



Office of the Provost
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7001

Visitors and Deliveries
Adelbert Hall, Room 216

Phone 216.368.4344
Fax 216.368.4325

www.case.edu

To: Cyrus C. Taylor, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Norman C. Tien, Dean, School of Engineering
Jerold S. Goldberg, Dean, School of Dental Medicine
Gary J. Simson, Dean, School of Law
Mohan Reddy, Dean, School of Management
Pamela B. Davis, Interim Dean, School of Medicine
May L. Wykle, Dean, School of Nursing
Grover C. Gilmore, Dean, School of Applied Social Sciences

From: Jerold S. Goldberg, Interim Provost 

Date: August 7, 2007

Re: Promotion and Tenure Procedures 2007-08

This memo accompanies promotion and tenure procedures for 2007-2008. These instructions are intended to guide the process by listing and describing the documentation, and should be given to each faculty member who will be considered for promotion or tenure. Please remember to inform candidates of the progress of their applications at each level of file review, either directly or through the relevant department chair.

To help me plan for the internal review process, I would like to have a list of your promotion and tenure candidates and suggestions of six tenured professors from your school who might serve on a president's advisory committee (PAC). Please provide this information by October 1, 2007.

Submit completed files to Lois Langell in my office on or before **December 3, 2007**, in electronic format. We will work as swiftly as possible to review the completeness of each package so that any incomplete applications may be returned to you, if necessary, with adequate time to ensure that, once corrected, they can still be considered during the current review year. We hope such corrections are rare.

If you have questions about the promotion and tenure process, please do not hesitate to call Lois Langell at extension 4342 or e-mail her at lois.langell@case.edu.

cc: Staff person responsible for appointments, promotions, tenure

SUBMIT:

One CD containing a file folder for each candidate from your school. Each disk will contain the approved document describing school's criteria for promotion and tenure and a file for each candidate containing the following documentation in PDF format (JPG documents are not accepted):

I. SUPPLIED BY THE DEAN

- A. Dean's recommendation
- B. Report and vote from the faculty Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure
- C. Third pretenure year review (and sixth pretenure year review, if applicable)
- D. List of referees and sample of letter of request
- E. Referee letters**
 - 1. Ten letters for candidates for professor; eight letters for candidates for associate professor/tenure; at least one-half of the letters must be from completely independent referees**
 - 2. Biographical information for each external evaluator
- F. Colleague letters (no more than 4)
- G. List of teaching referees and sample of letter of request
- H. Responses from teaching referees
- I. Course evaluations (typically standardized evaluation forms)

II. SUPPLIED BY THE DEPARTMENT

- A. Department chair's recommendation
- B. Department faculty report and vote, expressed numerically

III. SUPPLIED BY THE CANDIDATE

- A. 1. Curriculum Vitae
 - 2. Description of contributions to research, teaching, and service; this may be incorporated in the curriculum vitae **or** be presented as a separate self-description of (no more than 2 pages describing each category of contribution)
- B. Teaching summary table
- C. Publications (maximum of 3)

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

ELEMENTS OF A PROMOTION/TENURE FILE

The following descriptions of the elements of a promotion/tenure file are to be made available to the candidate and staff who are responsible for compiling the documentation.

I. MATERIALS TO BE SUPPLIED BY THE DEAN

CRITERIA DOCUMENT

Each faculty has a document or other policy statement describing the standards and qualifications for promotion and tenure that has been approved by the Faculty Senate and that expands upon and details the qualifications described in the Faculty Handbook. Each disk should include a copy of the relevant document for ready reference by reviewers at the provost's and president's level. We suggest that the document or an abbreviated version of the document be provided to external evaluators.

DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION

The dean's letter must express the dean's recommendation and the reasons for that recommendation. If the dean's recommendation is contrary to that of the faculty, it is particularly important that the letter explain fully the reasons for that recommendation.

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE COMMITTEE

Committee vote

The report from the faculty committee must report the numerical vote and explain the basis for the recommendation. The results might be expressed through a voting scheme where 0 means definitely do not promote; 1 probably do not promote; 2 probably promote; and 3 definitely promote, reported as an average.

Abstentions

Unwillingness to cast a vote in the affirmative will be construed as a lack of endorsement, thus, *abstentions are interpreted as negative*. Members of a deliberating body should disqualify themselves prior to discussion on any candidacy on which they believe they should not cast a vote; the reason for disqualification should be explicitly stated in a note that is signed by the faculty member. An abstention is recorded only if an eligible voter elects not to cast an affirmative or negative vote after deliberating, i.e., a faculty member who has recused himself or herself is not classified as a potential voter on the case and does not count as an abstention.

