ASSEMBLING A DOSSIER AND PREPARING THE CANDIDATE’S CASE

Preparation for tenure and promotion review begins when the candidate enters the University. Soon after the candidate’s arrival, the APT Policy calls for the administrator of the academic unit that will become the faculty member’s tenure home to (a) meet with the candidate and provide a written copy of the approved promotion guidelines and promotion criteria by which the candidate will be evaluated (APT Policy 389-393; 671-676) and (b) appoint one or more senior faculty mentors. (APT Policy 801-813; see also the Senate Task Force Report)

The list of new tenure-track faculty and their mentors is due in the Office of the Associate Provost by February 1, 2013.

The review for tenure and promotion is the University’s primary means for ensuring a productive and accomplished faculty befitting an outstanding research university. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate accomplishment in three areas: (1) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (2) teaching, advising, and mentoring; and (3) service. (APT Policy 406-437; 701-711) Colleges and Departments must have written explicit evaluative criteria covering these areas. These criteria should be included in requests for external evaluations and in the dossier after the letter written by the Department Chair. Upper-level APT review committees and administrators rely on the criteria to assess fitness for appointment or promotion equitably. It is vital that reviewers at all levels keep these criteria in mind as they consider individual cases.

The candidate’s dossier forms the basis for review at all levels. Therefore, it must be well prepared and include all relevant information in a form that will be clear to reviewers both within and outside the Department.

This section contains the general guidelines for preparing all dossiers. Tables 1 and 4 in Appendix A list the components of a dossier. Non-departmentalized Colleges will obviously omit the material that requires departmental input (Chair’s Letter and Department APT report). Specific varieties of dossiers are described in Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix A.

A. Submission Guidelines: The dossier, consisting of a single bookmarked PDF file, is to be uploaded on a secure Faculty Affairs website. These dossiers may be uploaded at any time prior to their due date.

B. The Electronic Dossier
PDFs are best created via a word processing program or OCR. These methods are easier to search and enable “cut and pasting.” If necessary, PDFs may be created by scanning. Whichever method is used to create the PDF document, it must have these characteristics:
- A resolution of 300 dpi. A finer resolution uses too much space; less is unreadable.
- Vertical flow of pages (avoid side by side presentations of pages).
- Bookmarked sections, as specified on the Transmittal Form, will serve as a readily accessible table of contents. Note that External Letters must be sub-bookmarked for each separate letter with a designation of their source (candidate-C or Unit-U), e.g., U-Smith.

C. Elements in a Dossier
An overview: Every dossier will be submitted in electronic form. Optionally, representative pieces of scholarship may be submitted. Inclusion of a teaching dossier is also optional. These additions may be specified in the form of a URL (preferred for very
large documents) or they may be uploaded to the area on the APT website for supplemental materials. In unusual cases (e.g., for large, non-electronic pieces of scholarship) a hard copy may be forwarded as a supplement under separate cover. Colleges are responsible for returning all supplemental materials to candidates after the Campus APT Review Committee has finished its deliberations. Dossiers failing to conform to these guidelines will be returned to the College for corrective action before they are submitted for evaluation to the Campus APT Review Committee.

#1. Transmittal Form: The first page of the dossier is the transmittal form. Information from the transmittal form is entered into both the ARS database and the personnel database in the Office of Faculty Affairs. Accuracy of information on the transmittal form, especially the record of votes, the dates of meetings, and the type of appointment (e.g., 9-mo., 12-mo., etc.) must be carefully checked. For new appointments, a separate letter with the proposed salary and start dates must accompany the dossier. (See Table 5, Appendix A) Units must inform the Office of Faculty Affairs about the acceptance of each appointment.

Candidate’s Name: Give the candidate’s full legal name.

UID No: Avoid disclosing Social Security Numbers by listing University ID number.

Citizenship: Tenure is granted to non-U.S. citizen candidates contingent on their possession of a visa status that permits continued employment by the University.

Summary of Votes: Record the number of: (1) positive votes, (2) negative votes, (3) mandatory abstentions, (4) voluntary abstentions, (5) absences due to leaves, illnesses, etc., and (6) the total number of faculty eligible to vote. The sum of the numbers in categories 1-5 should equal the total number of faculty members eligible to vote in the relevant APT body. The numbers recorded on the transmittal form must match the numbers reported in APT Review Committee Reports.

