

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE DOSSIERS COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES ~ 2011-2012

Please number all pages of the dossier consecutively, beginning with the Cover Sheet as page 1. Do not staple the dossier or place it in a binder; simply clip the tabs together with a spring clip.

Organization and responsibility of sections:

- *Cover sheet should be completed by the Chair.*
- *Tabs 1 & 2 are the responsibility of the candidate in consultation with his/her mentor (or some senior member of the faculty). The candidate should review and approve these sections for factual accuracy.*
- *Tab 3 includes two sections. The first section is written by the P&T Committee, independent of the candidate. The second section is the Chair's recommendation.*
- *Tab 4 is the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences recommendation.*
- *Tab 5 consists of external peer evaluations.*

Once the dossier is completed, Tabs 1 & 2 will continue to be available to the candidate; the remainder of the dossier, including the cover sheet, is to be considered and treated as a confidential document.

Cover Sheet for Promotion and Tenure Recommendation College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

- 1) Full Name:
- 2) Current Rank & Department:
- 3) Secondary appointments (departments or programs):
- 4) Campus Address:
- 5) Action Under Review:
- 6) Date of Present Rank:
- 7a) Is this a mandatory tenure review? ___ Yes ___ No ___ NA (promotion to professor)
 If no, date when candidate would normally be reviewed _____
 (Chair's recommendation should include reasons for forwarding non-mandatory tenure cases early)
- 7b) Did the candidate receive an official extension of his or her probationary period? ___ Yes ___ No
 If yes, how long was the extension? _____
 (Chair's recommendation should include details and documentation)

8) Highest Degree Earned:

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Field</u>
---------------	--------------------	-------------	--------------

9) Quantitative Summary of Productivity at ISU

- (A)
 - a. Average credit hours taught per year since initial appointment or since last promotion _____
 - b. Courses taught at ISU (list course numbers) _____

(B) Graduate Advising at ISU since appointment or last promotion (complete the following table)

<u>Graduate Advising Since</u> <u>Appointment or Last Promotion</u>		
	<u>Ph.D. Students</u>	<u>M.S./M.A. Students</u>
Major Professor	_____	_____
Committee Member Only	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____

(C) Number of publications based on work performed at ISU since appointment or last promotion, whichever is more recent. (Nearly always, this means during the past five years for candidates for promotion to associate professor. Publications based on work prior to appointment at ISU would be included only in cases where formal time on the tenure clock was granted and documented on the Letter of Intent):

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| a. Authored Books _____ | g. Refereed Journal Articles _____ |
| b. Authored Textbooks _____ | h. Non-Refereed Journal Articles _____ |
| c. Edited Books _____ | i. Refereed Proceedings from Major Conferences _____ |
| d. Book Chapters _____ | j. Refereed Presentations at Major Conferences _____ |
| e. Encyclopedia Entries _____ | k. Invited Presentations at Major Conferences or Institutions _____ |
| f. Juried exhibits/shows _____ | |
| l. Other (specify) _____ | |

10) Work Assignment

(A) Does the individual have any assignments beyond those expected of a regular faculty member in the department?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, they are/were _____

(B) *Optional*: Expected Distribution of Candidate's Responsibilities

- | |
|-----------------------------------|
| a. Teaching/Advising _____ |
| b. Research/Creative _____ |
| c. Service _____ |
| d. Administration _____ |
| e. Prof. Practice/Extension _____ |
| f. Other (specify) _____ |

11) Voting record on this recommendation: (Include only those that apply)

LAS policy requires a vote of the eligible voting faculty (EVF). Consistent with the university policy against double voting, the department P&T committee should not vote or make a recommendation (preferred action). If they do vote as a committee, then committee members may not participate in the EVF vote)

Departmental P&T Committee (totals)	Yes_____	No_____	Abstain_____	Absent_____
Eligible Department Faculty (totals)	Yes_____	No_____	Abstain_____	Absent_____
Chair's Recommendation	Yes_____	No_____		
College P&T Committee (totals)	Yes_____	No_____	Abstain_____	Absent_____
Dean's Recommendation	Yes_____	No_____		

**TAB 2: DOCUMENTATION OF CANDIDATE’S PERFORMANCE
IN SCHOLARSHIP & POSITION RESPONSIBILITIES**
(Please be as concise as possible. This section must not exceed 25 pages.)

