Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

eDossier Information

Presented by:

The Provost's Office

Table of Contents

Overview

This guide is to assist in the preparation of "final" dossiers to be presented next fall for review and contains information for both faculty candidates and peer review committees. Final eDossiers are due by September 1 for tenure/promotion and lecturer reappointment reviews, and October 7 for all probationary reviews.

Any date that falls on a weekend or university holidays should advance to the next work day that falls Monday through Friday.

Please review all important dates and deadlines for the reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

All eDossiers will be submitted using the eDossier system through Interfolio following the standard guidelines for each college.

A. The CBA. Familiarity with the principles and rules for faculty review, as stated in Article 12 of the CSU-AAUP CBA (and the analogous section of the LS-AAUP CBA for the Law School), is essential for all candidates and their reviewers -- for the most part, these points will not be repeated here. Please see the appended calendar of key faculty contract events. For Faculty considering promotion and tenure via the Teaching Track - please see Appendix A.

B. Early reviews. In recent years a relatively new issue has arisen related to the interest of some faculty in seeking early promotion, defined here as requesting a *tenure review prior to one's sixth year of service* (including any possible service credited from another institution), a *full professor /senior lecturer/ full professor of practice review prior to the completion of five years in associate professor/college lecturer/associate professor of practice rank.*

Presenting a record of sustained performance clearly above the threshold levels expected in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service is difficult and exceptional within a compressed time frame. For example, while it is possible that a new faculty member with a significantly reduced probationary teaching load may compile a strong record of scholarly accomplishments in less than six years, the reduced number of courses may not provide enough longitudinal data to assess full teaching competence at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Accordingly, the Provost's office recommends that candidates considering "going up early" should do so only after careful consultation with their Department Chair, PRC chair, and Dean's office. We further recommend that these three should only grant their approval and consent for an early review to candidates who demonstrate a record of sustained performance that is clearly above the threshold levels expected in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service. Keep in mind, however, that the current CSU-AAUP or LS-AAUP (for Law) Collective Bargaining Agreement contains no restrictive statements regarding the early review option.

C. Final dossier/eDossier content. What follows are suggested guidelines for the content and structure of eDossiers. Presented here is the set of sections that compromise the eDossier structure. Each candidate should address the criteria/ standards articulated in the CBA, and their college/department/school promotion and tenure guidelines. The materials

submitted in the dossier should all support the candidate's assertion that they met the criteria.

D. For additional information about the promotion and tenure process please review the materials included in the 2012 University Task Force Report on Tenure and Promotion: https://mycsu.csuohio.edu/ResourceCheck/VerifyServlet?loc=/committees/promotiontenu re/

Preliminary Dossiers

"Preliminary dossiers". The CSU-AAUP CBA requires preliminary dossiers be normally submitted on or before first Monday of April and must be presented by candidates for tenure and promotion only.

These dossiers serve the purpose of guiding the selection of five external reviewers who have the expertise to judge the candidate's scholarly materials and also have an appropriate "arm's length" relationship to the candidate. Typically, this dossier contains

- a current Curriculum Vitae,
- a personal summary statement (see below for suggested content); and
- reprints/reproductions or URL links for the selected peer-reviewed publications and other scholarly or creative products that represents the quality of the candidate's research/ scholarship/ creative activity.

For promotion and tenure reviews, these materials should be restricted to work produced during the period of activity to be reviewed as identified in the letter of intent (LOI).

List of Sections in a Probationary, Tenure/Promotion, or Reappointment eDossier

Material supplied by the candidate **(Sections 1-7 in eDossier)**

1. ***Introductory Materials.***

   a. Current CV
      Think about how your present your accomplishments. See https://www.fau.edu/provost/faculty/files/CV-Template-for-Promotion-2019-2020.pdf for suggestions of how to best present your research/scholarship/creative activity
   b. Signed Copy of Appointment Letter of Intent (LOI) (for all but full professor candidates, lecturer/Professor of Practice, faculty candidate in 9th year or 12th-year review, or Clinical or Legal Writing Faculty reappointments).
   c. Tenure/Promotion/Reappointment Guidelines of Department/School or College
   d. Other (optional). Upload and attach any supplementary material or additional items you wish to include in this section (e.g., Tenure Clock Extension Documentation or COVID Impact Statement).

2. ***Personal Summary Statement.***
   This statement should be a succinct (ten pages maximum is recommended) overview and self-assessment of the significance of one's instructional, scholarly/creative, and other professional accomplishments and associated future plans that demonstrate you have met or exceed the appropriate criteria for your review.