Mandatory abstentions often arise whenever a faculty member could vote twice, e.g., at the College and Department levels. In these cases, the faculty member is permitted to vote only at the lower level. If a faculty member is eligible to vote within two Departments (because both the candidate and the voter have similar joint appointments), the voting faculty member may only vote in their tenure home and must abstain from voting in the second unit. (APT Policy 631-635; 911-914; 966-969) A mandatory abstention may arise for other reasons, such as when a faculty member is the candidate’s partner.

As a general matter, voluntary abstentions are to be discouraged. Higher-level APT review committees depend on the reasoning and expertise of the lower level committees; voluntary abstentions result in an absence of crucial input on a candidate’s dossier. Abstentions of 50% or more of the relevant faculty mean that the decision (negative or positive) does not represent a majority opinion, and could give rise to grounds for an appeal.

Only tenured faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate is to be promoted or appointed may vote on that candidate’s case. (APT Policy 718-720)

Secondary Unit: If the candidate holds a temporary appointment in a secondary unit, the chair or director of the secondary unit provides a written recommendation to the chair of the
primary unit. If a candidate has a permanent joint appointment in a secondary unit with eligible voters, the secondary unit records the votes of the secondary unit (if this is required by the secondary unit’s plan of organization) and provides a written recommendation to the chair of the primary unit.

#2. a. Dean’s Letter: This letter should state the Dean’s personal assessment of the reasons the candidate merits or does not merit promotion. (APT Policy 943-945)

The letter should contain an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate’s scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of the Department APT Review Committee, College APT Review Committee, or the Department Chair, the reasons underlying the dissent should be explained. Negative votes or abstentions at the College level ought to be explained. The Dean can provide a context for evaluating the candidate through characterizing the strengths of the Department, its role in the College and the role of the candidate in enhancing the excellence of the department. The letter should also discuss the expectations of the College and Department for promotion.

b. When either the College APT Review Committee or the Dean make a negative recommendation, the Dean should: (1) write a brief letter to the candidate summarizing the nature of the considerations on which the negative decision was based, (2) allow the Chair of the College APT Review Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information in the summary letter, and (3) include this letter in the dossier directly following the Dean’s letter. (APT Policy 1023-1038) Members of the College APT Review Committee may see the Dean’s letter. A summary is not necessary if both College-level recommendations are positive.

#3. College APT Review Committee Report: This report must include the date of the meeting and the names of Committee members. The report should include a statement of the exact vote and the reasons for the recommendation. (APT Policy 940-945) It should address the same areas as the Department APT report described in #5. When the vote is not unanimous, the report should try to explain the reasons for the negative votes or the abstentions. If the assessment differs from the department vote, an explanation should be provided. Minority reports are permissible but not required.

#4. a. Department Chair’s Letter: The letter should contain the Chair’s independent evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service, and should make a clear recommendation supported by the reasons for it. (APT Policy 758-759) An explanation should be provided for negative votes and voluntary abstentions. For joint appointments, the head of the secondary unit should also provide a letter that is inserted in the same section as, and immediately following, the Department Chair’s letter.

The Chair’s letter is most useful when it places the performance of the candidate in the context of the Department or discipline, and it comments on the APT Review Committee’s report. It is particularly useful for informing the Committee about the criteria used to evaluate the candidate and the Chair’s assessment of the candidate with respect to those criteria. These criteria should be appended to the Chair’s letter. While the letter may summarize the basic information about the case, APT Review Committees expect the
Chair’s interpretation of the information about the candidate: an honest and balanced assessment of the candidate’s scholarship or creativity, teaching, mentoring and service, and a clearly stated recommendation. If this recommendation differs from that of a Department APT Review Committee, it is helpful to provide reasons. The Chair should also attempt to explain reasons for negative faculty votes and abstentions when they are known.

b. The Department’s APT criteria should be included after the Chair’s letter. (The Chair’s letter appears as 4a, and the promotion criteria appear as 4b.) For promotion cases, a candidate notification letter should also be included (as 4c).

c. The notification letter must be sent to promotion candidates within two weeks of the submission of the dossier to the next level. The Chair should: (a) write a brief letter summarizing the vote and the general nature of the considerations on which the department and chair’s decision was based, (b) allow the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee to review and, if necessary, correct the information before the letter is sent to the candidate, (c) send the summary assessment to the candidate, and (d) include the letter in the dossier which will be forwarded to the next level of review. (See Table: Candidate Notification of APT Decision) Voting members of the faculty may see the chair’s letter. (APT Policy 1016-1038) The notification letter should never refer to the content of confidential assessments from external evaluators.

