

# PROMOTION AND TENURE INSTRUCTIONS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Distribution .....	2
Confidentiality	
Promotion and tenure packets – Required documents.....	3
Dean’s recommendation	
Faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure committee	
Committee report	
Abstentions	
Department chair’s recommendation	
Department report or faculty report	
Voting	
Level	
Voter eligibility.....	4
Minority opinion	
Report on deliberations	
Pretenure reviews	
Curriculum vitae.....	5
Description of research, teaching, and service contributions	
Research	
Teaching	
Service	
COVID-19 impact statement	
Referee list.....	6
Selection of referees	
External referees (defined)	
Biographical sketches.....	7
Research collaborators	
Letters of evaluation	
Request format and language	
Evaluation of teaching	
List of potential teaching evaluators and request letter.....	8
Publications	
Criteria document	
Attachments	
Guidelines for evaluating COVID-19 impact statements.....	9
External reviewer list.....	12
Sample letter to external evaluators.....	13
Sample letter to research collaborators.....	14
Teaching evaluator list.....	15
Sample letter to teaching evaluators.....	16
Curriculum vitae format.....	17

**DISTRIBUTION:**

**A copy of this set of instructions is to be provided to everyone involved in file preparation, including the candidate, members of the Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure, and staff who compile the documentation.**

**CONFIDENTIALITY:**

Promotion or tenure review is a confidential process. A sentence included in letters to external reviewers and individual teaching evaluators promises that their responses will be held confidential to the extent permitted by law. Potential evaluators who are asked to write letters or teaching evaluations are selected by the dean from those suggested by the candidate and the department chair, but the composition of the final list and the identity of those who wrote are not revealed to the candidate. This policy is intended to encourage a balanced list of potential referees and to discourage a candidate or colleagues from approaching or otherwise attempting to influence potential evaluators. Correspondence or other contact with evaluators is to be conducted only by the dean or other person charged with responsibility for managing the review process. Discussion of the case at all levels is confidential, and details of discussion are not shared with the candidate or others outside the review process.

## PROMOTION AND TENURE PACKETS – REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

### **DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION:**

The dean’s letter expresses the dean’s recommendation and the reasons for that recommendation. If the dean’s recommendation is contrary to that of the faculty, it is especially important that letter explain fully the reasons for that recommendation.

### **FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE COMMITTEE:**

#### Committee report:

The committee report must report the numerical vote, summarize the meeting discussion, and explain the basis for the recommendation. An affirmative vote is one on which the majority of voting participants vote in favor of the proposed action.

#### Abstentions

Abstentions should be rare. **An abstention is recorded only for an *eligible* voter who participates in the deliberations but in the end declines to vote affirmatively or negatively.** An abstention is not recorded for 1) a member of a voting body who disqualifies herself or himself from participating in discussion and vote on a case because of a conflict of interest, or 2) a member of the department or equivalent body who reserves his or her vote to vote at a higher level. An affirmative vote requires that the majority of all eligible voters cast their votes in the affirmative.

### **DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S RECOMMENDATION:**

The department chair<sup>1</sup> makes his/her recommendation on the candidacy after a vote by department faculty or the department-equivalent committee. In addition to stating the chair’s recommendation, this letter might explain standards unique to a discipline, the significance of achievements in a specific field, or other elements of importance that might be less apparent to reviewers outside the candidate’s field than to those familiar with the discipline. If the department chair’s opinion differs from that of the department faculty, it is especially important that the reasons for that opinion are expressed in detail.

### **DEPARTMENT REPORT:**

Consideration of promotion or tenure award is initiated by the recommendation of a department, or, where faculty organization is not departmental, by a vote by members of the constituent faculty who are eligible to vote on the candidacy.

### **VOTING:**

#### Level at which vote is cast

Usually, a member of the candidate’s department who is eligible to vote at a higher level (e.g., the faculty promotions committee) should abstain from voting at the lower level to reserve his or her vote for the higher level of authority. **However, if there are fewer than three eligible voters at the department level, a department voter who would otherwise be eligible to vote at the higher level should vote at the department level and abstain from voting at the higher level.** A voter votes only once on a candidacy.

---

<sup>1</sup> The chair of a department of secondary appointment may submit a letter of recommendation. The candidate’s division chief should also submit a letter if the department is organized into divisions.

