

Departmental Chair and Committee Guidelines for Tenure & Promotion Evaluation ***Revised, April 2019***

The revised Faculty Handbook policies for tenure and promotion that came into effect at the beginning of the academic year 2010-2011 require that dossiers will be reviewed independently by both the Department Chair and the Departmental Committee. Department 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 Departmental Chairs and Committees with some guidelines to help with their evaluation.

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. As stated in the Guide to Assembling an FPC 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. The candidate is also encouraged to talk with peers who have recently been successful in the process, in addition to the department chair, and to look at several people’s dossiers to see what was done well.”

Composition of Departmental Committee (2.7.3.3.1.1)

Departmental Committees consist of all the eligible tenured members of the candidate’s department and must include a minimum of three faculty members.

Excluded from the committee are:

- The candidate
- The department chair
- Any member of the department currently serving on FPC
- Any member of the department who has a conflict of interest

If there are not three eligible members of the department to serve on the committee, additional members will be appointed from outside the department by the Academic Dean in consultation with the department chair, committee members, and the candidate.

Evaluation of the Dossier by Departmental Committee (2.7.3.3.1.2)

FPC relies on the Departmental Committees 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 Departmental Committee is expected to analyze both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The Departmental evaluation *must provide* specific examples or evidence from the dossier to support its statements.

The Departmental 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 or promotion to full 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 full 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).

- 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 soundness 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 departmental needs and is the candidate's departmental service load at, below, or above what is expected within the department?

2. 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 Departmental Committee may take place prior to the final vote and letter writing of the Departmental Committee. If the

candidate requests a meeting in their cover letter then the Departmental Committee is responsible for making it happen (see 2.7.3.1.1).

2. The Departmental 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 represented, not just the majority view.
3. All members of the Departmental Committee should sign the evaluation letter.
4. A copy of the Departmental Committee's letter is given directly to the candidate and is not reviewed by the Department Chair. The Departmental Committee and the Department Chair conduct independent evaluations of the candidate.
5. The candidate will be allowed to read the Departmental Committee's evaluation prior to submission to the Dean's office. However, the candidate cannot add a rebuttal to the Departmental Committee's letter to the dossier. The candidate will be interviewed by FPC later in the semester and will be able to address any concerns raised in the Departmental Committee letter at that time.
6. The chair of the Departmental Committee submits the letter to the Dean's office; it is then uploaded to the candidate's e-dossier by the Dean's office.

Evaluation of the Dossier by the Department Chair (2.7.3.3.2)

1. The department chair should evaluate candidates' dossiers in light of the same criteria and guidelines used by the departmental committee; in addition, this evaluation should be informed by the chair's interaction as chair with the candidate.
2. The letter is written by the current Department Chair. In the case of a recent change in the position of Department Chair, refer to Section 2.7.3.3.2 of the Faculty Handbook which states, "If the department chair has not been chair during the entire period of time for which the candidate is being reviewed, the

chair should consult with the previous department chair(s).” However, the current Department Chair is expected to be the sole author of the letter and must not collaborate or co-write the letter with the former chair.

3. A copy of the Department Chair’s letter is given directly to the candidate and is not reviewed by the Department Committee. The Department Chair and the Departmental Committee conduct independent evaluations of the candidate.
4. The candidate will be allowed to read the Department Chair’s evaluation prior to submission to the Dean’s office. However, the candidate cannot add a rebuttal to the Department Chair’s letter to the dossier. The candidate will be interviewed by FPC later in the semester and will be able to address any concerns raised in the Department Chair’s letter at that time.
5. The Department Chair submits their letter to the Dean’s office; it is then uploaded to the candidate’s e-dossier.