#5. Report of the Department APT Review Committee: (APT Policy 880-889) This report has two clearly separate parts (5a and 5b), neither of which is shown to the candidate. In addition, the Department APT Review Committee may include an optional Minority Report (5c) in cases of major disagreement. Both (or all three) reports above are incorporated into the dossier sent by the Chair to higher levels of review.

#5a. The Department APT Review Committee Meeting Report describes the decision meeting and is ordinarily written by the chair of the APT Review Committee or a designee. The discussions and the exact vote should be presented, as well as any departmental rules about the number of votes required for a positive recommendation. The report should contain the meeting date and be signed by its author.

#5b. The Department Evaluative Report: The Department may form an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC), whose members should be identified, to complete this report. (APT Policy 746-750) The evaluative report evaluates the candidate’s research or creativity, service, mentoring and teaching contributions in light of the standards of the Department and the discipline.

It is helpful to address the following questions when preparing the Evaluative Report:

- What are the standards and expectations of the Department or discipline with respect to the candidate as expressed in departmental criteria, and how are they measured?
- What are the candidate’s major contributions? Why are these contributions important in the candidate’s field?
- Has the candidate met or surpassed the Department’s standards and expectations?
- What evidence supports the Review Committee’s evaluation?
This information is particularly helpful in areas with distinctive expectations for promotion. It is important to consider the audience to whom this report will be addressed, which includes faculty and administrators outside the unit.

The following are suggestions for summarizing and evaluating faculty performance:

a. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the work (as summarized in 6 below) should be provided in 5b above, including a description of the influence of the work in the field. The bases for the evaluation should be made explicit.

Where the primary activities of the faculty member consist of performance or practice, the Department should develop methods and procedures to obtain outside evaluation of the faculty member. Submission of published reviews of books and performances, samples of extension publications, etc. are strongly recommended. For journal publications, where appropriate, the citation rates and other quantitative factors should be included. Similarly, for extension agents whose scholarship is directed toward producers or consumers, a thorough evaluation of the quality, quantity and impact of these publications is essential.

When a faculty member works in collaborative teams, ascertaining his or her role in those teams and the intellectual leader of the project is important.

b. Teaching, Advising and Mentoring

Dossiers should contain data from the campus-wide standardized course evaluations, normally for the last five years. An evaluation of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s teaching, advising and mentoring (as summarized in 6 below) should be provided in 5b above. Detailed data analyses and student comments should be deferred until Section 14a.

Candidates may facilitate the process of teaching evaluation by providing a teaching portfolio. Judgments of teaching could include an assessment of: instructional materials, the rigor and scope of examinations, incorporation of instructional aids, etc. Also to be considered is the development of techniques or modes of instruction and the substantial revision of or development of courses. Feedback of colleagues and students include: 1) surveys of student opinions, 2) awards, 3) colleagues’ opinions if based on systematic class visitations and 4) evidence of effective learning by the candidate’s students, such as may be shown by student performance on learning outcome assessments.

Demonstrations of effective mentoring/advising include: 1) number and caliber of students guided in research and their placement in academic positions, postdoctoral labs, graduate programs, etc.; 2) development of or participation in bridge or summer programs; 3) service on awards and mentoring committees, or as an advisor for student groups or clubs, or as a mentor for other faculty; 4) organization of professional seminars for students on article or grant submission, etc.

c. Service

Service contributions (summarized in section 6 below) should be evaluated in section 5b above, particularly in those areas where service is a major component of a faculty member’s activities, such as extension appointments. The report should do more than list committees or activities; it should, to the extent possible, evaluate the performance of these activities. Evaluation may be sought from supervisors or clients in organizations for which the faculty member has rendered service. Service awards help to document and evaluate service activities. Disciplinary service to editorial boards, national and international organizations, etc., is evidence of good citizenship and stature in the profession.
#5c. Optional Minority APT Report: Members of the Department APT Review Committee who do not think that the APT Review Committee Report adequately represents their views may write a signed minority APT report that will become part of the dossier. (APT Policy 886-889) A minority APT report is intended to be employed for major disagreements, not for presenting minor variations in wording.

