PROMOTION and TENURE
Guidelines and Policies for the College of Arts & Sciences

This guide, provided by the Office of the Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, is intended to assist candidates as they prepare a dossier for promotion and/or tenure review. The guidelines that follow offer more specific language than that found in the *Faculty Handbook* (Chapter 3.2.3 "Standard Dossier Format"):

> *Faculty members being considered for reappointment, promotion in rank or tenure will be asked to submit a dossier which is standard to the extent that it describes the way in which the faculty member has met each of the respective criteria as listed in this Handbook.*
>
> *The dossier should include a preface that must contain a **Curriculum Vita (CV)** describing the candidate's education and experience (both prior to coming to UTC and while at UTC) and a **one page executive summary** of the same. In addition, the preface may contain **a summary of EDO evaluations**. The dossier should be divided into the three distinct components based on the performance areas outlined in the EDO: teaching and advising; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and professional service to the University, profession, and community.*
>
> *The respective divisions of this dossier should include all documentation for and evidence of activities related to teaching, research, and service in which the faculty member has engaged since his/her initial appointment at UTC. A **teaching philosophy** and a record of **Student Ratings of Faculty (for a minimum of five years)** must be included in the dossier. Other materials should be included at the discretion of the individual faculty member, and, if possible, on the advice of the academic department's Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee. See Appendix A-C [of the Faculty Handbook] for information pertaining to appropriate activities in each of these three categories.* **(emphasis added)**

All faculty eligible for tenure and/or promotion are urged to familiarize themselves thoroughly with Chapter 3 <http://www.utc.edu/faculty-senate/pdfs/ch3handbook.pdf> of the *Faculty Handbook*. This guide does not in any way modify current tenure and promotion policy. Its sole purpose is to assist candidates and department heads in the preparation of documents which may be as informative and helpful as possible. In the end, candidates are responsible for the content and organization of their dossier. It is worth noting, therefore, that good documentation supports and clarifies; it does not obscure. An effective dossier provides what is needed but avoids volume for its own sake. Thus, this guide offers suggestions from which to select; it is not a rigid format to be followed.

NOTE: Candidates are asked to provide different "folders" for both tenure review and promotion review—*i.e.*, one for tenure review and one for promotion review. These folders are not duplicate copies of the dossier. Folders stay with University Records. The dossier, on the other hand, is returned to the candidate after review. Thus, when a candidate seeks both tenure and promotion, s/he will prepare two folders that are included in the same dossier, one folder for tenure and one for promotion. See "Tenure Folder Check List" and "Promotion Folder Check List" on the Dean's website: http://www.utc.edu/college-arts-sciences/forms.php

A. TEACHING

Documentation should attest to the quality of the candidate's teaching. Such documentation may take many forms.

- Student evaluations and EDO evaluations. *Candidates may wish to ask their department head to review their student evaluations over a period of years and write a summary which describes any evident trends. In addition, if the evaluations point to problems which have been resolved, the department head may wish to add an explanatory comment.*

- Representative syllabi and/or assessments of course planning and structure with regard to courses taught. *Candidates may include the syllabi of courses taught for the first time and/or syllabi of courses taught for the first time by a new pedagogical method or a new delivery system (*viz. online). *Candidates may wish to annotate such syllabi in order to make clear those elements which they believe document their commitment to effective teaching.*

- Peer or department head observations of classroom teaching. *Candidates may invite their department head, a faculty mentor, and/or department colleagues to observe their classroom teaching. It is reasonable, of course, to expect the observer to provide a written evaluation of observed strengths and weaknesses, along with justification of the evaluation. Because all departments in the College have departmental bylaws, candidates should follow departmental bylaws for teaching observations.*

- Performance of students with regard to any appropriate outcomes measures (departmental examinations, external tests, *etc.*). *Candidates may ask their department head to provide comparative student outcome results, if available. Or candidates are invited to discuss with their department head any means by which they may be better able to document student outcomes in their courses.*

- Awards for teaching excellence. *Candidates may wish to document nominations for and/or receipt of prestigious teaching awards. Effective documentation of such ancillary honors often depends on frank assessment by the department head of their relative significance.*

- Participation in professional development activities related to teaching. *Such activities may include both those candidates have attended individually and those candidates have attended with colleagues, e.g., the Instructional Excellence Retreat.*

- Participation in on-campus, regional, or national curriculum development activities.

- Teaching philosophy. (As noted in the *Faculty Handbook*, this is a separate document that is to be included in the dossier.) *During the reappointment process each faculty member provides a statement of teaching philosophy which usually evolves over the years.*

- Development and promulgation of innovative teaching materials and/or innovative teaching methods. *Candidates may elect to include in the dossier examples of innovative teaching materials or narrative accounts of innovative teaching methods. It is good practice to discuss such content with colleagues and/or with the department head. It is likewise good practice to provide context for and explanation of those materials and methods. Candidates may ask their department head and/or colleagues to review this content in order to determine the appropriateness or necessity of such materials.*

- Committee service directly related to the improvement of teaching.

