

Case Western Reserve University
College of Arts and Sciences

**Supplemental Instructions 2008-09
PROMOTION AND TENURE**

University policies for faculty promotion and tenure are presented in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3 (<http://www.case.edu/president/facsen/frames/handbook/CASEFH2006.pdf>). Please review that information carefully. These instructions are supplemental to those policies; please read this document carefully as well. All forms, policies, guidelines, samples, etc. mentioned herein are available on the college's web site (<http://www.case.edu/artsci/forms/>).

An exception to university principles of voting has been established for the college in cases involving promotion or tenure: when a member of the college's Committee on Appointments is also a member of the candidate's department or special committee, the member shall vote at that level but *shall not participate in the discussion or decision within the Committee on Appointments*.

The Committee on Appointments reviews all files involving promotion or tenure and provides an evaluation to the dean. The committee normally will request a meeting with the department or special committee chair to discuss any questions that arise during the review. The chair's role at this meeting is to answer the committee's questions in an objective, non-partisan manner—not to present the file, add materials to it, or otherwise “make the case” for the candidate. If important new information is received (e.g., approval of a grant application or acceptance of a manuscript for publication), the chair should contact the dean to discuss whether and how this information may be added to the candidate's file. In most instances, the file should be complete when it is reviewed by the eligible department faculty or special committee members. This is to ensure that reviewers at all levels read, discuss, and base their evaluations on the same materials.

The Provost's Office reminds us that “...the promotion/tenure process is confidential and the dean or committee chair should remind participants of the importance of confidentiality before they begin their review. Candidates are entitled to know how the process works and to be informed of the results (recommendation reached, not the numeric vote or contents of the recommendation memo) as the application progresses through the levels of review. Candidates should not be privy to specifics such as who was on the final list of evaluators (selected by the dean), who has or has not written, or even how many letters have arrived. The letters of request to potential evaluators must come from the dean or other person designated by the dean; no one else should approach a potential evaluator to discuss a candidacy. Inappropriate contact from others can compromise the process and jeopardize the candidacy.”

Suggested Timeline for Preparing File

Department chairs and chairs of special p/t committees appointed by the dean may find this information helpful. It is a suggested timeline only and has been written to help a department or committee move through the process of assembling a file in a smooth, orderly fashion. The only firm date is October 1 when the completed file is due in the dean's office.

Reporting Results

In accordance with instructions in the Faculty Handbook, the department or special committee chair shall promptly notify the candidate of the recommendation established by the departmental or special committee deliberations. This should occur at a meeting between the chair and the candidate, normally by October 1 or as soon as possible thereafter. The chair shall communicate the procedure followed and

the recommendation established but not divulge the detailed nature of the deliberations, the names of the participants, or the actual vote count. If the department chair is the candidate, the dean will provide this information.

The provost has mandated that the candidate next receive word at the conclusion of the college-level review. The dean will provide information to the candidate's department chair or to the chair of a special committee who shall communicate this information to the candidate.

The final action on the candidate's file occurs at the university level (provost, advisory committee, president, and Board of Trustees) as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook. The results are normally sent to the dean in the spring semester. The dean promptly notifies the chair, who, in turn, shall promptly share this information with the candidate. Promotions and awards of tenure are effective July 1 of the upcoming fiscal year.

Cover Sheet

This form lists the information to be included in the candidate's file. Incomplete files will be returned to the department for completion.

Vote Tally

Use this form to record the votes for promotion and/or tenure. Each action requires a separate vote. The total number of votes recorded must match the number eligible to vote, including the chair. See the sections entitled *Faculty Evaluation and Vote* and *Abstentions*, below.

Faculty Evaluation and Vote

A vote in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook is required on any request for promotion or tenure. All eligible departmental faculty or special committee members—including those on leave or away from campus for other reasons—must be given the opportunity to review the candidate's file and to vote. When a candidate is seeking both promotion and tenure, the department or committee shall vote on each request separately. The vote count (for, against, abstain) must match the number of faculty eligible to participate, including the chair. Someone other than the department or special committee chair (who will write a separate evaluation; see below) shall prepare a thorough report of the discussion concerning the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The report must convey the sense of the participants' deliberations. If the vote is not unanimous, the report should explain the basis for divided opinion. This report shall include the names of those who attended the meeting and describe the means by which those not in attendance were given the opportunity to review the materials and to vote. All those eligible to participate must have an opportunity to review the report before the file is forwarded to the dean. An eligible participant who feels that the report is not a thorough or accurate description of the discussion may submit a letter to the dean in accordance with instructions in the Faculty Handbook. This letter should be submitted no later than the due date shown at the end of this document, unless alternate arrangements have been made with the dean.