2.1. Performance in Position Responsibilities (note that performance in research/creative position responsibilities is addressed under scholarship in section 2.2)

A. Performance in Teaching Position Responsibilities (if applicable).

1. Statement of teaching philosophy.
2. List courses taught in last five years, using a tabular format, beginning with the most recent semester. Include the following columns: semester/year taught, course number, course title, enrollment, and percent of course for which you were responsible.

Semester and Year	Course #	Course title	Enrollment	Percent of course for which responsible
-------------------	----------	--------------	------------	---

3. Summarize results of student evaluations for all courses in the last five years on the two standard questions. ***Please note that all departments should now be using the following 5-point scale for instructor evaluations: 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = satisfactory, 4 = good, and 5 = very good. If this scale was reversed during prior years in your department, please convert scores to the specified format for this table (contact our office if you have questions).***

Information for each course should be presented in tabular format using the following headings:

Semester and Year	Course #	Total Enrollment	% of Students Responding	Overall Rating of Instructor	Department Mean for Comparable Courses	Overall Rating of Course	Department Mean for Comparable Courses
-------------------	----------	------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

4. Course and curriculum development activity.

Summarize contributions to course and curriculum development.

5. Undergraduate Advising. (Describe the general departmental practice in undergraduate advising.)

a. Average number of advisees per year since appointment _____.

6. Graduate Advising. (Describe the general departmental practice in graduate advising.)

a. M.S./M.A. Program of Study Committees (since appointment or last promotion)

1. In progress:

- Chair/major professor (list names of students)
- Member of committee (list names of students)

2. Completed:

- Chair/major professor (list names of students)
- Member of committee (list names of students)

b. Ph.D. Program of Study Committees (since appointment or last promotion)

1. In progress:

- Chair/major professor (list names of students)
- Member of committee (list names of students)

2. Completed:

- Chair/major professor (list names of students)
- Member of committee (list names of students)

7. Honors and awards received for teaching

B. Performance in Extension/Professional Practice Responsibilities (if applicable).

Provide a summary of extension and/or professional practice activities since the initial appointment at ISU, as well as information on quality and impact. Examples of these activities include teaching extension courses; preparing informational and instructional materials; conducting workshops and conferences; consulting with public and private groups; acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information resources; engaging in clinical and diagnostic practice; and participating in activities that involve professional expertise for appropriate technical and professional associations. These activities may be local, regional, national, or international in scope.

1. Summary of extension and/or professional practice activities with information on quality and impact.
2. Honors and awards for work in extension or professional practice (please list)
3. Positions/offices held on regional, national, and international organizations, panels, or committees.

C. Performance in Institutional Service

While service contributions cannot be the sole basis for a promotion and/or tenure recommendation, every faculty member is expected to be involved in institutional service, and each promotion and tenure recommendation must provide evidence of such contributions. Institutional service may include committee service at the department, college, or university levels. It may also include international assignments on ISU projects that were not included in the extension or professional service category.

1. Please list committee memberships and/or chairships since appointment or the most recent promotion and comment on the quality of contributions to those groups.

2. Honors and awards for institutional service

2.2. Performance in Scholarship Substantially Done at ISU Since Appointment or Last Promotion

Scholarship may occur in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and/or extension/professional practice. Although the nature and evidence of scholarship varies somewhat across these scholarly domains and across departments in the college, there are at least three common features of all types of scholarship. A critical feature of all scholarship is that it produces products, often referred to as intellectual property, that are shared with appropriate audiences (e.g., as a journal article, book chapter, book, exhibit, software program, musical score, professional presentation, performance etc.). A second important feature of all scholarship is that it is subject to “peer review,” a critical evaluation of the product by those qualified to judge it. Finally, scholarship demonstrates a solid foundation and visibility in one’s field and original contributions to that field.