   Consider the following:
   - Use active voice, not passive voice.
   - Think about the audience - your eDossier will be reviewed by people from outside your discipline. Describe your research/scholarship/ creative activity, teaching, and service for a lay person.
   - Cover the high points and direct the reader to where in your eDossier the supporting documentation is located.
   - Answer the questions: How do you define yourself? Start with the most important part of your job and end with a short summary.

   For more information/ general advice about tenure statements the following resources:
   - https://www.slideshare.net/UO-AcademicAffairs/writing-a-tenure-statement-2011
   - https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-professor-is-in-4-steps-to-a-strong-tenure-file/
   - https://twu.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-performance-review/pt-sample-narrative-statements/

3. ***Teaching Report.*** Candidates must be sure that the evidence they present is accurate and convincing. See Appendix B for further guidance on demonstrating the appropriate teaching criteria needed for promotion, tenure, or reappointment.

   Student evaluations are important. All candidates should provide summaries of all of their student evaluation scores for all of the course taught. Candidates should document how they use student evaluations to inform their teaching. See Appendix F for the Student Evaluation Policy.

   Candidates are required to document student responses to the following item "What is your overall evaluation of this instructor?" This item is scored on a 5-point scale. The corresponding data for this item should be summarized and presented in the eDossier. Additional BLUE student evaluation data may be used to highlight teaching achievements. Individual instructor and course data on the 5 -point scale is available at httQ_s://courseeval.csuohio.edu/.

   Peer and department chair assessments based on classroom/laboratory visitations are essential supplements to student evaluations. These should be longitudinal, based on a number of classroom visitations, rather than impressions recorded of a single visit. A minimum of one peer evaluation per semester is expected. For promotion to Full Professor or Senior Lecturer, peer evaluations demonstrating teaching ability should be provided for several consecutive years prior to applying for promotion.

   For faculty seeking promotion or reappointment using the teaching criterion, additional peer evaluations per semester are expected. Peer evaluations of asynchronous teaching or recorded materials from synchronous instructions is permissible.

   In addition, candidates might present copies of particularly useful syllabi and essays that they may have written about teaching. Candidates should also be sensitive to national accreditation standards regarding student outcome assessment; contributions to departmental activities in this area should be highlighted. Appended are further recommendations on how to document full competence, exceptional achievement, sustained excellence, or long-term and outstanding record of distinguished teaching, whichever is applicable. See Appendix B for detailed suggestions.

   a. Teaching Statement. Concisely describe one's teaching activities, referencing, and explaining the evidence in the sections b-e.
   b. Peer Observation Reports
   c. Student Evaluations (table with Blue/SEI Scores). ***Present summary table*** presenting the summary statistics for **each** course you have taught (average ratings, comparison averages, response rates, etc.). Please follow any instructions you received from your college regarding the amount of detail to be presented for student evaluations.
   d. Representative Syllabi. Include one copy of syllabus per course unless substantial revision of course has occurred.
   e. eFAAR Information - Teaching: Courses Taught. The eFAAR Information - Teaching: Courses Taught data must be imported into this section of the eDossier as a PDF. Please refer to the Faculty Candidate eDossier Instruction Guide for more information.

f. Other (optional). Upload and attach any supplementary material or additional items you wish to include in this section.

4. ***Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity Report Required for tenure - track and tenured faculty seeking promotion to full professor.*** For lecturers/Professors of Practice this **R/S/CA** section is optional.
   a. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity Statement.
      Beyond the overview presented in the personal statement, present a brief summary of the content and significance of each publication or other creative product, referencing the content in the next sections (points b and c) as appropriate.
   b. Published/Juried/Accepted Products. Upload or attach copies of/or weblinks to your publications (journal articles, book chapters, etc.) in this section.
   c. External Funding/Grant Proposals & Awards (if applicable/optional). Candidates will need to upload or attach grant award notifications and/or grant reviewer feedback for unsuccessful proposals in this section.
   d. Other (optional). For publications/activities on which the candidate is a co-author/co-collaborator, include here a statement from the senior/corresponding author or team leader explaining the nature of the candidate's contribution. Include evidence of the professional eminence and readership of one's publication venues (e.g. impact factors, rejection rates or status of publication outlet, if pplicable).

5. ***Service Report***
   a. Service Statement. A short narrative with evidence that documents being an effective university citizen, professional community outreach, and/or significant professional association activity.
   b. Service to CSU/Internal Service. This may include service to your department/school, college, and the university.
   c. External Service (if applicable). This may include clinical, community engagement, and service to your discipline.
   d. Other (if applicable). This may include letters acknowledging a significant external service activity. Upload and attach any supplementary material or additional items you wish to include in this section.