In a school that is not organized into departments, a member of the faculty promotions committee votes as a member of that committee and does not vote at the faculty level. The department chair can be present for and take part in the department discussion, provided the chair meets the eligibility criteria outlined in the section below. However, the department chair does not vote with the department faculty but prepares a separate recommendation. In addition, the department vote should remain private and/or anonymous, and the chair should not know the individual votes of each faculty member. The dean does not vote as a member of the faculty voting body. Rather, the dean's vote is expressed in the dean's letter of recommendation in favor of or opposed to the proposed promotion or tenure award.

#### Voter eligibility by rank

The Faculty Handbook (I.I.2) stipulates that the process for considering a faculty member for promotion or award of tenure includes a recommendation from the candidate's department or, where faculty organization is not departmental, by members of the constituent faculty. For recommendations involving the granting of tenure, only those faculty members with tenure shall be eligible to vote. On recommendations involving promotion, only those faculty members of rank equal to or superior to the rank being considered shall be eligible to vote. If additional eligibility restrictions are defined in the school's bylaws, they must also be observed.

Furthermore, the Provost's Office expects that only eligible faculty members, as defined above, will attend and participate in the discussion that leads to the department's vote and recommendation. Certain other administrators not eligible to vote but directly involved in the review process (e.g. department chairs who hold a non-tenure track position) may also take part in the discussion.

#### Minority opinion

A faculty member who participated in the discussion leading to the department or faculty vote who believes the report from the department or faculty **does not adequately express the deliberations** may send independently to the dean a statement of that opinion (Faculty Handbook, I. I. 3). Such a letter is permitted in the specific circumstance described in the Faculty Handbook and is not an opportunity for a dissenting voter to register disagreement with the conclusion of the majority. Disagreement with the majority conclusion is to be expressed during discussion and reported in the department or faculty recommendation.

#### Report on deliberations

Deliberations on promotion/tenure recommendations should be guided by principles of objectivity as expressed in the Faculty Handbook Review and Decision passage (Chapter 3 I J.1), "The faculty in a particular field has a responsibility to render favorable or unfavorable judgments on the work of its colleagues in an objective manner."

The department's report must convey the sense of the participants' deliberations. If the vote is not unanimous, the report should explain the basis for divided opinion.

#### **PRETENURE REVIEWS – THIRD YEAR (AND SIXTH YEAR, IF APPLICABLE):**

A copy of the third-year pretenure review (and the sixth-year pretenure review in schools with a nine-year pretenure period) is to be included in the promotion file of untenured faculty. Pretenure reviews are not included in the files of tenured faculty.

## **CURRICULUM VITAE:**

The candidate's curriculum vitae is an essential reference document for reviewers at all levels. The CV must be well organized and complete, and the first page or two must convey the candidate's educational and career history and list correct academic titles and the years of current and past positions. The CV should be dated and the pages numbered. The names of professional organizations and journals should be written out on first reference so that they are intelligible to readers outside the candidate's discipline. The titles of the publications submitted with the promotion/tenure dossier should be identified in the CV by an asterisk or other designation.

## **DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS:**

### Research

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

### Teaching

Teaching contributions and philosophy may be described in the CV or as a separate supplement not exceeding two pages; the teaching description is included with the CV sent to external reviewers. The narrative description must be concise, not more than two pages. It is not intended to restate the CV in narrative form.

### Service

Service activities are usually documented sufficiently by listing them in the CV. The listing, together with comments that are made in other documentation, such as a committee report, department chair's letter, or external evaluators' letters, are usually adequate to document the candidate's role as a citizen of the academic or professional community. If service activities are described in a separate document, the description should be one page or less. The service description is included with the CV sent to external reviewers.

### COVID-19 Impact Statement

The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly impacted nearly all aspects of academia, and the university is cognizant that COVID-19 restraints may have negatively impeded a faculty member's performance. Therefore, faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure, beginning with reviews conducted during the 2020-21 academic year, have the option to have their *COVID-19 Impact Statements* included in the materials sent to external reviewers. Guidelines to provide reviewers with information needed to perform a fair, contextualized review of the faculty member's performance and contributions can be found in the attachments section.

The *Impact Statement* can provide details about how the COVID-19 pandemic, starting in March 2020, affected the faculty member's teaching assignments and outcomes, their ability to conduct research, changes in engagement with the external community of peers, and service obligations to the university. The *Impact Statement* should not exceed two pages.

