

**Supplemental Instructions  
PROMOTION AND TENURE  
2020-21**

University policies for promotion and/or tenure are presented in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3 ( <https://case.edu/facultysenate/> ). 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 Forms and Documents web page ( <https://artsci.case.edu/forms/> ).

It is important to note that, per an agreement with the Office of the Provost, the College of Arts and Sciences considers all files for promotion and/or tenure on a yearly basis. Completed files are due in the dean's office **September 21, 2020 [firm date]**.

**Confidentiality at All Levels**

The provost notes that the promotion/tenure process is confidential. The department or special 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 as the application progresses through the levels of review. Candidates should not be privy to specifics such as who was on the final lists of evaluators (approved by the dean), who has or has not written, how many letters have arrived, contents of evaluation letters, or numeric vote count(s). The letters of request to potential evaluators must come from the department or special committee chair. It is not appropriate for the candidate or the candidate's colleagues to approach potential evaluators to discuss the candidacy or the evaluation request. Inappropriate contact from others can compromise the process and jeopardize the candidacy. Additionally, confidentiality by all participants should be strictly maintained before, during, and after the process has been completed, including maintenance of file materials. More on this is below under *Reporting Results*.

**Suggested Timeline for Preparing File**

A separate document with this information is posted on the college's Forms and Documents web page under the section 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, and one that must be strictly observed, is **September 21, 2020** when the completed file is due in the dean's office.

**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.

**Curriculum Vitae**

The candidate shall submit a current and comprehensive CV to the department chair or special committee chair who will provide it to the external evaluators (along with other materials, noted elsewhere in this document). This is the version of the CV which will be included in the candidate's file throughout all levels of review and should not be altered in any way. Additional information is provided in the section below entitled CV Updates. A separate document provided by the provost's office entitled "Curriculum Vitae and Bibliography Format" is posted on the college's Forms and Documents web page

under the section heading “*Promotion and Tenure.*” This document notes that the first pages of a candidate’s CV should “...convey the candidate’s educational and career history” listing correct academic titles and the years of current and past positions. These pages should comprise a usable abbreviated CV that will be attached to the promotion/tenure resolution presented to the university trustees. A candidate’s file may contain a copy of each version of the CV (comprehensive and abbreviated.) The CV should be dated, the pages numbered, and titles of the publications that are submitted with the promotion/tenure file clearly indicated (asterisk, highlight, etc.). It is helpful to evaluators/reviewers to know the status of the candidate’s publications, i.e., published, accepted for publication, submitted. The CV should list the names of contributors to multi-authored publications in the same order as that which appears on the original publication. A note on the CV should indicate the convention for order of authorship in the candidate’s discipline. It is also helpful to evaluators/reviewers to know the status of the candidate’s grants, i.e., funded, submitted, percentage level of effort provided by the candidate. The names of professional organizations, journals, etc. should be written out on first reference so that they are intelligible to readers outside the candidate’s discipline.

### **CV Updates**

It is appropriate and potentially important to submit significant, relevant CV updates as they may occur throughout the review cycle. Such updates should be sent to the dean in a dated memo with the subject line “CV Update” which will be appended to the original CV, labeled and dated as an Update.

### **Candidate’s Statements on Research, Teaching, and Service**

The candidate’s statements on research, teaching, and service, as appropriate to the file being assembled, are to be included with the information sent to the external evaluators and research collaborators. The narrative descriptions must be concise, not more than two pages on each topic.

Research contributions may be described in the CV 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. Unfunded grant applications also may be described (project, agency, dates, candidate’s role).

A summary of teaching contributions and philosophy should be presented as a narrative description of teaching.

It is generally sufficient to document service activities by listing them in the CV, but may be included as a narrative statement. A list of service activities, together with the comments to be received in the letters of evaluation, is usually adequate to document the candidate’s role as a citizen of the academic community.

### **Publications / Evidence of Research, Scholarship, Creative Endeavors**

To demonstrate success in research, scholarship, or creative endeavors, the candidate is to select three representative works. These should be noted on the candidate’s CV and shall be provided to the external evaluators and research collaborators. 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 set of candidate files each year, it is imperative that departments clearly define in their promotion/tenure guidelines the criteria for successful demonstration of scholarship and that the criteria be equivalent to those required by CWRU's peer

institutions. The provost's office has informed us that PDF submissions are preferred; JPG documents are not accepted. Please note: A published single-authored monograph should NOT be scanned for inclusion in the file; instead, a copy of the publication should be provided to the dean's office.

