Seattle University
Rank and Tenure File Preparation Guidelines

PURPOSE OF THE RANK AND TENURE FILE GUIDELINES:

Tenure candidates and departmental and school/college-level review committees are to use these guidelines to assist them in preparing a file that will give the Seattle University Rank and Tenure Committee (URTC) the information it needs to conduct a full and fair review of the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. These guidelines indicate only the materials required by the URTC. Departmental and school or college personnel committees may require other materials. Therefore, candidates should consult with those bodies to determine whether additional materials are required at these levels of review.

Note on Mid Probationary Reviews: Tenure-track assistant professor faculty members preparing files for mid-probationary review should consult with their respective dean's offices for appropriate submission guidelines and deadlines.

MANAGEMENT OF RANK AND TENURE FILES:

The file for tenure and/or promotion is an application submitted by the candidate with recommendations added by evaluators at the department and school/college level as indicated in this document. The candidate's file is submitted to the Provost by the candidate's respective Dean's Office by December 15th. The candidate will supply materials for Sections I, III, IV, and V as outlined in this document and will have access to these sections upon request. All confidential materials, including those outlined in Section II of this document, will be not be available to the candidate and will be managed consistent with the confidentiality provisions in Section VII of the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook*.

As of AY2013 candidate file materials are submitted in electronic format. Detailed information for creating this type of file is contained in a separate document – 'Electronic File Submission Guidelines.' This document can be accessed at:

http://www.seattleu.edu/academicaffairs/policies/

The URTC reminds department chairs, deans, and department and school/college personnel rank and tenure committees that their recommendations should not merely advocate for the candidate, but rather should include a thorough analysis of the applicant's professional performance along with a detailed discussion of the basis for the recommendation. This information is critical for the URTC to be able to make an informed review of department and school/college recommendations.

CONTENT OF RANK AND TENURE FILES:

Section I: Introductory Statement and Vita

A. The introductory statement summarizes and highlights the candidate's academic/professional activities as well as his or her accomplishments and philosophy with regard to teaching, scholarship, and service. This statement is an overview only and should provide a brief overall self assessment that speaks directly to how the faculty member's work reflects and supports her/his field as well as the character and mission of the University as expressed in the University's mission statement.   Faculty involved in graduate level education should address how his/her scholarship meets the greater expectation of scholarly and professional activity discussed in the *Faculty Handbook* Section III.B.

B. A comprehensive vita, including a full teaching, scholarship, and service history, follows the introductory statement. **Candidates should bear in mind that members of the University Rank and Tenure Committee represent diverse disciplines and that specific information about accomplishments helps them to understand and interpret these accomplishments. Candidates are encouraged to distinguish among professional, scholarly, and service-oriented presentations and between peer-reviewed scholarship and other kinds of publications and service in her/his curriculum vitae.**

Section II: Department and School/College Actions and Recommendations

Section II.A: Departmental Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations (applies only to schools having a departmental review structure):

In schools/colleges having a departmental review structure, action must be taken by a formal Department Personnel Committee, which may be a special committee in larger departments or a committee of the whole serving as a personnel committee. Departmental action and recommendations must be presented in writing by the chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee.

The recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee must be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's activities in the three key areas of performance—teaching, scholarship, and service, as these areas are documented in the file. The recommendation must include an analysis of all three areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the committee's recommendation. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

Given that disciplines vary in their assessment of what constitutes appropriate scholarly work and productivity, URTC encourages the Department Personnel Committee to provide a context

and/or description of the types, levels/quality of publication venues, and measures of scholarly work and output appropriate to the candidate's discipline and/or specialty. In addition to materials included in the file, the Department Personnel Committee is encouraged to review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and grading patterns.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (the votes of individual committee members should not be disclosed)**,** date of action, a description of the committee, and the signatures of all committee members.

Members of the Department Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report. In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report, and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.B: Department Chairperson's Recommendation (applies only to schools/colleges that have a departmental structure):

Whether or not the department chairperson is a member of the department personnel committee, s/he will submit his or her own recommendation on the candidate's petition. The University Rank and Tenure Committee requires this report because it believes the department chairperson is informed of the candidate's performance in ways that department personnel committees are not. This recommendation should be based on the chairperson's independent analysis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation must include an analysis of all three areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the recommendation, taking into account the candidates particular field and/or specialty. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the department, school/college, and/or university.