THIRD-YEAR (AND SIXTH-YEAR, IF APPLICABLE) PRETENURE REVIEWS

For candidates who are in the tenure track and not yet tenured, enclose a copy of the third-year pretenure review. If the school's pretenure period is nine years, also enclose a copy of the sixth-year pretenure review.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

REFEREE LIST

The referee list consists of the names of potential referees drawn from more than one source and in any case not all suggested by the candidate. The dean is responsible for determining the suitability of potential referees and deciding which referees will be solicited. To avoid a late effort to obtain the requisite number of letters, most schools solicit more than the required number of letters. List all potential referees, indicating the source of the name and which were asked to write (see referee list form, p.8).

LETTERS OF EVALUATION

LETTER OF REQUEST

Letters to potential evaluators must state the action under consideration (i.e., promotion to what rank and whether tenure award is being considered), and must say that the candidate is “under consideration for,” rather than “recommended for” the proposed action (because under some circumstances a candidate may be considered for promotion/tenure without the support of the department and/or school). The letter of request must state that the review process is confidential. If the candidate is being considered for promotion in the tenure track *without tenure*, the letter of request should make clear in what stage of the pretenure period the candidate is, e.g., the candidate “is in the seventh year of the nine-year pretenure period and is not now under consideration for tenure.” The letter must be in the format approved by the provost (see sample letter p. 9).

External referees

Evaluations from external referees are essential to support promotion of tenured/tenure track faculty. **At least half of the letters submitted must be from completely independent referees, i.e., those who have not been a colleague or collaborator.** An external referee is someone with whom the candidate has not had a working relationship as colleague, collaborator over the past five years, or trainee or student over the past ten years. Professionals within the same discipline might be acquainted with a candidate and still be classified as an external referee if they are “arm’s length” referees whose knowledge of the candidate comes from their awareness and understanding of the candidate's work through publication, presentation, or even personal exchange, so long as that personal exchange is not in the context of a mentor, boss, co-worker, etc. Evaluators are classified as external when the perspective from which they view the candidate is from outside this university, but preferably not outside of the academy. (Reviewers from outside the academy are welcome to submit reviews, but the candidate and his/her advocates should know that these letters often have reduced impact.) The key is not so much where the referees physically reside at the time they write the letter, but rather on where the referees are or have been when they have been able to observe the contributions and accomplishments of the candidate. **External evaluators must be of academic rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered.**

Biographical sketches

Each of the external referee letters should be accompanied by biographical information of 200 words or less describing the importance and relevance of the external referee. The

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

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. Responsibility for collecting the potential referees' biographical information might be delegated to the candidate's department to minimize the magnitude of the task on any one staff person.

Colleague referees (no more than 4)

While letters from colleagues do not represent an unbiased review of the candidate's professional accomplishments, they can contribute information that is not accessible to the external reviewers, e.g., research collaborators and mentors might explain the unique research contributions of a candidate who engages extensively in collaborative research. Colleagues, past or current, might provide information about a candidate's role as a citizen of the local academic and wider professional community, as described in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3 I F 1, that includes "...professional service activities, and... willingness to assume a fair share of University administrative and service tasks" as a necessary qualification for faculty appointment. *Letters from colleagues should be sought only if they can add information to the file.* Thus, it is not necessary or helpful for a colleague who has already had input into the recommendation to write a separate letter.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Methods of evaluating teaching vary among faculties. In some cases a set of standardized evaluation forms collected *since the candidate's most recent promotion* suffice to present a comprehensive view of the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom teacher. It is not helpful to submit a voluminous set of individual teaching evaluations to document teaching. Rather, it is more helpful to the candidate if the department chair, curriculum director, or other appropriate person compiles an overview of the evaluations along with statistical ratings. The overview document should note that the evaluations on which the summary is based are available for reference in the department or other appropriate office.

The significance and effectiveness of a candidate's role in course design or curriculum development might be conveyed through a combination of sources, including letters from teaching colleagues, the candidate's self-description of teaching, the report from the department or faculty CAPT, and the chair's or dean's letters. 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 such referees also help to augment standardized teaching evaluations.

LIST OF POTENTIAL TEACHING EVALUATORS

The list of potential teaching evaluators should be drawn from names suggested by the candidate and the dean, department chair, and/or other curriculum directors. List all from whom teaching evaluations were requested, their status (current student, former student, colleague), and the source of the name (see teaching evaluator list, p. 10).