6. ***Awards/Recognitions*** **(if applicable/optional).** List all awards/recognitions in one document and upload or attach in this section. **NOTE: Grant Awards go in section 4.c. External Funding/Grant Proposals** & **Awards**

7. ***Prior Probationary Review Letters***
   a. Reports from 3rd Year Review - assistant professors only
   b. Reports from 4th Year Review - assistant college lecturers/professors of practice only
   c. Reports from 5th Year Review - assistant professors only

Material inserted during review process **(Sections 8-10 in eDossier)**

8. ***Reviewer Inserted Material,*** **if applicable.** Upload or attach any supplementary materials (this may include materials requested by the **DPRC/CPRC** including missing co-author letters and/or **R/S/CA** accepted after submission of eDossier) in this section.

9. ***External Reviews.*** For tenure/promotion and full professor dossiers only.
Five letters are required, with the evidence presented of the relevant expert and "arm's length" qualifications of each, and of the selection process that was used. See Appendix C for more detailed information on selecting External Reviewers

Completion of this section is the responsibility of the PRC chair-the materials are inserted in this section after the candidate submits the final dossier. See Appendices D and E for sample invitations for external reviewers.

a. External Review Letters
b. Reviewers CV/Statement of Qualifications
c. Statement of Process used to select/recruit reviewers

10. *Internal Review Letters.* These recommendations should first present the decision or vote (for-against-abstained-recused) outcome and then proceed to document this conclusion. The most useful recommendations are well-thought-out assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in teaching, research, service, and, if appropriate, intellectual leadership. A good recommendation, in short, will not only comment on the quantity of a candidate's work but will also offer a considered judgment of its quality.

a. DPRC Recommendation, if applicable
b. Chair's Recommendation
c. CPRC Recommendation
d. Dean's Recommendation
e. UPRC Recommendation, if applicable
f. Additional UPRC Material Submitted, if applicable
g. Provost's Recommendation, if applicable

Responsibilities of Departmental-School Peer Review Committees

1. ***Departmental (School) PRC Membership - Participation***

a. ***Membership:***
See Section 12.12, B (2) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. PLOA status does not disqualify membership, but a faculty member who volunteers to participate while on PLOA must participate in the Committee's deliberations

b. ***Participation:***
The Departmental/School By-Laws regarding participation requirements need to be consulted (e.g., have to be present for all the discussions before exercising vote or a majority of the discussions)

c. ***Recusals/Conflict of Interest:***
See Article 12.16 in the Main AAUP and 12.13 in the Law ["Conflict of Interest] of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

2. ***External Reviewers***

a. ***Selection Process, Confidentiality and Content of Letter to External Reviewers*** (See Appendices C & D for more detailed information):
The letter soliciting the external review cannot promise or hint at confidentiality as the Ohio Public Records Act categorize these letters as a "public document" and, as such, are eventually available for inspection by the candidate.

b. ***Access to External Letters:***
Article 12.12 C (4) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement allows a candidate for promotion and/or tenure full and unedited access to the external letters, but not before the dossiers are transmitted from the Dean to the Provost (the written request for these letters is to be addressed to the Provost). The various levels below the Provost (Department-School **PRC,** Chair, College **PRC,** and the Dean) cannot make these letters available to the candidate. This was included in the Collective Bargaining Agreement to stop the past practice of candidates receiving copies at the beginning of the process and insisting that a rebuttal be inserted in the dossier.

c. ***Different Material Can be Sent to Different Reviewers:***
Most of the times, the same material on a candidate is sent to all five reviewers. However, this is not mandatory. If an individual has produced a corpus over more than one sub-area: each separate corpus can be sent to the relevant reviewer (this underscores the need to include a full curriculum vitae so the reviewer will have an idea of the candidate's work in toto rather than just a small portion).

d. ***Process I Relationship I Brief Biographical Sketch:***
The PRC must enclose the following in the eDossier before it is transmitted to the Department Chair/School Director:

(I) A full discussion of the process employed to select the external reviewers (including who suggested the names);

(2) A CV of each reviewer. This document should be uploaded into the appropriate section of the eDossier;

(3) A copy of the letter sent to the external reviewers asking for comments;
(4) A statement from the faculty candidate describing the relationship (if any) between the faculty member and the reviewers. Department Chairs-School Directors have been instructed to return the dossier to the PRC if any of this material is missing.

3. ***Written Recommendation from the Peer Review Committee***

a. The PRC's bottom-line recommendation must contain an explicit unambiguous statement with **the precise vote total** (i.e., "the PRC recommends the [requested action] by a vote of X in favor and Y opposed" or "the PRC does not recommend the [requested action] by a vote of X to Y"). The Department Chairs/School Directors have been instructed to return a dossier to the PRC if this statement is not included.

b. For preliminary reviews there are proscribed evaluation statements to assist the PRCs and the faculty member assess the progress a faculty member is making towards tenure or reappointment. See Articles 12.2 (E), 12.3 (F), or 2.12

For preliminary tenure reviews, the faculty member shall be advised one of the following:
(1) they are "making substantial progress toward promotion and tenure", or
(2) they have "a reasonable chance for promotion with additional effort," or
(3) they are "unlikely to be promoted and that a nonreappointment recommendation may ensue."