## **REFEREE LIST:**

The dean is responsible for determining which referees are asked to write from a list of potential referees, some of whom are suggested by the candidate, the department chair or other appropriate person, and the dean. **Those asked to write are drawn from more than one source and may not be only those suggested by the candidate.** All external referees should be of the academic rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered.

The referee list submitted with the file lists all the suggested referees and indicates who suggested them, which individuals were asked to write, and which ones responded. A copy of one of the request letters is to be enclosed in the promotion/tenure file. To avoid a late effort to obtain the requisite number of letters, most schools solicit more than the minimum required number of letters.

### Selection of Referees

External referees:

External referees: Evaluations from carefully selected external referees are essential to inform promotion and/or tenure decision. For assurance of quality and integrity of the review, it is a best practice that external referees are viewed as being independent of, and at an arm's length from, the candidate under review. This does not mean that the referee must never have met or heard of the candidate, but it does mean that referees should not be those who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the candidate. Referees should be from outside the University, but preferably not outside the academy. External referees are expected to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, and comment on the impact of the candidate's work on their field.

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement include:

- Serving as the candidate's doctoral or postdoctoral supervisor
- Being supervised by the candidate (e.g. as a former mentee, trainee, or student)
- Serving as supervisor of the candidate (e.g., in an employment relationship)
- Having a close familial/friend relationship with the candidate
- Being a former departmental colleague (or school colleague for schools that do not have a departmental structure) within the past seven years. Visiting faculty members are considered colleagues for the purpose of this restriction.
- Having a close research collaboration with the candidate within the past seven years, or actively planning to collaborate with the candidate. (See exception for team-science interactions noted below.)
- Coauthoring with the candidate within the past seven years, or actively planning to coauthor with the candidate. (See exception for team-science interactions noted below.)
- Having received compensation from or on behalf of the candidate

Examples of what does not violate the arm's length requirement include:

- Having conversation(s) with the candidate at a conference
- Participating on a panel or a committee with the candidate
- Inviting the candidate to present a paper at a conference organized by the referee, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the referee
- Presenting a guest lecture or seminar at the university of the referee

- Reviewing for publication a manuscript authored/coauthored by the candidate
- Participating in team-science<sup>2</sup> research, and/or coauthoring publications based on team-science research, provided that the referee certifies that there is significant distance within the team (no or very little direct interaction) between the referee and the candidate.

#### Biographical sketches:

Each external referee letter should be accompanied by the author's biographical information. 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 assess the candidate's accomplishments. Biographical information that includes the reviewer's credentials and appointment history can often be found on a university website or similar source. If an evaluator submits a full-length CV, only the pages that convey the author's credentials and appointment history, often the first 1-3 pages, should be enclosed with the file. Responsibility for collecting the referees' biographical information might be delegated to the candidate's department to minimize the magnitude of the task on any one staff person. The professional biosketch should not be a paragraph retyped from the website or CV nor a website listing that does not include the reviewer's credentials and academic appointments.

#### Research collaborators (only if required):

If the candidate's research program is highly collaborative in nature, letters from research colleagues may be sought from collaborators who can describe the candidate's independent or unique contributions to the group effort. Two to three such letters should be sufficient. Letters from research collaborators are to be sought only for the reason described.

### **LETTERS OF EVALUATION:**

#### REQUEST – format and language

The dean or other person designated by the dean (e.g., department chair, an associate dean or other person charged with managing the process) invites potential evaluators to write letters of reference using the approved request letter provided in the ATTACHMENTS section of this packet. Letters to external reviewers are standardized to help ensure that the promotion review process is applied equally to each candidate. The letter states the academic rank and tenure status for which the candidate is being considered and assures the letter writer that the response will be held in confidence. The letter says that the candidate is under consideration for the proposed action and does not express the school's position on the candidacy. To help potential evaluators understand the school's standards, a copy of the faculty's guidelines for promotion and tenure should be enclosed with the letter of request.