- Receipt of instructional or curricular grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding title of project and nature of the accomplishments). *Determining whether individual grants are better reported under teaching or research is not always easy. Candidates must not, however, "double report" this grant information. A brief note in one section indicating where fuller documentation of an activity may be found offers a means of avoiding this problem.*

- Research and refereed publication in pedagogy. *The comment above on where to report is relevant here also.*

B. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, and CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Documentation should attest to the quality of the candidate's scholarship, research, or creative activity. Such documentation may take many forms, but it should ALWAYS be clear what type of publication is included in the CV, *i.e.*, monograph, edited collection, review essay, peer reviewed article, individually-authored article, poem, screen play, *etc*.

- Books and monographs published (with bibliographic information for each citation). *Including works not published in an attempt to make the dossier appear stronger in fact weakens the dossier. Candidates may describe unpublished works as "work in progress" and seek independent evaluation of such work, however. If candidates are not providing copies of the publications themselves, complete and accurate citation information MUST be in the CV, including number of pages. Custom-published works merit inclusion, but care should be taken to distinguish such books from those which go through the traditional vetting, i.e., peer review, process.*

- Articles published in refereed scholarly journals (with bibliographic information for each citation). *Published statements of editorial policies provide effective documentation regarding the "refereed" status of a publication. Candidates may also include information about the acceptance rate of journals in which their articles appear.*

- Reviews of books and monographs.

- Other articles. *Articles published through less formal processes (e.g., in academic newsletters, community bulletins, etc.) may offer valuable documentation of research.*

However, distinguishing clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications can enhance the credibility of the dossier. In general, candidates must take care not to mix genres of publications (e.g., including a poem or a column from a local newspaper among articles). Including a brief, one-page review among peer reviewed/refereed articles weakens the dossier.

- Commissioned Research. *Candidates may have conducted research in the discipline as part of a commissioned project and published the results. Be sure that any such efforts that result from paid consultantships are so identified. Distinguishing clearly between research and scholarly or creative efforts for which a candidate is paid and those conducted independently will enhance the credibility of the dossier.*

- Scholarly notes, reviews of scholarly books, *etc.* (with bibliographic information for each citation).

- Scholarly presentations (with information for each citation regarding the title of the presentation, the name of the organization sponsoring the meeting, the site of the meeting, and the date of the meeting). *Correspondence with meeting organizers and program materials often will emphasize the competitive nature of the program for which a candidate is selected. Less formal presentations may offer valuable documentation of research or may be included more appropriately under the categories of "Teaching" or "Service." Distinguishing clearly between refereed and non-refereed presentations can enhance the credibility of the dossier.*

- Receipt of basic research grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding the title of the project, the agency from which the grant was obtained, and the term of the grant).

- Authorship of grant proposals. *Candidates may be the Principal Investigator and likely the lead author on individual and/or group grants. Even when the grant has an instructional or service orientation, the basic work of authoring a grant proposal, particularly where it requires significant investigation, can itself be considered a contribution to research or creative activity.*

- Citations of research, scholarship, or creative activity in other works published. *Even a modest reference may suggest the influence of a candidate's work on his/her field.*

- UTC awards, grants, fellowships, *etc.* for research, scholarship, and creative activity.

- External awards, grants, fellowships, *etc.* for research, scholarship, and creative activity. *Do not neglect to mention modest grants from local foundations, state agencies, organizations, etc., so long as the received support indicates recognition of your professional expertise.*

- Recitals, art exhibitions, creative writing, dramatic performances, *etc.* (with information for each citation regarding publication, sites, dates, and whether the activity was invited or juried, local, regional, national or international). *Candidates should explore means of*

obtaining reactions that go beyond local notoriety. Competition judges, for example, may provide evaluations that may be used in the dossier.

- Critical reviews of the candidate's recitals, art exhibitions, creative writing, *etc*. *Candidates may ask their department head to invite critics to observe their work.*

- Other creative work. *Candidates should not cite activities and interests which have no relation to their academic assignment; however, candidates should not neglect any which reflect on their expertise. Similarly, while a candidate's documentation should emphasize activities consistent with their current assignment, candidates may wish to include as well activities which promise some expansion of their areas of competence.*

- Electronic publication. *Scholarly work is scholarly work, regardless of the medium in which it is published. As is the case with print publications, candidates must be careful to contextualize and identify their published works as peer-reviewed/refereed or not. That is, the same care must be given to citation and documentation for electronic publications that we have come to expect for print publications.*

- External assessments of research, scholarship, or creative activity. External peer review is a process whereby academic peers across the country provide input to tenure and promotion committees, department heads, deans, and provosts with regard to their appraisal of a candidate's creative or scholarly achievement within their discipline. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a reviewer to evaluate the teaching or the service of a candidate from afar, so external reviewers assess only a candidate's scholarly and/or creative works. *(See "External Review Process" information at the end of this document.)*

C. SERVICE

Supporting documentation should attest to the quality of the service performed by the candidate consistent with a) his or her professional expertise and b) his or her role in the University community. Such documentation may include the following.