Abstentions

The provost has informed us that unwillingness to cast a vote in the affirmative will be construed as a lack of endorsement, thus, *abstentions are interpreted as negative*. Members of a deliberating body should disqualify themselves prior to discussion on any candidacy on which they believe they should not cast a vote; the reason for disqualification should be explicitly stated in a note that is signed by the faculty member. A faculty member who has recused himself or herself is not classified as a potential voter on the case and does not count as an abstention. An abstention is recorded only if an eligible voter elects not to cast an affirmative or negative vote after deliberating.

Chair's Evaluation

The department or special committee chair is to write a separate, thorough evaluation of the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In the evaluation, the chair should also explain disciplinary conventions governing the format of the C.V., the normal protocol for publications (or other evidence of research and scholarship) within the discipline, any variations in the process for teaching evaluations, and any special considerations regarding service contributions within the discipline. This information is particularly helpful to reviewers at various levels who may not be familiar with standards in the candidate's discipline and how they differ from standards in other disciplines.

Curriculum Vitae

The candidate shall submit a current and comprehensive C.V. to the department chair or special committee chair. The C.V. should be dated, the pages numbered, and titles of the publications submitted with the promotion/tenure file clearly indicated by an asterisk. The C.V. must be well organized and complete, conveying the candidate's educational and career history and listing the correct academic titles and the years of current and past positions. The names of professional organizations, journals, etc. should be written out so that they are intelligible to readers outside the candidate's discipline. The C.V. should list the names of contributors to multi-authored publications in the same order as on the original publication. A note on the C.V. should indicate the convention for order of authorship in the candidate's discipline.

Candidate's Statements on Research, Teaching, and Service

Research contributions may be described in the curriculum vitae or in a separate supplement. The description of research contributions will include funding history with dates, amounts, and total cost for the years outlined; sources of research grants; and the candidate's percentage effort and role (e.g., principal investigator, co-investigator) in the project. The narrative description must be concise, not more than two pages. It is not intended to restate the C.V. in narrative form.

A summary of teaching contributions should be presented as a narrative description of teaching, which may be incorporated into the C.V. and should not exceed two pages.

It is generally sufficient to document service activities by listing them in the C.V. A list of service activities, together with comments in the letters of evaluation, is usually adequate to document the candidate's role as a citizen of the academic community. If service activities are described in a separate document, the description should be one page or less.

Publications

To demonstrate success in research or scholarship, each file should contain the candidate's three most important publications. These should be noted on the candidate's CV as well. In many disciplines, this requirement will be fulfilled with copies of monographs, articles, book chapters, etc. In some disciplines, however, the quality and quantity of scholarship may be represented in a different manner. In some cases a faculty member in the performing arts (theater, dance, music) may demonstrate productivity in a discipline through acting, stage direction, set design, choreography and performance, conducting, orchestral performance, etc. As the college's Committee on Appointments evaluates a diverse selection of candidate files each year, it is imperative that departments clearly define their criteria for successful demonstration of scholarship and that the criteria be equivalent to those required by Case's peer institutions. The provost has informed us that PDF submissions are preferred; JPG documents are not accepted.

Course Evaluations

In accordance with the college's Policy on Evaluation of Teaching, the results of student course evaluations *since the candidate's most recent promotion* are to be included in the file. The chair or the chair's designate should prepare a narrative overview of the statistical data from the numerical ratings on the course evaluations. The candidate should not prepare this document. The overview should note the author and the date of preparation.

Classroom Visits

The chair or the chair's designate should prepare a narrative overview of visits to the candidate's classroom. The overview should note the author and the date of preparation.

Teaching Portfolio

The chair or the chair's designate should prepare a narrative overview of the candidate's teaching portfolio. The overview should note the author and the date of preparation. The teaching portfolio itself should not be submitted with the candidate's file. Instead, the overview should note that the portfolio is available in the department office or indicate if it is kept elsewhere.

