

THE TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS: BEST PRACTICES FOR CANDIDATES AND CHAIRS

FOR CANDIDATES:

1. Include the results of the PAR merit evaluation, identified by year, for the past 5 years.
2. Joint publications should have evidence of the parts done by each author in the final publication. The easiest way to do this is to provide a statement from the co-author(s) outlining who did what. Co-authors should validate percentages of effort claimed.
3. Books must be in production by the tenure or promotion review process. Ideally, they will be published or at least page proofs should be available. An advance contract is not sufficient, as this does not imply (1) that a final manuscript has been written, (2) that reviewers have seen the manuscript and approved it for publication, and (3) that there is a publication schedule including a publication date.
4. Provide a list of no more than 5 potential external reviewers to the Chair. Avoid including any graduate school associates, dissertation directors/committee members, co-authors, or close personal friends.
5. Provide student evaluations of the candidate over the past five years. To make these evaluations more meaningful, provide comparative figures (e.g. department means). These data may be obtained through the Dean's Office. You should not use evaluations of other faculty members.
6. Be selective in what is included in the candidate's packet. Divide the packet into important vs. ancillary materials. Ensure that the professional relevance of any included material is evident.

FOR CHAIRS*:

1. Chairs need to secure at least 5 external reviews, 3 of which should be proposed by the department. The chair's letter should outline the process by which external reviewers were chosen, including the rationale for selecting specific external reviewers (i.e., experts in the field); their origin in at least a peer institution (or, if not, why they are special and should be included); and a summary of which reviewers were from the candidate's list and which were chosen by the department. Reviewers who appear on both lists should be considered as coming from the candidate.
2. If an outside reviewer has some close association with the candidate (which is contrary to the guidelines), this should be explicitly and convincingly justified.
3. Chairs should ask the candidate to provide a list of no more than 5 outside reviewers. Chairs need to reach out to the reviewers as soon as possible (March or April) before the reviewers accept other responsibilities.

4. The department chair/committee should comment on the candidate's teaching skills and evaluate the student evaluations. If the chair has received particularly noteworthy feedback (positive or negative) from students regarding the candidate's teaching, this should be summarized.
5. Include a letter of evaluation from the chair, even if the chair is new. A new chair may, of course, consult the former chair or provide other evidence in support of what is said in the evaluation. The chair should provide letters for all candidates (including those going up for full professor, where the chair holds the associate professor rank; if the chair is an associate professor and the candidate is going up for full professor, the chair's letter should emphasize the tenor of the departmental discussion of the candidate's research rather than a recommendation about promotion).
6. Avoid using the length of service as a criterion for promotion.
7. Send copies of the candidate's work to the outside reviewers. It should be the candidate's responsibility to gather this material for transmission.
8. Include a copy of the letter sent to the outside reviewers.
9. Offer some evaluation of the significance of the candidate's publications or creative activities. Remember that evaluators above the departmental level are not familiar with standards of achievement in your discipline.
10. If a publication is widely judged to be "top three" or "top five" in a field, some evidence must be given to this effect.
11. If a candidate has low citations, compelling reasons must be given as to why we should consider their scholarship to be impactful (just "junior scholars have not yet had a chance to get cited" is not enough).
12. For forthcoming books, if the candidate cannot provide a published copy or page proofs, you must obtain a letter from the editor that the final manuscript has been submitted and approved by external reviewers, and outlining the production schedule including copy-editing, production of page proofs, and scheduled publication date. **ADVANCED CONTRACTS ARE NOT SUFFICIENT PROOF OF PUBLICATION.**
13. For forthcoming articles, you must obtain a communication from the journal editor confirming that the final manuscript has been submitted and accepted and giving the prospective date of publication, volume, issue, etc.

14. Process: dissent should be encouraged at all levels, including the departmental committee discussion/vote and the college committee discussion/vote. All discussions and reports should be evaluative, meaning that they should present both positive and negative points of the candidate's record in scholarship, teaching and service.
15. Chairs' letters should give a full account of the tenor of the discussion leading up to a vote. They should include the progression of discussion, including both positive and negative points.
16. Keep the candidate informed of the overall recommendation at each step of the process; the candidate should not, of course, be informed about particular individuals' votes.

* As departments move towards their deliberations, each Chair will be sent more detailed guidelines relating to procedure that should be shared with members of the departmental committee as well.

If there are any questions or concerns, please contact the Associate Dean by email, phone call, or in person at any point in the process.