- Receipt of public service grants from external agencies (with information for each citation regarding title of project, the granting agency, and the term of the grant).

- Successful completion of external public service assignments (with information for each citation regarding title of project and the nature of the accomplishments).

- External assessments of candidate's public service activity.

- UTC awards and grants for public service activity.

- Citations of public service in works of research or scholarship.

- External awards, grants, fellowships, *etc*. for public service activity.

- Service in campus governance (with information for each citation regarding offices held, assignments completed, *etc.*).

- Assessments of institutional service. *Candidates may request of committee chairs and colleagues written evaluations of the candidate's contributions to a committee in instances where such contributions exceed the norm.*

- Other committee service (college, departmental, *etc.*). *In documenting committee service, you should distinguish between appointments which required a major investment of time and energy and those which required only your occasional presence. Cite any distinctive accomplishments of the committees on which you served actively and describe your contributions to those accomplishments.*

- Public service expressive of candidate's professional expertise. *Although candidates should not cite activities which have no relation to their academic assignment, candidates should not neglect any activities which reflect their expertise. Similarly, while documentation should emphasize activities consistent with the candidate's current assignment, candidates may wish to include activities which promise some expansion of their expertise.*

D. EXTERNAL REVIEW POLICY

External peer review is a process whereby academic peers across the country may provide input to tenure and promotion committees, department heads, deans, and provosts with regard to their appraisal of a candidate's creative or scholarly achievement within their discipline. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a reviewer to evaluate the teaching or the service of a candidate from afar.

The College of Arts and Sciences External Review Policy will take effect on September 1, 2013. This is a broad and flexible policy for the departments within the College. Should departments wish to do so, they may submit to the Dean for approval, external review policies that are more refined or more rigorous than the policy listed below. This policy is in effect for any tenure-track faculty member hired after September 1, 2011. This policy is effective immediately for any tenured faculty member seeking promotion.

External Review Process

Prior to October 15th in the year that a faculty member applies for either tenure or promotion, the faculty member will provide the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent) a single portfolio (or in the case of a digital portfolio, a DVD or CD-ROM) documenting creative activity and/or research.

The faculty member will provide a list of potential external reviewers, no fewer than four, that the Committee will review. Each potential reviewer should be identified by name, title, institution, accompanied by a brief rationale for his/her selection.

The Committee will choose at least two reviewers from the faculty member's list. The

Committee will then generate a list of potential external reviewers, no fewer than four, that the faculty member will review. Each potential reviewer should be identified by name, title, institution, accompanied by a brief rationale for his/her selection. From the Committee's list, the candidate will choose no fewer than two reviewers. No fewer than four external reviewers remain at this point.

By November 1st, the chair of the Committee, with the Department Head*, will solicit via email a minimum of four and a maximum of seven external reviewers using a "neutral" template letter supplied by the College. Should some of the selected reviewers decline, the Committee would go back to the two lists and continue the process until at least THREE reviewers agree to submit an external review of the candidate's materials. Reviewers will then be mailed the candidate's scholarship portfolio and be asked to supply two things: 1) a one-to-two page letter of evaluation, and 2) a copy of their curriculum vitae by no later than January 15th.

Reviewer Selection Guidelines:

- Reviewers should be tenured and at or above the rank that the candidate seeks.
- Reviewers should be at a peer institution, an aspirant peer institution, or an institution that is universally recognized as excellent.
- Reviewers should not have had a working relationship with the candidate (dissertation director, chairperson, co-author, etc.)
- Reviewers should not be in contact with the candidate about the review process from the time that they accept the external review assignment. The candidate should also not attempt to contact the external reviewer.

External reviews will be delivered directly to the chair of the Committee. At minimum, the faculty member's dossier should include two reviewer recommendations. Should fewer than two external reviews be returned, the chair of the Committee will note the efforts made to solicit reviewers and their reviews. The chair must document the fact that only one external review was returned. The single external review, however, will not be included in the candidate's materials.

* In the event that the Department Head is him/herself being evaluated for tenure or promotion, the cover letter will be sent by the chair of the Committee and the Dean of the appropriate College.

Flow chart available on the following page.

FLOW CHART FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS

CANDIDATE Identifies no fewer than 4 potential reviewers	COMMITTEE Identifies no fewer than 4 potential reviewers

COMMITTEE Selects at least two names from Candidate List	CANDIDATE Selects at least two names from Committee List

COMMITTEE
Selects four to seven reviewers from both lists

COMMITTEE AND DEPARTMENT HEAD
Sends invitations to potential reviewers. Returns to the list if needed to ensure that at least three reviewers accept invitation.

CONCLUSION
A minimum of two external reviews must be completed to be included in the review process.

Last updated: August 2013