Letters from Teaching Evaluators

Evidence of teaching effectiveness must be included in a candidate's file. The significance and effectiveness of a candidate's role in instruction, course design, or curriculum development should be conveyed through a combination of sources, including the candidate's narrative statement on teaching; statistical data from course evaluations; narrative overviews of course evaluations, classroom visits, and the candidate's teaching portfolio; and letters from students and others able to comment on the candidate's teaching abilities.

Current or former students may be selected by the candidate and at random by the department or special committee chair from the candidate's class rosters and asked to provide a letter of evaluation. If a candidate's major educational contributions occur in a venue that does not lend itself to standardized evaluation, comments from faculty colleagues and past trainees are of paramount importance in documenting teaching performance. Such evaluations also may help to augment standard teaching evaluations that might not include narrative comments.

A sample letter requesting an evaluation of a candidate's teaching is available at <http://www.case.edu/artsci/forms/>. Each letter of request must clearly state the academic rank or tenure status for which the candidate is to be evaluated, and it must include a statement on confidentiality. All those who were asked to provide an evaluation should be listed in the file, not just those who responded. The list should provide names only; other identifying information (Social Security numbers, student ID numbers) should not be included.

External Letters of Evaluation

The eligible department faculty (or members of a special committee, if one is appointed by the dean) shall prepare a list of suggested external evaluators. The candidate will prepare a similar list of suggested external evaluators and give it to the department or special committee chair. This process should begin in the spring semester prior to the promotion or tenure consideration in the fall. When compiling these lists, please conform to the Guidelines for Selection of External Evaluators (<http://www.case.edu/artsci/forms/>). From the candidate and the department lists, the chair should recommend eight or ten names to the dean as primary choices, and other names from each list as alternates. The dean may add names to the lists as well.

The dean will notify the chair in writing of the approved names; the chair is then responsible for sending letters requesting an evaluation. Each letter must clearly state the academic rank or tenure status for which the candidate is to be evaluated, and it must include a statement on confidentiality. (A sample letter is available at <http://www.case.edu/artsci/forms/>.) The chair is to send these letters at the earliest opportunity so that a respondent has adequate time to write a thorough evaluation. All of the evaluators approved by the dean should be solicited and listed in the candidate's file, not just those who respond. It is the chair's responsibility to monitor the receipt of letters and seek approval of additional names as necessary to ensure that a balance (or near balance) of the resulting letters in the file are from evaluators suggested by the candidate and by the department. When submitting the file, at least half of the external letters must be from completely independent evaluators. Each of the external evaluator letters should be accompanied by biographical information of 200 words or less describing the importance and relevance of the external evaluator. Please do not include complete CVs. The purpose of the biographical information is to help file reviewers discern the candidate's independence from the evaluator and the evaluator's qualifications to judge the candidate's accomplishments. Often this information is available from the evaluator's personal or institutional website. It is not necessary to include biographical information for any evaluator who does not provide an evaluation.

Colleague Letters

The provost has provided the following information regarding colleague letters (maximum of 4). While letters from colleagues do not represent an unbiased review of the candidate's professional accomplishments, they can contribute information that is not accessible to the external evaluators, e.g., research collaborators and mentors might explain the unique research contributions of a candidate who engages extensively in collaborative research. Colleagues, past or current, might provide information about a candidate's role as a citizen of the local academic and wider professional community, as described in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3 I F 1, that includes "...professional service activities, and... willingness to assume a fair share of University administrative and service tasks" as a necessary qualification for faculty appointment. *Letters from colleagues should be sought only if they can add information to the file.* Thus, it is not necessary or helpful for a colleague who has already had input into the recommendation (i.e., a fellow department faculty member) to write a separate letter.

**Promotion and/or tenure files
(submitted in electronic format, except for books)
are due in the dean's office October 1, 2008.**

Related Documents:

Provost's Supplemental Instructions

Promotion and/or Tenure – *Suggested* timeline for Preparing File

Promotion and/or Tenure – Cover Sheet

Promotion and/or Tenure – Vote Tally

Promotion and/or Tenure – Teaching Summary Table

Promotion and/or Tenure – Sample Letter to Teaching Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – Sample Letter to External Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – List of Teaching Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – List of External Evaluators

College's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Guidelines for Selection of External Evaluators for New Appointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure Cases