

Guidelines for Review Committees, School Deans, and Assistant Deans for Tenure & Promotion Evaluations, Revised, May 2025

The Faculty Handbook requires that dossiers be reviewed independently by (1) the candidate's School and Assistant Dean (together) and (2) a Review Committee of program faculty. Review of dossiers is covered in the Faculty Handbook under Section 2.7.3.3. This document is an attempt to clarify the process as outlined in the Handbook and to provide evaluators with some guidelines to help with their evaluation.

Here is an executive summary/checklist of important information:

- ☐ All evaluators are expected to thoroughly review all materials in a candidate's dossier and evaluate them in an unbiased fashion strictly to the standards in the faculty handbook, not personal preference. The letter should be honest, thorough, and professional. It must also include *all* pertinent information the evaluator(s) wish FPC to know.
- ☐ If an evaluator notices any missing content in a dossier, they should reach out to the chair of FPC and the Vice President of Academic Affairs as soon as possible via email.
- ☐ FPC (including the Vice President of Academic Affairs) rely heavily on the evaluations provided by program faculty and the candidate's supervisors, especially in the area of Professional Life. Please ensure these letters provide sufficient context when assessing a candidate's work in each of the three areas (Teaching, Professional Life, and Service).
- ☐ If a candidate requests an interview with either their Review Committee or their School and Assistant Dean, these must be granted prior to final voting and letter writing. Review Committees and School/Assistant Deans may request an interview with the candidate if they wish. FPC strongly encourages reviewers to request an interview with the candidate if they are considering a negative recommendation to gain as much information as possible prior to finalizing their evaluation. Interviewers should also engage in good practices with interviewing, as they would an external candidate for a faculty position, as described further below.
- ☐ Letters must clearly state the result of the evaluation with votes. In the event of a disagreement, all views must be represented in the letter.
 - For pre-tenure review, evaluators must assess making "strong progress towards tenure", "satisfactory progress towards tenure", or "not yet making satisfactory progress towards tenure" in each of the three areas, Teaching, Professional Life, and Service.
 - For tenure and/or promotion reviews, evaluators must either recommend that tenure and/or promotion be granted or not.
 - FPC assumes all signatories to the letter have all read and agree to the text of the letter in its entirety.
- ☐ Email the letters to the candidate, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Jenna Alcorn by the deadline given in the faculty handbook (September 24 for tenure and/or promotion reviews, January 31 for pre-tenure reviews)

At the time dossiers are due (see Tenure & Promotion Calendar), they should be considered complete and finished. To aid in revision, feedback should be solicited by the candidate *prior* to submission of the dossier. If a candidate has questions about any of the suggestions below, or

needs clarification on any aspect of compiling the dossier, the candidate is encouraged to consult with the chair of FPC or the Vice President of Academic Affairs before the dossier is submitted.

If any evaluator notices anything is missing during the review of a candidate's dossier, they should contact the chair of FPC and the Vice President of Academic Affairs immediately.

Composition of Review Committee (2.7.3.3.1.1)

A candidate's Review Committee consists of tenured faculty members selected by the Vice President of Academic Affairs after a nomination process. Excluded from the committee are:

- The candidate
- The candidate's School and Assistant Dean
- Any member of the candidate's degree program(s) currently serving on FPC
- Any member of the candidate's degree program(s) who has a conflict of interest

Evaluation of the Dossier by Review Committee (2.7.3.3.1.2)

FPC relies on the Review Committee to *critically evaluate* the dossier with particular regard to the nuances of the candidate's discipline. Using section 2.6 as its primary guide, the Review Committee is expected to analyze both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. This evaluation *must provide* specific examples or evidence from the dossier to support its statements.

The Review Committee should strongly consider providing the following information that assists FPC in gaining perspective about the candidate. Especially helpful is providing information or perspective that would not be evident in the dossier itself.

- Teaching (2.6.1.1 #3, 2.6.2.1.3 #3)
 1. For candidates under review for either tenure, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor, speak to what extent and in what ways the candidate demonstrates in their teaching the hallmarks of high-quality college courses listed in the handbook (2.6.1.1 #3).
 2. For tenure candidates, discuss their potential for growth in teaching (2.6.1.1 #6).
 3. For Professor candidates, speak to what extent and in what ways the candidate demonstrates in their teaching the hallmarks of an excellent teacher listed in the handbook (2.6.2.1.3 #3), beyond the hallmarks of high-quality college courses.
- Professional Life (2.6.1.1 #4, 2.6.2.1.3 #4)
 1. For scholarly work, comment on the *quality* of the publication(s) and the *venue(s)* in which it appears. For their artistic work, comment on the quality of the performance(s)/exhibition(s)/recorded work(s) and the venue(s) in which it appears.
 2. What is the *quality of and/or status at* meetings for which the candidate gives presentations? Comment on the appropriateness of these meetings for the