**It is not appropriate for the candidate or the candidate's colleagues to approach potential reviewers to discuss the candidacy or the letter request.**

### **EVALUATION OF TEACHING:**

Methods of evaluating teaching may vary among faculties and from candidate to candidate. Standardized student evaluation forms collected over a reasonable period of time (usually the previous three years), may be sufficient to portray the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom

---

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this restriction, "team science" is defined as collaborative effort of seven or more individuals, addressing a scientific challenge through leveraging the expertise of researchers from different fields.

teacher. Regardless of the number of course evaluations included in the packet, there should also be a summary of the course evaluations prepared by a department chair, curriculum director, or other appropriate person. The summary is to identify the preparer and indicate that the supporting evaluations are available for reference in the department or other office. 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. Evaluations from individual referees also help to augment standardized teaching evaluations.

Educational activities other than direct teaching, e.g., course design or curriculum development, may be documented in a number of ways and conveyed through a combination of sources, such as letters from teaching colleagues, the candidate's self-description of teaching, or the report from the department or faculty CAPT.

#### **LIST OF POTENTIAL TEACHING EVALUATORS AND REQUEST LETTER:**

The list of potential teaching evaluators from whom letters are requested should be drawn from names of individuals suggested by the candidate and the dean, department chair, or other curriculum director and not all from the same source. In the case of student evaluations, those who are asked to write should be randomly selected from a list of former students. The letter or e-mail to selected evaluators is to follow the approved format in the ATTACHMENTS section of this packet. The list of all from whom teaching evaluations were requested includes their status (current student, former student, colleague), and the source of the name.

#### **PUBLICATIONS:**

The candidate is to select three representative publications for the file. Titles of the representative publications are to be clearly marked on the CV. Copies of the publications are to be sent to external reviewers.

#### **CRITERIA DOCUMENT:**

Each faculty has an approved document that describes the standards and qualifications for promotion. A single copy of the relevant document is to be included with the school's files submitted to the provost's office for ready reference by reviewers at the provost's and president's level. **This document or an abbreviated version of it might be provided to external evaluators to familiarize them with the school's standards.**

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

External reviewer list  
Sample letter to external evaluators  
Sample letter to research collaborators  
Teaching evaluator list  
Sample letter to teaching evaluators  
Curriculum vitae format



## GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENTS IN PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

### **Rationale**

Faculty members have the option to submit a COVID-19 impact statement to document the professional effect of the pandemic on their work. These statements will be included in files submitted for promotion and tenure reviews. Faculty members have the option to have their COVID-19 impact statements included in the materials sent to external reviewers. These guidelines are intended to provide reviewers with information needed to perform a fair, contextualized review of the faculty member's performance and contributions.

CWRU has not changed the standards for review and promotion on account of the pandemic. However, CWRU recognizes that the pandemic had the potential to affect scholarly productivity and creative performance output. The constraints of the pandemic can also impact the amount of effort needed to carry out teaching and service responsibilities assigned to the faculty member. The COVID-19 Impact Statement offers the faculty member an opportunity to document the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic has directly had on workload, productivity, performance, and trajectory. There are many different possible effects (both negative and positive) that may have resulted from the constraints of the pandemic.

While COVID-19 Impact Statements are not meant to be an explanation for not meeting promotion or tenure standards, they can provide context about the faculty member's efforts throughout and beyond the duration of the pandemic.

### **Guidelines for Consideration of COVID-19 Impact Statements**

The COVID-19 pandemic may have introduced changes in a faculty member's amount and performance in terms of workload, responsibilities and scholarly accomplishments. In addition, prospects for innovation and the availability of new opportunities may have been altered. Below are some examples of potential disruptions that might have been experienced by faculty members. Reviewers should consider how the COVID-19 Impact Statement summarizes and explains how the faculty member has addressed these challenges and how they plan to manage any lingering effects of these challenges in the future.

The following sections present examples of the type of information that is considered appropriate for COVID-19 Impact Statements. These lists are not meant to be exhaustive.

#### Teaching and Advising

- Potential negative impacts
  - Moving classes to remote delivery may have led to negative impact in terms of re-distribution of workload away from research and scholarship.
  - Support or advising of students in a remote learning environment may have added to faculty workload.
  - Being asked to cover another faculty member's course for some period of time may have diverted the amount of time the faculty member had for research or scholarship.
  - Providing increased support for students may have affected workload.
- Potential positive impact

- Moving a class online may have resulted in an improved pedagogical and learning experience, or increased attendance of students to office hours, etc.

