



**Promotion and Tenure Dossier Preparation and Evaluation
Recommendations and Notes
July 8, 2009**

1. Assembly and Length of the Dossier

Preparation of a dossier for promotion with tenure, promotion, or tenure is the responsibility of the chair or director of the promoting/tenuring unit or, with the approval of the candidate, the chair's or director's designee. The latter is a particularly important consideration when a chair or director does not hold the rank to which the applicant aspires. Also, if a chair or director (or dean, at the college-level of review) feels too close to a candidate, or has a personal bias or conflict of interest, s/he should recuse herself/himself from assembling and commenting upon the dossier. It is the responsibility of the chair, director, or dean, however, to appoint a designee who is approved by the candidate.

The chair, director, or designee is obligated to ensure that the dossier contains all necessary information, and that these parts are presented in a logical manner. It is, however, the responsibility of the candidate to provide the contents of the dossier and to ensure they are adequate to the applicant's goal of presenting her/his case well.

Many dossiers are simply too large and a candidate's central message and record of accomplishments tend to become obscured by irrelevant material. The presentation in a dossier is necessarily case-driven, but as a general guideline a single three-ring binder, with ca. two inches of content, should constitute an adequate dossier.

Please **do not** use plastic page inserts; they make reading difficult and they add thickness and weight to the dossier.

2. Dossier Format – Front Matter and Inclusions

- a. Each dossier must include a signed statement from the candidate that s/he is aware of the contents of the dossier (with the exception of confidential letters, if the candidate has waived the right to see external evaluations) and that s/he concurs that the dossier is ready to be reviewed. The statement must be signed and dated prior to formal initiation of the review process in the department or school. A dossier that does not include this statement will not be reviewed;

- b. Each dossier must include a signed statement from the candidate that s/he has or has not waived her/his right to see external letters of review. This statement must also be signed and dated prior to formal initiation of the review process in the department or school. A dossier that does not include this statement will not be reviewed;
- c. The standard front matter, as found in the *Employees Handbook*, and a table of contents should be included. Tabs should be used to delineate the various sections of the dossier;
- d. An up-to-date copy of the candidate's curriculum *vitae* should be included, in the standard University format (<http://www.siu.edu/~facsenat/cvform.html>);
- e. Include copies of the ad copy and position description for the search that hired the candidate for promotion with tenure or tenure;
- f. Copies of the letter of offer to the candidate, as well as copies of any side letters on start-up commitments and job expectations, should be included in the dossier;
- g. Copies of annual reviews of pre-tenure candidates should be included in the dossier;
- h. Descriptions of candidates' annual workload assignments should be included in the dossier;
- i. Do not submit the department's, school's, or college's entire operating paper in dossier; only submit a copy of the section on promotion and tenure from the department and college papers;
- j. Copies of articles, chapters, images, scripts; syllabi, etc., **should not** be included in the dossier. These are supportive materials for review by department, school, and college administrators and Faculty. They do not come to the Provost and Vice Chancellor area with the dossier, unless requested by the Provost. Therefore, they should be referred to and described in detail by the applicant, chair, director, and/or dean if they are critical to the evaluation of the candidate;
- k. Once the department or school review of a candidate's dossier begins, the dossier is closed to any additional materials. The exceptions include: the chair's/director's or designee's letter, the dean's or designee's letter, replacement with original documents of previously received e-mailed or faxed letters from external reviewers, and letters of rebuttal or response by candidates to the recommendations of administrators;
- l. E-mailed, faxed, or posted external evaluations, or candidates' materials, received after the review process begins, cannot be added to the dossier. Department, school and

college evaluators may, however, consider positive events that occur during the review process, provided these document information already provided in the dossier.

3. Department, School, and College Evaluations

- a. If there are any potential biases, or personality or political problems in the department, school, or college that might interfere with an accurate and responsible review, administrators are expected to resolve them before a review begins and/or to acknowledge them during in their comments in dossiers;
- b. If an applicant for promotion with tenure, promotion, or tenure is accused of misconduct during the review process, or if other negative circumstances arise during the review, the review should be suspended until allegations are adjudicated or negative events are resolved;
- c. Chair's, director's, dean's, or designee's recommendations must be shared with candidates at each level of review and candidates have the right to respond to recommendations at each level of review;
- d. Chairs, directors, deans, and designees receive candidates' rebuttals to their recommendations and they must ensure these are added to the dossier before it goes to the next level of review. Administrators are not to respond in writing to candidates' rebuttals, however, unless asked to do so by the Provost and Vice Chancellor;
- e. The Faculty Association contract and operating papers of the department, school, and college inform the processes for review of dossiers. College operating papers trump department and school operating papers, and the Faculty Association contract trumps operating papers when there is concern over process;
- f. 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 a later iteration of the operating paper(s);
- g. The evaluations and recommendations by department and school administrators, committees, designees, and Faculty are expected to be consistent with criteria of pertinent operating paper(s), just as candidates' careers have been informed by them, and consistent with critique provided probationary candidates in annual letters of review;
- h. Prior to the beginning of the review process, candidates and evaluators should agree how dissenting or minority opinions should be communicated to colleagues, review committees, or administrators, or reported in a candidate's dossier;

