

Case Western Reserve University  
College of Arts and Sciences

**Supplemental Instructions 2009-10  
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 guidelines for 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 evaluation 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.” More on this is below under “*Reporting Results*.”

**Suggested Timeline for Preparing File**

A separate document with this information can be found on the college's Forms and Documents web page under the headings “*Promotion and Tenure*” and “*Lists*.” 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 during 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 shall 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 may 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/counts (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 at the meeting concerning the candidate's performance in the areas of research, teaching, 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 abstentions should be rare. An abstention represents an unwillingness to cast an affirmative vote and, therefore, will be interpreted as negative. An abstention is recorded only if an eligible voter declines to vote affirmatively or negatively *after participating in the deliberations*. A member of a deliberating body should disqualify himself/herself prior to discussion on any candidacy on which he/she believes they should not cast a vote. A faculty member who has recused himself/herself is not classified as a potential voter on the case and does not count as an abstention. A potential voter who disqualifies himself/herself should submit a signed statement of the reason for the disqualification.

## **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 research, teaching, 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 information shall be provided to the external evaluators. 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**

This information may be included with the information sent to the external evaluators. 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**

This information may be included with the information sent to the external evaluators. 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.

Each request letter must conform to the sample provided at <http://www.case.edu/artsci/forms/>. All those who were asked to provide an evaluation should be listed in the file, not just those who respond. 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 occur 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 may recommend 6-10 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 request letter must conform to the sample provided 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 shall 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. Each of the external evaluator letters should be accompanied by biographical information (200 words or less or 1-3 pages in length) 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.

## **Letters from Research Collaborators**

The provost has provided the following information letters from research collaborators (maximum of 4). If the candidate's research program is highly collaborative in nature, it may be necessary to document the candidate's independent or unique contribution with letters from research colleagues who can describe the candidate's role in group efforts. Letters from research collaborators (including collaborators within CWRU) are important only for the reason described.

**Promotion and/or tenure files  
(submitted in electronic format, except for books, and one printed copy)  
are due in the dean's office October 1, 2009.**

### 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 – Sample Letter to Teaching Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – Sample Letter to External Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – Sample Letter to Research Collaborators

Promotion and/or Tenure – List of Teaching Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – List of External Evaluators

Promotion and/or Tenure – List of Research Collaborators

College's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

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