### Research and Scholarship

- Potential negative impact
  - Cancellation of conference presentations, keynote speaking engagements, invited talks, performances, exhibitions, etc.
  - Closing or restricted access to labs or other research resources (field work sites, archives and libraries, human subjects, performance spaces, external collaborations, etc.).
  - Additional planning and documentation required to meet university guidelines for safely reopening laboratories, research, field work projects, and studio work.
  - Delays or interruptions in leaves for faculty development (e.g., sabbaticals).
  - Restrictions in grant funding.
  - Delays or cancellations of publications or book contracts.
  - Delays in publications due to inaccessibility of reviewers by the publishers.
  - Delays in (or cancellation of) arrivals of collaborators (postdocs, visiting scholars, faculty collaborators).
  - Having to pay students and/or postdocs, although not making typical progress in research.
  - Need to spend time to redefine research objectives.
  - Other professional responsibilities and workload constrained time available for scholarly research or creative output.
  - Budgetary constraints which resulted in loss of research assistant funding; limits on incoming graduate students; loss of summer funding.
  - Issues associated with faculty and graduate students needing to travel to conduct research.
  - Reduced productivity or opportunities for training or practice because of safety guidelines within the work environment due to sanitation, mask wearing, social distancing, and limiting numbers of people in work settings at one time.
- Potential positive impacts
  - Response to the COVID-19 pandemic led to new opportunities for research and discovery.
  - Scholarly expertise of relevance to pandemics led to more research opportunities and collaborations.
  - Expanded opportunities for those in COVID-related research fields; altering research priorities to answer emergent questions related to the pandemic.
  - Donating resources to respond to the pandemic.

### Service

- Potential negative impacts
  - Service workload increased in order to support staff, students, faculty.
  - Needs to support the university's pivot to online teaching, learning, and advising.
  - Suspension of or curtailed traditional and *ad hoc* service assignments.
  - External service responsibilities (e.g., journal editorships, chairing of academic conference sessions, professional organization service, etc.) complicated by the need to make adjustments in response to the pandemic.

- Increased service responsibilities for those doing community outreach and engagement, thus reducing time for research and/or teaching.
- Increased service in academic governance, and university reopening subcommittees or review processes.
- Invisible service to support the mission, e.g., helping others navigate problems, which in turn reduced one's own ability to do work.

### Personal

- Potential negative impact
  - Lack of infrastructure at home to support virtual work (e.g., technology access/lack of access, overloaded bandwidth, lack of quiet space, etc.).
  - Disruptions and reduced productivity engendered by intensified caregiving (childcare, eldercare, etc.) responsibilities.
  - Family responsibilities that required attention such as home schooling, personal and familial health issues, etc.
  - Financial stress caused by the elevated costs of childcare, eldercare and/or healthcare.
  - Increased anxiety and other mental health issues that impede productivity and performance.

## EXTERNAL REVIEWER LIST

LIST all suggested potential reviewers, who suggested them, whether they were asked to write, whether they responded, and whether a biosketch is included.

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	Recommended by whom (dean/chair/candidate, other)	Solicited	Response	Bio
------	---------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------	-----

RESEARCH COLLABORATORS ( <u>only</u> if required to delineate candidate's role in collaborative research)				

## SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

During the 20xx-20xx academic year, (candidate), (current rank and tenure status), in the Department of (department), will be considered for promotion to (rank and tenure status). Add here applicable sentence 1, 2, or 3 below. If a tenure candidate's pretenure period has been extended, add **sentence 4 (revised 11/16)**.

Your name has been suggested as a potential referee who can evaluate (candidate)'s qualifications for (promotion/tenure). Your comments on (candidate)'s reputation in the field and on the quality and impact of (his/her) published work and presentations would be welcome. We would also appreciate your comments on (his/her) teaching if you have observed (him/her) in this capacity. It would assist us if you could rank (candidate) among peers at the same career stage and tell us if you believe (he/she) would achieve the proposed (promotion/tenure) at your institution or others with which you are familiar. Any other relevant observations you might wish to make would be most helpful. Finally, if you know (candidate), please tell us in what context.

Enclosed is a copy of (candidate)'s curriculum vitae and self-description and publications (she/he) selected as representative work. If you need other information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

May we receive your reply, which may be transmitted electronically, by (date)? Your reply will be shared only with the appropriate committees and administrators involved in the process and will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law. Your contribution to this process is an important one. We look forward to hearing from you and thank you for your assistance.