- i. Chair, director, dean, or designee letters of evaluation and recommendation should not be written before department, school, or college committees or Faculty meet to review candidates. If early drafts are written prior to these reviews, they should be not shared with the committee(s) or Faculty. To do so can be interpreted as attempts to influence the committee(s) or Faculty;
- j. Letters by chairs, directors, deans, or designees must include a statement outlining the procedures followed in the department, school, or college for evaluating a candidate;
- k. If administrators received written summaries or analyses from department, school, or college review committees, these should be included in dossiers, together with committee votes;
- l. Letters of evaluation and recommendation from chairs, directors, deans, and designees must present clearly the arguments and reasons underlying promotion and/or tenure recommendations. Abstentions or disagreements among committee members or Faculty in departments and schools, or between departments or schools and colleges, must be explained;
- m. Candidates and evaluators should be familiar with and agree upon voting protocols at each level of a dossier review before the review process begins;
- n. Chairs, directors, and designees should make it clear that their personal votes on promotion with tenure, promotion, or tenure **are not** included in the reported votes of the department and school review committees and Faculty. Administrators' opinions and recommendations are recorded separately in the letters they include in dossiers.

4. External Evaluations

One of the most substantive and influential inclusions in a dossier is letters of evaluation from acknowledged national and international authorities familiar with a candidate's area of work – individuals who are able to offer informed and objective appraisals. Careful thought should be given to the selection of these reviewers, their credentials, and the nature of reviewers' academic or non-academic affiliations.

While no firm rules can be established that will fit all disciplines and professions, every effort should be made to exclude reviewers whose analyses of a candidate's work might be viewed as biased. For example, co-authors, personal friends, relatives, or former advisers and teachers should not be asked to provide letters of evaluation. The goal is to identify external reviewers who can assess a candidate's work from an appropriate "arm's-length" perspective. External reviewers are evaluators, not advocates.

The dossier belongs to the candidate, not a team, and the dossier review is intended to assess a candidate's personal contributions, productivity, and disciplinary impact. If a candidate's work is co-authored, co-created, or co-performed, it is the responsibility of the candidate, chair, director, dean, or designee to explain the nature of the working relationships, divisions of labor, etc. Letters from co-authors or other associates can be included in the dossier for this purpose.

In selecting external reviewers, the chair, director, or designee should work closely with the candidate and Faculty to identify qualified individuals. The selection process will vary according to disciplinary membership and standards, and guided by department and school operating papers. Home affiliations (employers) and academic ranks of reviewers are important, however. Reviewers should come from SIUC peer institutions or higher (or equivalents in non-academic venues) and they should hold ranks (or equivalents in experience) above the current rank of the applicant.

As noted above, each candidate should be given the opportunity to waive or not waive her/his right to see the external letters **before** the letters of reference are requested. In addition:

- a. Chairs, directors, or designees request external reviews, not candidates;
- b. External reviews should be addressed to chairs, directors, or designees, not candidates;
- c. Requests for and receipt of letters of external evaluation must occur **before** the department or school review of a candidate's dossier begins;
- d. Although no precise number of letters from external reviewers is required, normally 5-6 thoughtful letters of assessment suffice. A greater number of potential reviewers may have to be contacted in order to arrive at this level of external review;
- e. A candidate's curriculum *vitae*, together with selected works (publications, images, videos, etc.), should be included with letters sent to external reviewers;
- f. Reviewers should be advised of what is expected of them. They should be asked to critique candidates in the contexts of disciplines and from broad perspectives on artistic and scholarly specialties. In Library Affairs, for example, external reviewers are sought for evaluation of teaching/librarianship, research and service. Reviewers **should not** be asked if the candidate would merit promotion with tenure, promotion, or tenure at her/his home institution;
- g. Letters to external reviewers should include a statement informing the reviewer of the candidate's decision whether to waive access to external evaluations;
- h. A sample copy of the letter sent to external reviewers, with a list of materials submitted to them, should be included in the dossier;

- i. Once received, letters from external reviewers **cannot** be censored, edited, or excluded from the dossier by a candidate, Faculty, chair, director, dean, or designee;
- j. In her/his letter of evaluation and recommendation in the dossier, the chair or director must explain how and why external reviewers were chosen;
- k. A short paragraph introducing each reviewer and their qualifications for doing an evaluation should be included in the dossier. Please do not include the reviewer's complete curriculum vitae; a one-paragraph statement is sufficient;
- l. Regardless of whether the candidate chooses to waive access to letters, administrators should code and refer to external reviewers by letter or number (e.g., "External Reviewer A," etc.), not by her/his name or institution;
- m. External reviews are solicited to assist administrators, review committees, and Faculty in their evaluations of candidates. Administrator and review committee comments in dossiers should acknowledge the comments of external reviewers, either collectively or individually (when and where appropriate). Disagreements between external reviewers, or between reviewers and administrators, committees, or Faculty should be explained.