Section II.C: School/College Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations:

School/college action must be taken by a formal School/College Personnel Committee, which must be constituted in a manner appropriate to its structure and consistent with its bylaws or procedural rules governing the committee.

The School/College Personnel Committee recommendation must be presented in writing. The recommendation must be based on a full review and analysis of all file materials and must include discussion of the basis for recommendation, including all three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service). As appropriate, the school/college assessment of the

candidate's performance should clearly reflect any published guidelines the school/college has regarding productivity and quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

If the school/college does not have a departmental structure, the School/College Personnel Committee must review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and grading patterns.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (the votes of individual committee members should not be disclosed)**,** date of action, a description of the committee, and the signatures of all committee members.

Members of the School/College Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report. In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.D: Dean's Recommendation:

The Dean must present in writing a fully justified recommendation that includes an analysis of all three areas of performance and that is based on a review of all file materials and of preceding recommendations. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

Section II.E.: External Letters:

At least three evaluations from peers outside the university who can speak to the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly work are required. External evaluators will be chosen according to the guidelines of the individual school or college, solicited by a representative of the dean's office and made available in the electronic file for reviewers. C.V.'s for external reviewers do not need to be placed in the electronic file, but should be available upon request. The URTC advises that the credibility of the external evaluation is directly linked to the independence of the evaluator. The role of external evaluators should be to assess the significance of the candidate's scholarship within the standards of the discipline. External evaluators should be provided with materials outlining Seattle University and the applicable school/college policies and expectations for scholarship, but should not be asked to explicitly assess candidates according to these standards. External reviewers should not be

asked to comment on teaching or service.

Section III A&B: Prior Reviews

In the cases of applications for either tenure or for tenure and promotion, copies of all previous reviews (annual and formal) must be included in the materials for the University Rank and Tenure Committee.

In the case of applications for promotion to professor, all annual reviews since the last formal review of the candidate by the URTC must be included. However, if the time between the last formal review and the new petition is greater than four years (see *Faculty Handbook,* Section VI), the candidate need only include the past five annual reviews (e.g., if ten years have passed between the formal review that led to tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, then the candidate need only include the past five annual reviews). Additional annual reviews may be included if they are needed to give an accurate context for the achievements of the candidate. Please explain the justification for the additional reviews in the Statement on Teaching (see Section IV.A below).

Section IV: Supporting Documents

The Rank and Tenure file should include supporting documentation discussing the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate. The teaching, scholarship, and service sections of the notebook must each include individual analytical statements, written by the candidate, that discuss the contents of the respective sections and provide information that will help the committee interpret the contents. In these statements, candidates should explicitly address how her/his teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university. Candidates should also explicitly discuss the contexts for their performance in each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) as well as address areas of apparent weakness in his/her file and how those weaknesses are being or have been addressed. Such discussion is critical to the URTC's understanding of how to assess the candidate, including how possible weaknesses fit within the overall contributions of the candidate as well as the possibility for improvement.

Section IV.A: Teaching

1. Statement on Teaching: This statement acquaints the URTC to the candidate's philosophy of education, his/her discipline, and the courses taught. It presents the candidate's achievements in the area of teaching and how her/his teaching contributes to the overall educational mission of the university. The statement should present evidence demonstrating

the candidate's effectiveness as an educator and the promotion of student learning. It is recommended that the candidate address peer evaluations, student evaluations (including quantitative and qualitative analysis), and grading patterns. A list of courses taught with brief course descriptions is encouraged.

2. Student Evaluations: All student evaluations should be done using the standard student evaluation form for the applicant's college/school.

In the case of an application for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, candidates must provide a summary chart of student ratings for all courses taught with comparison information on department and/or college/school student rating averages. The chart should be clearly identified by the following: year and quarter taught, course title and course number, and mean of scores for major evaluation categories on the school/college approved forms.

For candidates seeking promotion to professor, a summary chart for all courses, minimally four years prior to the candidates' application should be included. All courses should be clearly identified by the following: year and quarter taught, course title and course number, and means for major evaluation categories on the school or colleges approved forms.