For preliminary reappointment reviews for Lecturer and Professor of Practice the faculty member shall be advised
(1) they are "making substantial progress toward reappointment", or
(2) they "reasonable chance of reappointment with additional effort", or
(3)) they are "unlikely to be reappointed and that a nonreappointment recommendation may ensue."

b. There is only one PRC recommendation (it may contain separate majority and minority statements).

c. Outing of Individual Votes:
The individual vote of each Committee member is confidential unless there is a unanimous decision by the Committee to publicly identify how each individual voted on a particular dossier.

4. ***Solicited Material***

Article 12.12C (1) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement reads: "The [Departmental] PRC may also consider additional materials it deems relevant to the evaluation." This has been interpreted that the Departmental-School PRC thus has the prerogative of soliciting- in addition to the external reviews - additional relevant information. If this is done, due process and professional ethics require that the PRC exercise caution using such material: The

Committee must make sure that the information is relevant and valid. The Committee cannot base its decision on secret scurrilous information.

5. ***Distribution of Letters from Departmental/School PRCs and from Department Chairs/School Directors***

The Department/School PRC must, at the time that the dossier is transmitted to the Department Chair-School Director, provide a copy of the Committee's recommendation to the candidate via the eDossier system. The candidate is not required to make any sort of request (written or verbal).

cc: Laura Bloomberg, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
University Peer Review Committe

APPENDIX A

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT A TEACHING TRACK DOSSIER
(Recommendations by the University Personnel Committee January, 1995)

Assumption: Gaining promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure should be attainable but should not be considered an easy or inferior track.

Guiding Principles for Dossier Review: Two guiding principles for teaching track dossier review that are analogous to those currently used in the scholarship track are that the candidate must demonstrate that his/her teaching is an intellectually demanding activity, and that some product must be available for peer review. In addition, documentation of outstanding classroom performance and appropriateness of teaching materials should be provided. The dossier should also address the candidate's contribution to departmental activities with regard to student outcome assessment and eLearning, if appropriate.

Teaching as an Intellectually Demanding Activity: Excellent teaching is intellectually challenging because it requires thoughtful preparation and planning, on-the-spot classroom performance, and serious reflection about this preparation, planning and performance. When reading a dossier, the reviewers should be able to recognize and appreciate this intellectual activity.

A teaching portfolio would be the basis for demonstrating this. This portfolio should not be just a laundry list of "things I did in my classroom" but should reflect some coherence of ideas and activities. This requirement could be demonstrated in a number of ways. For example, the candidate could articulate his/her teaching philosophy and explain how it relates to his/her classroom performance. Or, the candidate could document how his/her contributions to pedagogy have changed over time because of recent theory, research, and/or reflection on his/her own practice.

A Product for External Peer Review: Promotion on the basis of teaching should require a product, beyond classroom teaching, that can be peer-reviewed in a similar manner to the review of scholarship. The product could be journal articles about some aspect related to one's teaching but could also include curriculum-related products (including software and textbooks) and funded external grants related to teaching. In other words, the candidate needs to demonstrate his/her contributions and the impact of those contributions to the pedagogy in his/her discipline. The range of acceptable journals should be broad.

External peer reviewers selected for evaluation of a teaching dossier should have expertise in college teaching. The criteria traditionally used for selecting external peer reviewers stress expertise in traditional scholarship, but this scholarly distinction may not necessarily be relevant when evaluating excellence in teaching.

Documentation of Classroom Performance: Classroom performance should be evaluated by a reliable and valid student evaluation instrument. This should also include systematic peer evaluation by CSU faculty. Departments and Colleges need to institute consistent policies for both student and peer evaluation.

Evaluation of Classroom Materials: The materials used in the classroom should be evaluated by multiple peers to judge whether the syllabi are comprehensive, the readings reflect current knowledge in the field, and the assignments and tests are appropriate. Generally, this review could be conducted by colleagues at CSU, but in rare cases some courses are so specialized that peers with expertise in the area may have to be sought from other institutions.