Please keep one complete set of reprints/publications in the departmental office that is available to the P&T Committee. These materials do not need to be submitted to the College office. This section should not be a verbatim repetition of the material listed in the CV.

A. Please address the significance of your scholarship, comment on the quality and impact of your work, and clarify your role in work that was done collaboratively with others. This description should address scholarship in any applicable scholarly domain(s) (teaching, research/creative activity, and/or extension/professional practice) based on work substantially done at ISU since appointment or the most recent promotion. Prior work would be included only in cases where formal time on the tenure clock was granted and documented on the Letter of Intent. Examples of peer reviewed scholarly products include refereed journal articles, books, chapters, textbooks, printed conference proceedings, conference presentations, and juried shows or exhibitions. Invited presentations and service on editorial boards are also important measures of national visibility.

Please remember that a copy of your curriculum vitae is included in Tab 1, so this section is primarily for providing an analysis of your work, its importance and impact, and your role in collaborative activities. Please limit your description to five pages.

- B. Please summarize your efforts and success in obtaining external support for your scholarship. External support for scholarship is a necessity in many disciplines and it also constitutes an additional measure of peer review.
- C. Please provide a summary of scholarship in progress and your plans for future scholarship.

TAB 3: DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Part 1: P&T Committee's Report

This section begins with a description of the preliminary review process in the department. This should be followed by the department's evaluative synthesis of the candidate's performance in position responsibilities and scholarship. The evaluation of performance in position responsibilities should consist of separate analyses of performance in each applicable domain (teaching, extension/professional practice, and institutional service). The evaluation of scholarship may include separate analyses of scholarship of teaching, scholarship of research/creative activity, and scholarship of extension/professional practice. Alternatively, and in keeping with the spirit of the University P&T document, the department's analysis of the candidate's scholarship may be combined into a single statement. When a faculty member is formally associated with another department or program, that department/program must be involved in the evaluation performance in scholarship and position responsibilities, consistent with LAS and university guidelines.

Please do not cite the names of the external reviewers in the narratives in Tab 3

- 3.1. Description of the P&T review process in the department. This summary briefly explains (1) selection of faculty members for review, (2) selection of faculty members to serve on the review committee, (3) voting eligibility, and (4) the department chair's role in the departmental review process.
- 3.2. Assessment of performance in position responsibilities in teaching/advising and/or extension/professional practice, as applicable, and institutional service. (Note that research/creative activities are evaluated in Section 3.3.)

Drawing on the materials presented in Tab 2, the department is expected to analyze the candidate's performance in position responsibilities and, wherever possible, submit documentation to support the evaluation and place candidate's performance in a comparative framework. Evaluations should focus on the quality of performance as well as the quantity of work performed in each area.

When evaluating performance in teaching, student evaluations should be documented, compared to departmental norms, and factored into the evaluation. A synthesis and evaluation of student comments may be helpful, but do not include pages of verbatim student comments. Please also note that peer evaluation of teaching, including classroom observations and the review of teaching materials, is an essential component in the evaluation of teaching.

- A. Assessment of performance in teaching (if applicable).
- B. Assessment of performance in extension and/or professional practice (if applicable).
- C. Assessment of performance in institutional service.

3.3. Assessment of scholarship in research/creative activity, teaching, and/or extension/professional practice.

Drawing on the materials in Tab 2 and the external reviews in Tab 5, the department is expected to evaluate the quantity, quality, impact and trajectory of scholarship. Wherever possible, submit documentation to support the evaluation and place candidate's performance in a comparative framework. Although this narrative should include summaries of completed, current, and future scholarship, the evaluation should focus on both the quality and the quantity of scholarship. The criteria used should be appropriate to the promotion being considered.