In the case of evaluation using computer-scored forms, the file must contain the individual computer-generated summaries for each course along with student comments in the Supporting Documents Teaching folder. In the case of courses not evaluated with computer-scored forms, a summary of the results along with the copy of the evaluation instrument is to be submitted. It is important that the candidate's appraisal of individual teaching evaluations relate to the overall quality of the candidate's teaching.

The context of student evaluations, especially quantitative scores, are not self-evident. Given that such evaluations provide just one way of assessing the quality of teaching, chairpersons and/or departmental personnel committees, as well as the candidate, are strongly encouraged to include an interpretation of these evaluations. Deans should interpret candidates' student evaluations in light of the norms or standards for his/her schools/colleges.

(1) **Quantitative analysis of student evaluations**: The candidate should include some form of quantitative analysis or summary of the student evaluation data, such as data summaries and trends in the data over time. Such summaries must include the mean (average) of scores. Analysis of quantitative evaluations must also include information relating to the quarter or semester taught, course number, enrollment, whether the course is a requirement or an elective, and whether the course is a new preparation.

(2) **Qualitative analysis of student evaluations**: The candidate should thoughtfully comment on and interpret the student evaluations. For example, if a course was taught

on an experimental basis, the success (or lack thereof) of this course should be discussed. The URTC encourages discussion that will help it understand the causes of and responses to negative patterns in the evaluation data.

3.   Peer Evaluations: The URTC encourages annual peer reviews of all tenure-track faculty and requires that applications for tenure or promotion include at least three peer evaluations from the past two years. The peer evaluator should normally be a tenured faculty member. The selection of peer evaluators is normally made by the department chairperson (or dean in schools without departments) in consultation with the candidate.

The peer review process must be carried out in accordance with school/college and departmental policy, but must, at a minimum, include classroom visitations (or videotaping, visitation of student teaching, or clinical training, as appropriate) and a review of course syllabi and materials, sample written assignments, examinations, and grading patterns (the materials themselves should not be included).

The peer evaluation must include a description of the review process, a detailed report of the observations of the evaluator or evaluators and any recommendations that seem appropriate.

4. Grading Patterns: Information on grading patterns with comparison information on department and/or college/school grading patterns should be included. The faculty candidate should request information on grading patterns from her/his dean's office. Grading patterns included in the file should be for the past five years or the candidate's time at Seattle University, whichever is less.

.

Section IV.B: Scholarship

Statement on Scholarship: To assist the URTC with the evaluation of scholarship from different disciplines, candidates should present an overview of the focus of her/his scholarship, achievements, and goals or plans for future work. A brief description of selected scholarly projects should be included. Specific discussion of the competitive context and peer-reviewed nature of submitted scholarship is required (e.g. acceptance or rejection rate of the journal, impact factor scores, citation index, etc., as appropriate). The goal of this part of the statement will be to inform those reviewers who are not familiar with the publishing journal of the quality and readership of that journal*.*

This section must include materials documenting the candidate's scholarship. In this context

"scholarship" is to be understood as creative production, typically including books, peer-reviewed or equivalent articles, artistic productions, and other major works. Representative copies of manuscripts, conference presentations, reviews, creative artistic productions, software and websites developed, symposia or panel comments, and curricular or grant proposals may also be included. **This section should contain only the two or three submissions that the candidate considers best.**

Section IV.C: Service

Statement on Service: The candidate's service contributions play an important role in the rank and tenure review process. The candidate's statement should address the record of service activities and the role that his/her service activities have played in other aspects of her/his file as appropriate; e.g. the impact of service on teaching and scholarship. The record of service should be reflected in the candidate's vita and introductory statement. Additionally, departmental and school reviews must include an evaluation of the candidate's service.

Section V: Supplemental Supporting Materials:

This section contains materials not included elsewhere in the file that offer direct evidence of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and/or service. For example, monographs pertaining to community engagement, or notification of major grants and awards. Candidates should be judicious in their inclusion of these materials and should not include conference programs, letters from students, etc. unless this material is specifically referenced elsewhere in the file (e.g. the candidate's teaching or scholarship statement) and has specific bearing on the case.

Submission of Documentation

For complete instructions on electronic submission of review documentation, refer to the Electronic Portfolio Guide for Faculty on the Policies and Procedures page of the Office of Academic Affairs.