APPENDIX B

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING DEMONSTRATION OF "FULL COMPETENCE", "EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT", OR "SUSTAINED EXCELLENCE" IN THE AREA OF TEACHING

(Recommended by the University Peer Review Committee and the Office of the Provost, spring 2008, updated 2021)

If you are considering designating teaching as your area of strength, you would be well advised to speak with colleagues in your department and College and consider their advice in making this decision. If your chosen area of strength for promotion to associate professor is teaching (which requires evidence of "exceptional achievement" in teaching), or if you are seeking promotion to the rank of professor (which requires evidence of "sustained excellence in teaching"), you will need to demonstrate a higher level of achievement in teaching than simply "full competence". After all, most college professors consider themselves to be excellent teachers. The case you make will need to be especially rigorous.

Teaching portfolios have been recommended as one way of documenting excellence in teaching. You may want to review *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching* (1991), by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education). Faculty are also encouraged to participate in the Teaching Portfolio workshops offered through the Center for Faculty Excellence.

Since teaching is a sine qua non for promotion and tenure, you should seriously consider including the following information in your dossier, whether or not teaching is your major area of strength:

1. A complete list of all courses taught at CSU (and elsewhere, if they are part of the information for your probationary period as identified in your letter of intent). Indicate whether each course is at the undergraduate or graduate level (or both).

2. Copies of syllabi for the latest offering of each course. (Include older syllabi only if you are making a case for course improvement in one or more courses).

3. Summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught. These evaluations should be presented **in <u>summary</u> form** (tables and data visualizations are acceptable). It is and candidate's responsibility to present the SEI data in manner that supports their claim they have met the appropriate teaching criteria. It is helpful for the college or department means to be included to provide further context for the SEI scores.

   One would normally expect scores at or above the department mean, and one would also normally expect to see improvement over time. Scores in new or innovative courses may not be high, and thus the type of course being evaluated should be taken into account- it is your responsibility to provide such an explanation- - if you feel it to be appropriate.

4. Longitudinal peer evaluations of your teaching in more than one course. These evaluations should be based on direct observation by colleagues at multiple meetings of each class. Furthermore, these evaluations should be longitudinal (extending over several years, not just the year in which you apply for promotion).

5. Demonstrated evidence of teaching large introductory-level sections in an effective manner.

6. Evidence of development of new courses or workshops and/or the substantial redesign of existing courses.

7. Evidence of effectively advising students on an extensive basis on academic matters and career possibilities

8. Highly effective non-classroom instructional/supervisory activities (dissertations, theses, clinical supervision, independent study, tutorials, training and supervision of teaching assistants).

9. Accounts of innovations in curriculum and/or delivery systems (e.g. eLearning).

10. Demonstrated evidence of the incorporation of student outcome assessment measures into course syllabi.

If considering promotion with teaching as your primary strength, the following list indicates various types of information considered evidence of "full competence", "exceptional achievement", or "sustained excellence" in the area of teaching. This list is meant to suggest some of the means by which a case for high performance in the area of teaching might be documented and argued. It is not meant to be a rigid inventory of prescriptions, and no single candidate would be expected to document effectiveness in every area:

a. Published journal articles about some aspect of your teaching (such articles would be documented in the same fashion as other professional publications);
b. Curriculum products (e.g., textbooks, software, simulations, exercises) that have been published or adopted by others;
c. Funded grants related to teaching (such grants would be documented in the same fashion as research grants).
d. Detailed accounts of courses developed for and offered via eLearning modalities (e.g. web-based, hybrid, and/or IVDL).
e. Descriptions of course modifications made for the purpose of participating in Learning Communities at CSU.
f. Descriptions of co-teaching activities, including statements from one's co-teachers regarding course design and division of labor.
g. Requests for teaching assistance from others (e.g., teaching consultations, teaching demonstrations).
h. Examples of students who have excelled in your field in advanced courses or after graduation due to your influence.

1. Demonstration of significant course redesign that has resulted in excellent student learning outcomes.

J. Awards for excellence in teaching by the College, University, or professional organizations.

k. Significant innovations and applications of technology and eLearning (beyond the mundane level).

I. Statements about your teaching achievements from administrators and peers at CSU and elsewhere.

m. Self-reflections about philosophy, growth, and improvement as a teacher (the CSU Center for Faculty Excellence offers a program to assist with this process).

APPENDIX C

SELECTING AND SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Several issues have come to the attention of the University Peer Review Committee with regard to the letters to external reviewers who will evaluate the scholarship or teaching credentials of candidates for promotion/tenure. The checklist below is to alert the Departmental PRCs, or the College PRCs where there are no departmental PRCs, to these issues. These are issues which the PRC must address in drafting the letter to the outside reviewer See

1. ***Selection of External Reviewers.***
The process of identifying external reviewers is a shared responsibility between the candidate and the Peer Review Committee (either the DPRC or CPRC whichever committee reviews the eDossier first) is responsible for identifying and recruiting external reviewers to write letters of evaluation during the spring and summer terms of the year preceding the year that the review will be conducted.