5. Dossier Format – Teaching Section

- a. The candidate should include in her/his dossier a reflective statement on teaching – her/his philosophy, goals, and approach in obtaining positive learning outcomes (a maximum of two-to-three pages);
- b. Awards and honors for teaching excellence, if any, should be listed in a candidate's curriculum vitae;
- c. Copies of course syllabi and exams **should not** be included in the dossier;
- d. Written reviews of teaching and mentorship by departmental peers (at least two) should be included in the dossier. For Library Affairs, these reviews should consist of an assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the candidate's efforts in librarianship. These peer letters should focus on how materials are organized for courses (syllabi, nature of required readings/assignments, examination procedures, faculty availability), and assessment of candidates' ability to convey information and encourage students. Evaluations should be based upon direct observations of actual classroom teaching performance and departmental activities;
- e. The dossier **should not** include all Instructor Course Evaluation (ICE) printouts or their equivalents – the raw data. There should be **summaries** of ICE scores or data from other evaluation instrument(s) for each course. These summaries should be presented

- in tabular form, and include the semester the class was taught, the number of students in class, the number of students completing the evaluations, the mean values, etc.;
- f. Chairs, directors, deans and designees should discuss and evaluate ICE scores or their equivalents from the perspective of department, school, or college expectations and norms. If these expectations or norms are not formally stated in operating papers or elsewhere, their derivation must be explained;
 - g. Administrators should provide evaluations of candidates' contributions to indirect teaching;
 - h. A candidate's curriculum *vitae* or dossier should include a list of undergraduate and graduate students advised, and roles played by the candidate in their education and mentoring – director of undergraduate or graduate studies in the department or school, dissertation or thesis advisor, dissertation or thesis committee member, undergraduate research sponsor, etc.;
 - i. Letters of evaluation from students are not required, but if included, they should be kept to a reasonable number, approximately five. To reduce any appearance of conflict of interest, these letters should be from former students, not current students;
 - j. Letters from students are to be solicited by the chair, director, or designee, not the candidate. Letters are to be delivered to the chair, director, or designee, not the candidate;
 - k. Student comments solicited by a candidate, and unsolicited hand-written letters or notes of praise or thanks delivered to the candidate, add little to the dossier and they should not be included.

6. Dossier Format – Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity Section

- a. The candidate should include a reflective statement that summarizes the nature or focus of her/his scholarship/research/creative activity. The statement should be succinct (no more than two-to-three pages);
- b. A complete list of books, scientific/scholarly papers, artistic exhibitions or performances, abstracts, presentations, patents and other distinctions, with the appropriate reference numbers or other designations, should be in a candidate's curriculum *vitae* and **should not** be repeated in this section;
- c. Only accomplished artistic work, performances, articles, chapters, books, etc. (already accepted, published, or performed, with appropriate documentation) will be the focus

- of a dossier review. Work in progress can be listed and so labeled, but with the understanding that the status of this work is not clear because it has not been peer-reviewed;
- d. Chair, directors, or designees must complete and include in the dossier an “Evidence and Evaluation of Research” chart that identifies and rates the venues of a candidate’s art and scholarship. The intent of this chart is to help reviewers assess the quality and impact of disciplinary venues. Only publications or activities that have occurred since a candidate’s hiring data or since a candidate’s last promotion should be ranked;
 - e. The quality or ranking of the venues for creative activities and scholarly work in a candidate’s area of specialty should be agreed upon by department and school administrators, Faculty, and candidates **before** assembly and submission of a dossier for review. These rankings **should not** be the product of a dossier review, with potential for contention between an applicant and her/his hiring administrator(s) or Faculty.

7. Dossier Format – Service and Commitment

- a. A candidate should include a brief reflective essay that highlights the candidate’s commitment to departmental, college, university, professional, and community service, describing the role service plays in her/his academic career. Again, two-to-three pages should suffice;
- b. A candidate’s curriculum *vitae* or this section of a dossier should include a list of service activities – service to the University (department, college, and university committees), service to the profession (offices held, service on grant review panels and editorial boards, etc.), and service to the community (service organizations, volunteer activities, and the like);
- c. Unless otherwise described or stated formally, is assumed that expectations for University and professional service and commitment will vary according to the academic rank of the candidate (more professional contributions expected from full professors, for example) and the requirements of a department, school, and college;
- d. Community service enriches one’s life and the lives of colleagues and residents of the region. Documentation of community service in the dossier is not as important, however, as that of University and professional service;
- e. Chairs, directors, or designees may solicit evidence of outcomes associated with service and include such evidence in dossiers. Comments solicited by a candidate, or unsolicited hand-written letters or notes of praise or thanks delivered to a candidate add little to the dossier, however, and they should not be included.