Faculty members who engage in research/creative activities are expected to make original contributions that are appropriate to their chosen area of specialization. Documentation supporting a departmental evaluation of a candidate's scholarship will vary among the different departments. In most disciplines within the college, evidence of research primarily consists of publication in refereed journals, scholarly books, and monographs. Other forms of dissemination of research results include oral presentations of such work to the academic community on campus, at other universities, and at regional, national, and international meetings. Invited lectures and papers presented, as well as requests to review and referee the scholarly work of others, are evidence of the individual's local, regional, national, and international reputation. In areas such as the arts, juried performances and exhibitions are also appropriate channels for demonstration of creative activity. Additional indicators of the quality or visibility of the research or creative activity may include reviews of the candidate's papers, books, performances and exhibitions; the candidate's ability to attract external research funding; and citations of the candidate's work by other scholars. Participation in or honors received from technical, professional, or scholarly societies appropriate to a candidate's academic discipline and public service related to the candidate's academic expertise might also be used to support the quality and national recognition of scholarship in the area of research or creative activity.

3.4. Future development and prospects

- A. Future development. Include an assessment of the candidate's prospects for future development and the basis for this assessment.
- B. Programmatic contribution. A detailed programmatic justification ("role in the department and beyond") is required for all tenure recommendations. Indicate how the present recommendation for the faculty member will continue to serve the missions of the department, the college, and the university. Identify specific programs in which the candidate has been, and will continue to be, involved.

3.5. Department P&T Committee’s Vote (if applicable)

LAS policy requires a vote of the eligible voting faculty (EVF). Consistent with the university policy against double voting, the department P&T committee should not vote or make a recommendation (preferred action). If they do vote as a committee, then committee members may not participate in the EVF vote)

Please record the committee vote below or check the “No Vote Taken” box.

Yes _____ # No _____ # Abstain _____ # Absent _____

No Vote Taken _____

3.6. Vote of Eligible Faculty (required)

Yes _____ # No _____ # Abstain _____ # Absent _____

Part 2: Department Chair’s Recommendation

3.7a. Chair’s Recommendation

Yes _____ No _____

3.7b. Chair’s Statement

The Chair’s statement should not simply be an advocacy letter for one position; rather, the statement should summarize the Chair’s critical analysis and weighting of the evidence for and against promotion in a manner that makes evident the thinking and rationale underlying the Chair’s recommendation.

TAB 4: COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. College P&T Committee Vote

Yes _____ # No _____ # Abstain _____ # Absent _____

4.2. College P&T Statement

4.3. Dean's Recommendation

Yes _____ No _____

4.4. Dean's Statement

TAB 5: EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Evaluations by Peers Outside the University. (See P&T guidelines regarding issues of confidentiality.)

Departments should make every effort to secure a minimum of five external letters, with the ideal number being six. The candidate will generate a list of potential external reviewers, and the committee will independently generate a list of appropriate external reviewers. At least one, and no more than 50%, of the letters should come from the candidate's list. Reviewers on both the candidate's list and the committee's list are counted as coming from the committee's list. It is expected that the external reviewers will be from peer institutions or better and that they are of an equal or higher rank than the candidate's proposed rank (e.g., associate and full professors may review cases for promotion to associate professors, and full professors may review cases for promotion to professor). Candidates are permitted to submit a list of up to three people in their field who are not to be contacted as reviewers. (This request, if made, must be put forward at the same time candidates submit names of potential reviewers.)

5.1. List of external reviewers

- A. Provide a brief statement explaining criteria for and method of selection.
- B. Indicate the reviewer's relationship to candidate. **Note that the university has very clear language about who should not be asked to serve as an external reviewer (e.g., major professors, members of dissertation committee, post-doc supervisors, and co-authors should not be used as external reviewers).**
- C. Clarify which reviewers were suggested by the candidate and which by the department.

It is strongly recommended that you use the table from the Provost's Office for tracking correspondence with external reviewers.

5.2. Sample request letter to referees

5.3. Letters of external reviewers and brief biographical summaries of reviewers

Note. Please include only a brief biographical summary (one or two pages maximum) for each external reviewer. Do not include the CV of each reviewer; simply retain the CV's in the department for reference and include only the brief biographical summary in this section.