e., five maximum) of acknowledgement and appreciation.

END