The Peer Review Committee must compile a list of possible external reviewers. The PRC will independently develop an additional list from among authorities in the candidate's field of expertise. The PRC may consult the department chair/school director as appropriate.
The candidate may also provide a list, which should be compiled without knowledge of the unit's list. If the candidate suggests a reviewer who also appears on the unit's list, that reviewer may be considered an independent unit selection rather than one proposed by the candidate.

A completed list of external reviewers will be submitted by the PRC to the candidate, who may advise the PRC that some of the names should be deleted if he/she feels the suggested reviewer is not qualified to render an objective assessment. The process of identifying suitable reviewers is expected to be a collegial and collaborative process between the candidate and the PRC. However, according to Article 12.12 C (I) of the collective bargaining agreement it is the responsibility of the PRC to obtain external reviews. A minimum of five external reviewers will be identified by the PRC from the candidate's and PRC's lists of names to review the candidate's materials. Normally, one would not expect to see more than one reviewer from the same department within a given institution for any single candidate. A minimum of five external letters is required for each case, making it advisable to arrange for at least six or seven.

2. ***Appropriate Reviewers.***
All external evaluation letters should be solicited from disciplinary and professional leaders with no more than a professional knowledge of or relationship to the candidate.

- Reviewers should be at or above the rank being sought, ideally at the rank of full professor, though an associate professor can serve as a reviewer, if that reviewer clearly represents an essential voice in the critical evaluation of the candidate's scholarship/creative practice.
- Identify reviewers at comparable institutions.
- Reviewers should be leaders and respected colleagues in the disciplinary or professional field.

- Avoid reviewers with close relationships to the candidate. The following relationships should be considered disqualifying: dissertation advisor or member of doctoral committee; former departmental colleague; research collaborator within the review period; co-author within the review period. Close personal relationships are also problematic. Many other professional relationships are acceptable, but prospective reviewers who express concern about their ability to present an unbiased evaluation or are uncomfortable playing the role of an evaluator should be excused.

3. Confidentiality.
Since letters from external referees become part of a candidate's dossier, and since the dossier is considered to be a public record, confidentiality may not be promised to external reviewers.

4. Scholarly and Pedagogical Contributions.
Letters are to request evaluations of the candidate's scholarly and/or pedagogical contributions to the field. Comments on the candidate's service are appropriate only if the reviewer knows of them from personal experience. It is not appropriate to ask whether the candidate would be promoted at the reviewer's institution or any other university.

The UPRC prefers reviewer comments which are explicit as to the significance and influence of the candidate's work on his/her discipline and detailed as to the nature of the contribution.

5. Materials Sent.
It should be clear to all parties what materials are sent to the reviewers. The reviewer should receive enough scholarly or teaching materials to be able to evaluate the candidate's contribution, but not so much that the reviewer has to waste a lot of time wading through the materials. Elements of scholarly productivity or teaching effectiveness, which are essential to the case, should be included, and the selected list should certainly be checked with the candidate for completeness.

6. Reviewer Impartiality (see further detail in the 2012 Report of the University Task force on the Application of Promotion and Tenure Standards and Processes).
The reviewer cannot have been a co-author or collaborator on any project with the candidate; cannot have been a mentor or professor in any institution during the time the candidate received a degree or other form of professional training; cannot be someone in a position to receive some advantage or benefit beyond the honorarium based on the outcome of the candidate's review.

Evidence of arm's-length impartiality requires a written statement of such from the reviewer within his/her review letter and from the candidate during the process of developing the list of potential reviewers. Candidates should refrain from any direct or indirect contact with a potential external reviewer.

7. Honorarium.
Reviewers may be offered an honorarium of two hundred dollars, payment to be processed upon receipt of the review letter.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
For Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure Reviews

[Date]

Appropriate inside address

Dear .....

In response to his/her request for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor , the Peer Review Committee of the College/Department of _____has initiated an external review of. 's____ credentials. Having identified you as a leader in the [INSERT candidate's field], the Committee is grateful for your willingness to provide a candid evaluation of Dr.___ 's professional accomplishments based on an analysis of his/her curriculum vitae and a representative sampling of his/her work.

More specifically, as Dr. has purposely selected the enclosed materials in an effort to demonstrate ***significant scholarship or creative work in addition to his or her dissertation, although such scholarly work may be an extension or reworking of dissertation material, provided it demonstrates independent work*** (we are most interested in your assessment of the quality and impact of his/her scholarly and creative achievements. Put another way, of what importance has Dr.'s _____work been to the field of [insert candidate's field]? Is it original and innovative or relatively commonplace and inconsequential? What is its potential--both realized and unrealized--for advancing theory, research, or practice? Has Dr._attained a position of academic distinction as evidenced by publication in highly regarded, refereed journals and presentation at major conferences?