### **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. Similarly, the candidate shall prepare a 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://artsci.case.edu/forms/>). Any suggested external evaluator should be at an academic rank equal to or above the rank under consideration for the candidate. Additionally, the provost recommends that all external evaluators be at the academic rank of professor and, when possible, the lists should include chaired faculty, department chairs, and deans. Some of the external evaluators for candidates for promotion to associate professor or tenure may be at the academic rank of associate professor or equivalent in cases where they are the most qualified to assess the candidate's specific contributions. Any name recommended as an external evaluator must be accompanied by the person's affiliated institution, current rank, and title. Emeritus faculty may be considered if evidence is provided to ensure that the person is still active in his/her field. From the candidate and the department lists, the chair may recommend names to the dean as primary choices and other names 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 contacting each name approved by the dean to request an evaluation. Each request letter must conform to the sample provided at <http://artsci.case.edu/forms/>. Submit the draft request letter for dean's review/approval. Materials to be provided to the external evaluators include:

- the candidate's CV,
- candidate's statements on research/teaching/service, as appropriate,
- candidate's three scholarly works selected for the file, as appropriate, and
- the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines appropriate for the candidate's file.

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. Files for promotion to Senior Instructor require a minimum of four letters from external evaluators; all other promotion and/or tenure files require a minimum of six letters from external evaluators.

Each external evaluator 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 access the candidate's accomplishments. Biographical information that includes the evaluator's credentials and appointment history often can be found on a university website or similar source. If an evaluator submits a full-length CV, only the pages conveying the author's credentials and appointment history, often the first 1-3 pages, should be included with the file. The professional biosketch should not be a paragraph retyped from the website or CV, or a website listing that does not include the evaluator's credentials and academic appointments.

### **Letters from Research Collaborators**

The provost's office has provided the following information regarding letters from research collaborators. 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. Any name recommended as a research collaborator must be accompanied by the person's affiliated institution, current rank, and title. Emeritus faculty may be considered if evidence is provided to ensure that the person is still active in his/her field. Submit the draft request letter for dean's review/approval along with the list of suggested names. A file may include up to four letters from research collaborators. Materials to be provided to the external evaluators include:

- the candidate's CV,
- candidate's statements on research/teaching/service, as appropriate,
- candidate's three scholarly works selected for the file, as appropriate, and
- the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines appropriate for the candidate's file.

Each research collaborator letter should be accompanied by the author's biographical information. Biographical information that includes the collaborator's credentials and appointment history often can be found on a university website or similar source. If a collaborator submits a full-length CV, only the pages conveying the author's credentials and appointment history, often the first 1-3 pages, should be included with the file. The professional biosketch should not be a paragraph retyped from the website or CV, or a website listing that does not include the collaborator's credentials and academic appointments.

### **Letters from Teaching Evaluators**

The significance and effectiveness of a candidate's role in instruction, course design, or curriculum development should be conveyed through a combination of sources. These may include 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 former students and others (including colleagues, if specifically requested and solicited as noted below) who are able to comment on the candidate's teaching abilities.

The candidate must be afforded the opportunity to provide names of former students or others who will be asked to provide a letter of evaluation. In addition, the department or special committee chair shall randomly select names from the candidate's former students who will be asked to provide a letter of evaluation. The department or committee chair shall review the process of random selection with the dean.

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.

Each request letter must conform to the sample provided at <http://artsci.case.edu/forms/>. Submit the draft request letter for dean's review/approval. 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.

### **Course Evaluations**

In accordance with the college's Policy on Evaluation of Teaching, the data results of student course evaluations are to be included in the file. The provost's office has noted that "Standardized student evaluation forms collected over a reasonable period of time (the most recent three years of teaching) may be sufficient to portray the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom teacher." The chair or the chair's designate (though not the candidate) shall prepare a narrative overview of the statistical data from the course evaluations. The overview should include a list of all the courses taught by the candidate (course number and title) and should also note any course for which there is no evaluation and an

explanation of the absence. Effective narratives usually take the form of a qualitative summary that reports the percentage of evaluations that fall into each range (e.g., good to excellent); the average course rating for the candidate; average course rating when taught by others, etc. Please do not include blank pages in the data sheets for courses that did not have an end-of-semester evaluation. References to other instructors and students comments may not be included. The overview must note the author and the date of preparation.