(Preferred closing)

Signature  
(Dean or dean's designee)

### **\*Select the applicable sentence:**

- 1) If the candidate is tenured: "Candidate was awarded tenure in (year)."
- 2) If the candidate is being considered for tenure: "Tenure consideration is mandatory in (academic year)."
- 3) If candidate is being considered for promotion in the tenure track without tenure: "He/she is not now under consideration for tenure. Tenure consideration will be mandatory in (academic year)."
- 4) **If candidate has had a pretenure extension: Please note that (Candidate) has received an extension of (his/her) tenure clock by virtue of university policy. Under these circumstances, the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than for faculty whose tenure clock has not been extended. We therefore request that the review is done on the merits of quality and impact and not on the time taken to achieve those accomplishments.**

SAMPLE LETTER TO RESEARCH COLLABORATOR REFEREES

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

Paragraph one: Same as letter to external referees

Paragraph two:

As part of the promotion and tenure process, we may solicit letters from research collaborators who can describe the candidate's role in group efforts. Your assessment will help reviewers at the university determine the candidate's independent or unique role as an investigator. In addition to describing the candidate's contributions to research collaboration, your comments on (candidate)'s recognition in the field and the quality and impact of (his/her) published work and presentations would be welcome. It would assist us if you could rank (candidate) among peers at the same career stage and tell us if you believe (he/she) would achieve the proposed (promotion/tenure) at your institution or others with which you are familiar. Any other relevant observations you might wish to make would be most helpful.

Paragraph three: Same as letter to external referees

Paragraph four: Same as letter to external referees

(Preferred closing)

Signature  
(Dean or designated other)

### TEACHING EVALUATOR LIST

LIST all suggested evaluators and category of evaluator. Indicate who suggested them, whether an evaluation was requested, and whether they responded.

TEACHING EVALUATIONS FOR (CANDIDATE) WERE REQUESTED FROM:

Name/category, i.e., former                      Suggested by whom  
student, colleague, etc.                      (dean/chair/candidate) Solicited? Response

Name/category, i.e., former student, colleague, etc.	Suggested by whom (dean/chair/candidate)	Solicited?	Response

## SAMPLE LETTER TO TEACHING EVALUATORS

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

During the 20xx-20xx academic year, (candidate), (current rank), in the Department of (department), will be considered for promotion to (proposed rank) (and tenure, if applicable). As part of the review process, we are seeking letters of evaluation of (his/her) teaching. You have been selected as an evaluator who might assess (his/her) teaching or mentoring performance from your experience. Your reply will be shared only with appropriate committees and administrators involved in the promotion process and will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law.

May we receive a response, which may be submitted electronically, from you by (date)? Your contribution to this evaluation process is an important one, and we look forward to hearing from you.

(Preferred closing)

(Dean or designated other)

**Note: The candidate's CV is not provided to teaching evaluators unless they request it.**



## CURRICULUM VITAE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY FORMAT

Every faculty member should maintain a well-organized, up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography. It should be dated and the pages numbered. Note that some elements listed may not be applicable to all.

1. Personal data: name; business address; education with dates, places, and types of degree; postgraduate training with dates and places.
2. Professional appointments: dates, names of institutions and departments (if applicable), academic rank of the appointment
3. **Professional** licensures and certifications, if applicable, e.g., board certification, professional licenses.
4. Membership in professional societies
5. Professional honors and awards
6. Professional service (e.g., grant review panels, editorial boards, professional societies, advisory bodies)
7. Service on institutional committees (department, school, university), including the name of the committee and dates of service
8. Teaching activities: summarize in CV or in a separate brief document appended to CV
9. Research support: past and present support, including the granting agency; years; project title; role, i.e., principal investigator, co-investigator; the percent effort; total direct costs awarded. Applications pending review should be included. Unfunded applications may also be listed.
10. Bibliography: listed in standard reference style and organized by category - books, articles, refereed publications, non-refereed publications, abstracts, conference presentations, etc. Articles or books listed but not yet published are to be identified as submitted, accepted, or in press. List in chronological order, preferably most recent first.

---

Case Western Reserve University's editorial style guide at <https://www.case.edu/umc/communications/editorial-writing/editorial-style-guide/> is a reference source for the mechanics of written communications.