

Promotion and Tenure Dossier Preparation Guidelines

April 25, 2014

Introduction

This document is distributed by the Provost and is intended to provide guidance to candidates, departments/schools, and colleges about the procedures and policies that control the promotion and tenure processes. **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.

General Guidelines

The chair or director² of the promoting/tenuring unit, in cooperation with the candidate, has the responsibility to verify that the dossier has been properly prepared. If a chair/director does not hold the rank to which the candidate aspires, or if there is potential 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 this case, it is the responsibility of the chair/director to appoint a designee, in consultation and agreement with the candidate, to serve in the capacity of chair/director for the purpose of the promotion/tenure process.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide the contents of the dossier (exclusive of confidential letters of evaluation), which will be presented for secure review in a standardized digital format (via SIU Online). Candidates should include sufficient and consistent documentation 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. Do not include in the 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 should be uploaded in the designated sections of the digital dossier.

Format and Preparation of Digital Dossier

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. The shell will parallel the standardized dossier format outlined in the *Employees Handbook* (see

¹ With respect to process, college operating papers trump department/school operating papers, and the collective bargaining agreement between SIU Carbondale and the Faculty Association trumps operating papers. The *Employees Handbook* otherwise provides details regarding the process for the promotion and tenure review.

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

<http://pocaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.html> for summary of format). The candidate, chair/director, or designee, will upload non-confidential PDF documents into the appropriate sections of the digital dossier. **Confidential materials shall be uploaded only by the chair/director or appropriate designee.** The CTE, in collaboration with the APAA office, will provide training through workshops and/or one-on-one assistance. Secure access to the site 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. If there are potential biases or conflicts in the department/school or college that 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 or her own letter of recommendation.
- b. If minor, correctible procedural concerns are identified, the review process should be briefly paused so that these might be addressed. Questions or concerns should be directed to the Associate Provost for Academic Administration for consultation and assistance.
- c. 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 2010 – 2014 Collective Bargaining Agreement with the SIUC Faculty Association (Section 13.03.b.).
- d. 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.
- e. The evaluations and recommendations by committees, Faculty, and administrators are expected to be consistent with criteria of pertinent operating papers and University policies.
- f. Each reviewer has a single vote (or recommendation) on the dossier. Chairs/directors (or designees) and deans do 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.

Guidelines for Specific Dossier Sections³

Once the department/school review of the dossier begins, the dossier shall be closed to the inclusion of any additional materials. The only exceptions include the chair/director and dean's letters of recommendation, replacement of original versions of previously-received, electronically-transmitted external review letters, 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 for electronic dossier creation.

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

I. Candidate Information:

- 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.
- Section must include a signed statement from the candidate stating whether s/he has waived her/his right to see external review letters.
- Section must include Basic Information data, including a current *curriculum vitae* in standard University format, (see <http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.html>).

II. Letters of Recommendation and Review

- The chair/director and dean's letters of recommendation are included in this 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 external reviewers were chosen and the process by which external letters 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.
- The chair/director and dean's letters must be shared with the candidate at each level of review. In cases of negative recommendations, the candidate has the right to respond through a letter of rebuttal or response using the process outlined in the Faculty Association contract (see Section 13.01.m. and 13.02.i.). Letters of rebuttal to the chair/director or dean's letters must be added to the dossier before it proceeds to the next level of review.

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

- Following the chair/director's recommendation letter, 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.

III. Position Information

- 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.
- Include copies of annual workload assignments, along with a summary of workload assignments over the entire probationary period.
- Include sections of the department/school's and college's operating papers that pertain to promotion and 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.** 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 helpful to include a mean score for all classes taught during the evaluation period and an indication/explanation of departmental/school and/or college ICE norms and expectations.
- c. If the candidate chooses to include student support letters, the number of letters should be limited to five. 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.
- d. 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).
- e. 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.

- f. 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 PVC Promotion and Tenure page (<http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.html>), 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 or evaluation period (e.g., since the last promotion), unless specifically identified as part of the hiring process [*other works are taken into consideration via their inclusion on the CV*]. Papers and other works accepted unconditionally for publication, presentation, or production may be listed, but they should be clearly labeled as such. 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, or their designee, 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 PVC Promotion and Tenure page (<http://pvcaa.siu.edu/academic-administration/promotion-and-tenure-information/index.html>). 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 are 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 shall solicit external letters of evaluation from those who have special knowledge of the candidate's scholarly work. Although there is no standard requirement regarding the number of external review letters included in the dossier, five to six thoughtful letters of assessment is typical and will suffice in most cases. In general, 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.⁴

- 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 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 external review letters. This decision must be made *prior to solicitation* of review letters. A signed statement shall be included in the dossier to affirm the individual's decision to waive or not waive this right to confidentiality.
- 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; and
 - 3) 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. Reviewers should also be asked to disclose or describe any personal or professional relationship with the candidate.

⁴ Unless specified in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, pursuant to the University's Promotion Policies and Procedures for Faculty (Section III.A.)

- 4) **Reviewers should be instructed that they are NOT to assess whether the candidate would merit promotion/tenure at the reviewer's home institution.**
 - 5) **Reviewers should NOT be asked to provide a recommendation on promotion/tenure at SIU (this being a campus decision).**
- e. Regardless of whether the candidate chooses to waive confidentiality, each external reviewer should be coded and referred to by a letter or number (e.g., External 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 external 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