### **Classroom Visits**

This document is required for any file requesting tenure; it is optional in any file requesting promotion only. The chair or the chair's designate (though not the candidate) shall prepare a narrative overview of visits to the candidate's classroom. The overview must note the author and the date of preparation.

### **Teaching Portfolio**

This document is required for any file requesting tenure. The chair or the chair's designate (though not the candidate) shall prepare a narrative overview of the candidate's teaching portfolio. 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. The overview must note the author and the date of preparation.

### **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**

The Faculty Handbook notes, "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." 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, participate in the meeting/discussion, and to vote.

An exception to university voting guidelines 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 the department level but *shall not participate in the discussion or decision within the Committee on Appointments*.

When a candidate is seeking both promotion and tenure, the department or special committee shall vote separately on each request. The vote count/counts (for, against, abstain) must match the number of faculty eligible to participate, including the chair. One of the eligible faculty participants (but not the chair) shall prepare an evaluation to serve as a thorough report of the discussion at the meeting concerning the candidate's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, as appropriate for the file being assembled. If the vote is not unanimous, the evaluation shall explain the basis for the divided opinion. This evaluation shall include the names of those who attended the meeting and describe the means by which those not attending were given the opportunity to review the materials and to vote. The provost has noted that the written evaluation is occasioned by the specific circumstance described above, and is not an opportunity for a dissenting voter to register disagreement with the conclusion of the majority. Disagreement with the majority conclusion should be expressed during discussion and reported in the department evaluation. Before inclusion in the file, this evaluation shall be made available for inspection by resident faculty members who participated in the vote. If a faculty member believes the evaluation to express inadequately the deliberations, he or she may send

independently to the dean a statement of such opinion, which shall be appended to the department evaluation for higher reviews. Any such statement 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 Faculty Handbook notes, “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 provost’s office has informed us that abstentions should be rare. An abstention represents an unwillingness to cast an affirmative vote and, therefore, will be interpreted as a negative vote. 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, as appropriate for the file being assembled. The provost has noted “If the department chair’s opinion differs from that of the department faculty, it is important that the reasons for that opinion are expressed in detail.” In the evaluation, the chair should also explain any standards unique to the discipline, significance of achievements in a specific field, disciplinary conventions governing the format of the CV, the normal protocol for listing publications (or other evidence of research and scholarship) within the discipline, comments on the quality of the venues in which the scholarly works appear, any variations in the process for teaching evaluations, any special considerations regarding service contributions within the discipline, or any other elements of importance. 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.

### **Additional Role of the Chair**

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 address any questions that arise during the review. The chair's only 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 material.

### **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 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 as either “positive” or “not positive,” 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.

**Promotion and/or tenure files**  
**(submitted in electronic format, except for books, and one printed copy)**  
**are due in the dean's office September 21, 2020 [firm date].**

Related Documents posted on A&S Forms and Documents web page ( <http://artsci.case.edu/forms/> ):

A&S Supplemental Instructions – Promotion & Tenure 2020-21

Provost's Supplemental Instructions – Promotion & Tenure

A&S Suggested Timeline for P-T File Preparation 2020

A&S Cover Sheet – Promotion & Tenure – Fillable

A&S Vote Tally Form – Promotion & Tenure – Fillable

A&S Form – List of External Evaluators – P-T File – Fillable

A&S Form – List of Teaching Evaluators – P-T File – Fillable

A&S Form – List of Research Collaborators – P-T File – Fillable

A&S Sample Ltr – External Evaluators for Tenure-track P-T Files

A&S Sample Ltr – External Evaluators for Sr Instructor Promotion File

A&S Sample Ltr – Teaching Evaluators for Any Promotion-Tenure File

A&S Sample Ltr – Research Collaborators for Any Promotion or Tenure File

A&S Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A&S Guidelines – Selection of External Evaluators