- candidate's area of specialty. Do you agree with the candidate's assessment of whether each meeting is regional or national/international?
3. Do you agree with the categorization of the candidate's activities in each of the categories 2-4d found in section 2.6.3 of the Handbook? Do you believe they have met the relevant standards? Comment on any deviations from the average achievement levels found in Section 2.6.3.6 or 2.6.3.7 of the Faculty Handbook.
 4. Discuss the clarity/coherence of the candidate's research agenda. For instance, describe the central question(s) and whether the candidate's work meaningfully addresses these questions.
 5. For tenure candidates, discuss their potential for growth in the area of professional life (2.6.1.1 #6).
- Service and Advising (2.6.1.1 #5, 2.6.2.1.3 #5)
 1. How has the candidate helped out with program/School needs and is the candidate's program/School service load at, below, or above what is expected within the program/School?
 2. If applicable, to what extent is the candidate effective at advising or mentoring students on their academic and career goals?
 3. For tenure candidates, discuss their potential for growth in the area of service (2.6.1.1 #6).

Other Related Issues:

1. An interview of the candidate by the Review Committee may take place prior to the final vote and letter writing. If the candidate requests a meeting in their cover letter then the Review Committee is responsible for making it happen (see 2.7.3.1.2). The Review Committee may request an interview with the candidate if they wish, but the candidate is not obligated to attend. FPC strongly encourages Review Committees engage in an interview with the candidate before their letter writing if there is any significant likelihood of a negative recommendation.
2. Interviewers should engage in good practices with interviewing, as they would an external candidate for a faculty position (that is, consider tone of questions, stick to questions relevant to the tenure and/or promotion standards, avoid questions that could lead to bias or discrimination on the basis of protected classes, characteristics, or personal information, be transparent and direct in questions, etc.). If interviewers have questions on what is not appropriate to ask, FPC encourages them to engage in discussions with Human Resources.
3. The Review Committee's vote and recommendation on the candidate must be reported in the letter (see 2.7.3.2.1). If the vote is not unanimous, the dissenting view must be represented in the letter. All members of the committee have the responsibility to make sure all of the viewpoints of the committee are accurately represented, not just the majority view.
4. All members of the Review Committee should sign the evaluation letter.

5. A copy of the Review Committee's letter is given directly to the candidate and is not reviewed by the School Dean or Assistant Dean. The Review Committee and the School Dean/Assistant Dean conduct independent evaluations of the candidate.
6. The candidate will be allowed to read the Review Committee's evaluation prior to their evaluation by FPC. However, the candidate cannot add a rebuttal to the Review Committee's letter to the dossier. If the candidate is interviewed by FPC later in the semester, they will be able to address any concerns raised in the Review Committee letter at that time.
7. The chair of the Review Committee submits the letter to the Candidate, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and their administrative assistant; it is then uploaded to the candidate's e-dossier by the Academic Affairs.

Evaluation of the Dossier by the School Dean and Assistant Dean (2.7.3.3.2)

1. The candidate's School Dean and Assistant Dean, together, should evaluate candidates' dossiers in light of the same criteria and guidelines used by the Review Committee; in addition, this evaluation should be informed by their supervisory interaction with the candidate.
2. If a candidate has requested an interview with their School and Assistant Dean, it must be granted prior to their voting and authoring of their letter of evaluation. The School and Assistant Deans are responsible for making this happen. The School and Assistant Deans may request an interview with the candidate if they wish, but the candidate is not obligated to attend. FPC strongly encourages an interview with the candidate before their letter writing if there is any significant likelihood of a negative recommendation.
3. Interviewers should engage in good practices with interviewing, as they would an external candidate for a faculty position (that is, consider tone of questions, stick to questions relevant to the tenure and/or promotion standards, avoid questions that could lead to bias or discrimination on the basis of protected classes, characteristics, or personal information, be transparent and direct in questions, etc.). If interviewers have questions on what is not appropriate to ask, FPC encourages them to engage in discussions with Human Resources.
4. At the end of their deliberations, the candidate's School and Assistant Deans will co-author a letter that communicates their opinions and their votes. In case of disagreement, all views should be represented in the letter. This letter should follow the guidelines outlined in 2.7.3.2.
5. The letter is written by the candidate's *current* School and Assistant Dean. In cases where these faculty have not been in these supervisory roles during the entire time for which the candidate is being reviewed, they should consult with their predecessors (as stated in 2.7.3.3.2). However, the current School and Assistant Deans are expected to author the letter and must not co-write the letter with the former supervisor.
6. A copy of the letter is emailed to the candidate and is not reviewed by the Review Committee. The Review Committee and the School Dean/Assistant Dean conduct independent evaluations of the candidate.
7. The candidate will be allowed to read the School/Assistant Dean's evaluation prior to their evaluation by FPC. However, the candidate cannot add a rebuttal to the letter in the dossier. If the candidate is interviewed by FPC later in the semester, they will be able to address any concerns raised in the letter at that time.
8. The School Dean submits the letter to the Candidate, the Assistant Dean, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and their administrative assistant; it is then uploaded to the candidate's e-dossier by the Academic Affairs.