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

SAMPLE OF LETTER TO TEACHING EVALUATORS

Include a sample of the letter or form used to solicit the teaching evaluations. Requests for teaching evaluations must state the rank (and tenure status, if applicable) for which the candidate is under consideration and must include a statement that guarantees confidentiality to the evaluator. The letter states that the candidate is under consideration for promotion but does not express the dean's or faculty's opinion on the candidacy. (Use the format provided, p. 11)

TEACHING EVALUATIONS:

- A. a summary of course evaluations from students, usually covering the period since the candidate's most recent promotion
- B. individual responses from students and/or colleagues who are knowledgeable about the candidate's teaching, solicited by the dean or department chair

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

II. SUPPLIED BY THE DEPARTMENT:

DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S RECOMMENDATION

In a faculty that is organized into departments, the department chair writes a recommendation on the candidacy after a vote by department faculty. In addition to expressing the department chair's recommendation on the candidacy, the chair's letter might explain standards unique to a discipline, 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. As with the dean's letter, if the department chair's opinion differs from that of the department faculty, it is particularly important that the reasons for that opinion are expressed in detail.

DEPARTMENT FACULTY REPORT

The consideration of promotion or tenure award is initiated by the recommendation of a department, or, where faculty organization is not departmental, an appropriate committee of the constituent faculty. *On recommendations involving promotion, only faculty of rank equal to or superior to that being considered shall vote. On recommendations involving tenure, only faculty with tenure shall vote.* (Faculty Handbook, I.I.2) The result might be expressed through a voting scheme where 0 means definitely do not promote; 1 probably do not promote; 2 probably promote; and 3 definitely promote, reported as an average.

Minority opinion

If a faculty member who participated in the discussion leading to the department or faculty vote believes the department's or faculty's report **does not adequately express the deliberations**, he or she may send independently to the dean a statement of that opinion (Faculty Handbook, I. I. 3). This letter 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 recommendation.

One vote at highest level

A member of the candidate's department who is eligible to vote at a higher level (e.g., the faculty CAPT) should abstain from voting at the department level in favor of voting at the highest level of authority. (An exception to this policy is made for the College of Arts and Sciences, where the vote is to be cast at the department level and not at the higher level.)

Report on deliberations

Deliberations at the department level, as at higher levels of review, should be guided by principles of objectivity expressed in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3 I J.1), Review and Decision, "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.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

III. SUPPLIED BY THE CANDIDATE

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, conveying the candidate's educational and career history and listing the correct academic titles and the years of current and past positions. The CV should be dated, the pages numbered and the pages numbered. The names of professional organizations and journals, etc., 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 by an asterisk or other designation.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH, TEACHING AND SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS

Research summary

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 CV in narrative form.

Teaching summary

A summary of teaching contributions should be presented in two documents, (a) summary in table format, as on page 13 in this set of instructions; and (b) a narrative description of teaching, which may be incorporated into the CV or presented in a separate supplement that not exceeding two pages.

Service summary

It is generally sufficient to document service activities by listing them in the CV. The list of service activities, together with comments in the letters of recommendation, 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

Submit three representative publications and clearly mark their titles on the CV. Please be sure that each is complete and in order.

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REFEREES

Dear _____:

During the 2007-2008 academic year, (candidate), (current rank) (tenure status, if applicable), in the Department of (department), will be considered for promotion to (rank and tenure). **(If candidate is being considered for promotion in the tenure track but without tenure, add “Candidate is in the (____) year of the (____)-year pretenure period. He/she is not now under consideration for tenure.”)**

As part of the promotion and tenure process, we solicit letters of evaluation from external scholars and colleagues. You have been recommended as a referee who might 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 abilities, 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 own 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 any materials). 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, and we look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your assistance.

(Preferred closing)

Signature
(Dean)

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

SAMPLE LETTER TO TEACHING EVALUATORS

Dear _____:

During the 2007-2008 academic year, (candidate), (current rank), in the Department of (department) will be considered for promotion to (proposed rank) (and tenure status, if applicable). As part of the promotion and tenure process, we are seeking letters of evaluation of (his/her) teaching. You have been selected as an evaluator, and we would very much appreciate your assessment of (his/her) teaching or research mentoring performance from your experience. Your reply will be shared only with appropriate committees and administrators involved in the promotion and tenure 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 department chair)

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE 2007-08

EXAMPLE

TEACHING SUMMARY

Candidate: _____

Course name	Term taught	Enrollment	Instructor rating (scale x-x)*	Course rating (scale x-x)	Number of responses	Instructor rating last time taught by other instructor (omit name)	Course rating last time taught by other instructor

*appropriate to the rating scale used, e.g., scale 1 to 5 with 5 highest)