

Tenure and Promotion – File Preparation Guideline

The Tenure and Promotion File Preparation Guideline is designed to serve as an administrative tool to assist File Preparation Committees (FPC) in compiling tenure and/or promotion file material, and in subsequently writing its commentary (report). Items below are listed with the intent of provoking clarity and transparency into the file preparation process and are based upon the suggestions of the Senate Review Committee in its review of tenure and promotion applications. Where applicable, items below have been referenced to the University *Tenure and Promotions Policy, Criteria, and Procedures*.

Teaching

- Of internal referees: were two (2) selected by FPC and one (1) by the candidate? F.3.1.2.(a)(i)
- Were referees provided with copies of course outlines, assignments, handouts, etc.? F.3.1.2.(a)
- Did referees attend classes taught by candidate to observe teaching? F.3.1.2.(a)(iv)
 - Did referees attend a variety of classes, dates, and class formats (i.e. lecture, seminar)? Are they reflective of the candidate's teaching activities?
- Were evaluations by students composed of a random sample? F.3.1.2.(b)(i)(b)
 - Does the FPC report contextualize how the random sample was achieved?
- Did the candidate add names to comprise up to no more than 1/3 of the students solicited? F.3.1.2.(b)(ii)
 - Were both undergraduate and graduate students solicited? F.3.1.2.(b)(i)(c)
- Has statistical data (i.e. course evaluations) been clearly interpreted?
- Have all letters (including student letters and student evaluations) been signed? F.3.1.2.(b)(iii)

Professional Contribution and Standing

- Of potential referees: did candidate add names not exceeding ¼ of total names on list? F.3.1.3.(a)
- Were at least three (3) referees solicited at "arm's length"? F.3.1.3.(b)
 - Does the FPC report contextualize any referees solicited at non-"arm's length"? F.3.1.3.(c)
 - Does the FPC report describe the process by which external referees were selected?
- Has a brief bio of each referee been included in the file?

Service

- Of potential referees: did candidate add names not exceeding ¼ of total names on the list? F.3.1.4.(a)
- Does the FPC report describe the process by which referees were selected?

Candidate's Curriculum Vitae & Personal Statement

- Are publication gaps addressed in the FPC report?
- Is the C.V. free of errors? (i.e. dates, subtitles, names)
- Does the C.V. specifically describe the status of the candidate's research and publications?
- Is the personal statement more than just a reiteration of the C.V.?
- Has the candidate contextualized his/her relative contribution in instances of co-authorship?
- Has the candidate contextualized his/her role in relation to grants received?

FPC Report

- Is the FPC report free of evidence of adjudication (no suggestion or conference of rankings [i.e. competence; high competence; excellence])? F.3.1.1.(b)
- Are letters of solicitation included in the file? F.3.1.5.(e)
- Does the file include the respective standards by which the candidate will be evaluated?
- Have any errors made by referees been contextualized and/or refuted? (if applicable)
- Have anomalous contextual data or negative comments been addressed in the FPC report? (if applicable)
- Does the FPC report contextualize new information not seen by referees? (if applicable)
- Was the candidate provided with a copy of his/her file (minus contextual identifiers and signatures)? F.3.1.6. & F.3.1.7
- Was the FPC report dated and copied to the candidate, and the candidate given the opportunity to review any contextualizing commentary before the file is considered by the Adjudicating Committee? F.3.1.1.(c)