In sum, we are requesting an appraisal that focuses on the candidate's record of performance as a scholar, rather than his/her teaching or service contributions. Moreover, we would prefer that you ***not*** comment on Dr. ___ 's eligibility for tenure and/or promotion at Cleveland State or any other university. Your letter will become part of the documentation that those charged with responsibility for making recommendations regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion and tenure will examine. In keeping with Ohio law, please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

CSU uses an eDossier system for our promotion and tenure reviews. In order that we may meet University deadlines governing our internal review process, we ask that you submit your comments to us by [insert dateL If you are willing to serve as a reviewer, please email me separately to send a copy of your current CV [*If your college provides an honorarium or other gift include the following:* "and personal mailing address so that we may send you [insert how your department/college processes payment of honorarium"], as a small token of appreciation for your review

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING IF THE TENURE CLOCK HAS BEEN EXTENDED: *Dr. [INSERT NAME]'s tenure clock was stoppedfor _____ year(s) under Cleveland State's Tenure Clock Extension Policy. Your review should be based on a full-term 6-year tenure track without consideration of extra time. We request that your review be performed without prejudice to the fact that Dr. [insert name] had a longer probationary record*

Again, many thanks for your assistance; your kindness in agreeing to evaluate Dr._'s materials is most appreciated. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at- [INSERT PRC CHAIR CONTACT INFORMATION].

Sincerely,
[Insert name of Chair of the Depart/School/College PRC Chairperson, Depart/School/ College Peer Review Committee]
[Insert name of Chairperson/ School Director, Depart/School of_]

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
For Promotion to Full Professor

[Date]
Appropriate inside address

Dear .....

In response to his/her request for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Professor, the Peer Review Committee of the College/Department of _____has initiated an external review of Dr. 's____ credentials. Having identified you as a leader in the [INSERT candidate's field], the Committee is grateful for your willingness to provide a candid evaluation of Dr.__ 's professional accomplishments based on an analysis of his/her curriculum vitae and a representative sampling of his/her work.

More specifically, as Dr. has purposely selected the enclosed materials in an effort to demonstrate *an outstanding record as a scholar or creative artist),* we are most interested in your assessment of the quality and impact of his/her scholarly and creative achievements. Put another way, of what importance has Dr.'s _____work been to the field of [insert candidate's field]? Is it original and innovative or relatively commonplace and inconsequential? What is its potential--both realized and unrealized--for advancing theory, research, or practice? Has Dr._attained a position of academic distinction as evidenced by publication in highly regarded, refereed journals and presentation at major conferences?

In sum, we are requesting an appraisal that focuses on the candidate's record of performance as a scholar, rather than his/her teaching or service contributions. Moreover, we would prefer that you ***not*** comment on Dr. __ 's eligibility for promotion at Cleveland State or any other university. Your letter will become part of the documentation that those charged with responsibility for making recommendations regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion and tenure will examine. In keeping with Ohio law, please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

CSU uses an eDossier system for our promotion and tenure reviews. In order that we may meet University deadlines governing our internal review process, we ask that you submit your comments to us by [insert date]; If you are willing to serve as a reviewer, please email me separately to send a copy of your current CV [*If your college provides an honorarium or other gift include the following:* "and personal mailing address so that we may send you [insert how your department/college processes payment of honorarium"], as a small token of appreciation for your review

Again, many thanks for your assistance; your kindness in agreeing to evaluate Dr._'s materials is most appreciated. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me

at - [INSERT PRC CHAIR CONTACT INFORMATION].

Sincerely,
[Insert name of Chair of the Depart/School/College PRC Chairperson, Depart/School/ College Peer Review Committee]
[Insert name of Chairperson/ School Director, Depart/School of_]

APPENDIX F

STUDENT EVALUATION POLICY

Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Principles and Policies (April 1, 2016; revised and reaffirmed Nov. 29, 2017, with addition of final two paragraphs)

Principles

1. The overarching goal of the SEI process is continuous improvement of education at CSU.
2. More specifically, the SEI process is intended to provide faculty feedback from students for evaluating, improving, and refining their methods of instruction.
3. Accordingly, personnel action (promotion, denial of promotion, renewal, non-renewal, merit awards, discipline, or sanction) should not be undertaken solely on the basis of SEI data. The SEI should not be construed as the sole or primary evidence of competence or excellence in teaching. Rather, the SEI is part of a constellation of materials that document teaching performance, including, but not limited to, peer observations, teaching portfolios, and student outcomes.

Administration of the SEI

1. Each semester, the SEI will be opened for students at the beginning of the twelfth week of classes and close at the end of the fourteenth week of classes. Courses whose opening and closing dates do not fit the semester schedule will have the evaluation window scaled appropriate!y.
2. At the opening of the evaluation window, faculty will supplement the reminders delivered by the on-line software by reading the following statement of purpose and guarantee of anonymity to the students: "You are about to complete an electronic student evaluation of your instructor. The purpose of this evaluation is for the student to provide constructive feedback to improve the learning experience at Cleveland State University. Please do not identify yourself in your responses. Responses will be kept anonymous. The course instructor will not see the results of this evaluation until after final grades are submitted and posted."
3. While faculty may remind students to complete evaluations, they should take care not to provide any individualized incentives or disincentives, whether explicit or implied, to affect the students' responses to the SEI. If the faculty member provides time in class for completion of the SEI, she or he must be absent from the classroom during such time.
4. In order to ensure adequate student participation, faculty may use the following practices to motivate students:
    - Remind students that their evaluation data helps other students choose their instructors, using the "courseeval" site - https://courseeval.csuohio.edu/.
    - Set aside class time for students to complete the SEI, as long as the instructor is not present.
    - Offer a reward for the entire class if a certain threshold of participation is reached. (For example, the instructor might offer a modest amount of extra credit if 90% of students fill out the SEI by a certain date.)
    - Send email reminders to the class.

- Post reminders and a link to the SEI page on the course Blackboard page.

Reporting of SEI Data to Faculty

1. SEI reports to faculty will incorporate the following standard calculations provided by the software for each SEI question: mean, mode, median, along with distribution bar graphs.
2. The comparators in such reports will be the current department and college means for each question.
3. Aggregate reports of SEI data will be sent to chairs and deans. In addition, chairs or their designees will have access to the individual reports of each faculty member, including both the quantitative and qualitative responses.

Campus Access to SEI Data

1. In order to inform students as to their peers' assessment of courses and instructors, the Faculty Senate is committed to sharing SEI data with students in accordance with the following principles.
    l. All access must pass through appropriate secure authentication.
    2. Resources permitting, Institutional Research will work with appropriate faculty and student governance mechanisms, including UFAC, Faculty Senate, and Student Government Association, to determine the data to be shared and the implementation method for sharing it.
    3. These governance and administrative units will monitor the data to ensure its validity and determine when a sufficient data set has been gathered for that data to be statistically reliable.
2. Faculty will have the same access to this data as students.
3. Requests for reports upon or analysis of SEI data should be directed to the Chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee and Director of Institutional Research; requesters must provide a rationale for the request.

Inclusions and Exclusions for SEI Data Collection

l. Unless an exemption is deemed necessary by a College/School, all academic activities with a course number will be evaluated using the SEI process. Where Blue cannot perform evaluations for a particular academic activity due to current technical limitations, an alternative method will be used in a manner appropriate to that activity as determined by the unit's Dean's office and College/School Faculty Affairs Committee. The goal is for Blue, ultimately, to be able to capture all evaluation data.
2. College/School Faculty Affairs Committees will be responsible for determining the evaluation needs and parameters, if any, for their College or School; this determination is expected to be stable over time. The Committee will determine which courses, if any, are to be excluded from the evaluation process. For example, some Committees may determine not to include thesis or independent study courses in the evaluation process.
3. A representative for the College or School will work with Institutional Research to implement changes consistent with the capabilities of the Blue software.
4. A course enrolling fewer than 5 students will be excluded from reports, to ensure student anonymity, except in the case of combined or cross listed courses. For those courses data will be reported in aggregate.

5. Data for non-grade-earning students, e.g., Project60 students, may be collected but only data for grade-earning students will be reported

Alternative methods of evaluation of teaching effectiveness for low-enrollment classes
Given the important role of student evaluations in an instructor's dossier for reappointment, promotion and tenure, it is important to recognize that some faculty members may primarily teach either low enrollment courses or low enrollment sections of a course. This results in student evaluations not being made available to the instructor for reasons of preserving student anonymity. Academic units should devise alternative methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness in such cases. Alternative methods could include, for example, peer evaluations of those sections.

For SEI Report to Chairs/ Directors
This language will be included at the top of SEI reports from Institutional Research to chairs and School Directors.

Department Chairs/School Directors: Please note that the SEI report you receive includes individual faculty reports of courses with fewer than five respondents. In an effort to protect student anonymity, a faculty senate approved policy states that these reports must not be made available to faculty; therefore, they should not be used to evaluate faculty performance. Please adhere to this policy. Due to limitations with the Blue system, the report to chairs/directors cannot be changed to remedy this issue.