#6. Summary Statement of Professional Achievements: This summary report is often written by an Advisory Subcommittee (formerly referred to as an Initial Review Committee, or IRC)—whose members should be identified—or its representative. The purpose of the summary is to ensure that committees have correct and complete information about the candidate on which to base their evaluation and explanations of the candidate’s credentials. It is a factual statement of the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of: research, scholarship, or creative activity; teaching, mentoring, and advising; and service. The summary statement is not to be mailed to external reviewers. It should place the candidate’s accomplishments in research, scholarship, extension activities and/or artistic performance in the context of the broader discipline, and the candidate’s professional achievements in service and teaching in the context of the responsibilities of the Department, the College, the University and the greater community. It should be a neutral description; no evaluation of the candidate’s work should be included. The candidate must be shown the Summary Statement at least two weeks before the Department deliberates about the candidate’s case. Candidates must certify in writing that they have seen the document (which may be achieved by signing the document), and must be allowed to draft a rejoinder before it is used by the Department APT Review Committee as a basis for its discussion and vote. The date on this report (and any rebuttal by the candidate) should predate the meeting on which the case is decided. If there is a rejoinder, the summary must acknowledge receipt and consideration of the rejoinder. (APT Policy 860-879) To facilitate production and “certification” of the report, Departments may wish to inform candidates in advance of deadlines for reviewing the Summary Statement and for return of the signed Statement with any rejoinder.

#7. Curriculum Vitae: The candidate’s curriculum vitae must be signed and dated by the candidate to certify that it is accurate and current. (APT Policy 682-684; 687-692) The CV should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and should be included in each request for external evaluation. The CV that is sent to external evaluators is the official CV for the candidate. If there are subsequent changes in the candidate’s credentials (e.g., additional funding, new external recognition), the Chair should forward a memo containing these changes to higher levels of review and this document should be appended to the candidate’s CV in the electronic dossier. Memos may be added to the dossier up until the point when the dossier is signed by the President of the University. However, candidates should avoid multiple requests for such additions, especially for minor changes (e.g., reviewing activities, paid consulting).

The CV should present an accurate portrait of the candidate’s accomplishments in as concise a manner as possible. Please refer to the University CV template.

#8. Reputation of Publication Outlets: The Department should provide an appraisal of the reputations of the journals, presses and other outlets (e.g., theaters, exhibits, etc.) for the candidate’s scholarship/creative activity. Indicate whether peer review is required for each
publication outlet. Departments should develop a standard, stable, credible method of rating journals and should present these ratings and, when possible, the rate of acceptance to the journal or other medium. The following fictional table suggests how the information should be provided. It contains just those outlets where the candidate’s work appears and it uses objective indices. Acceptance rate and impact are used here, but there may be other more appropriate indices.

Reputation of Publication Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>No. Of Articles</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, citation counts should be included. *Departments may prefer to put these in the Summary Statement (#6), so candidates can verify the counts.*

#9. **Candidate’s Personal Statement:** This statement provides candidates with the opportunity to make a case for their promotion based on a demonstrated record of achievement. The statement ordinarily describes the questions addressed by the candidate and indicates their importance to the candidate’s field, progress made in addressing these questions and directions of future creative work. (APT Policy 684-687) These statements should be relatively short, 3-4 pages, and directed toward readers who are not specialists in the candidate’s field. The personal statement should be signed and dated. The statement should be prepared no later than the beginning of the academic year in which the candidate is reviewed and must be included in each request for external evaluation. The document may not be changed after it is submitted to the APT Review Committee representative for letter writers to evaluate. (APT Policy 687-692)

#10. **Log of Evaluation Letters:** The Review Committee shall solicit letters of evaluation from at least six widely recognized authorities in the field, chosen from a list that shall include individuals nominated by the candidate. Among the letters requested, at least three and at most one-half must be from persons nominated by the candidate. (APT Policy 796-800) APT Review Committees at all levels question the credibility of letters from the candidate’s mentors and collaborators, and heed closely the comments of evaluators from highly ranked institutions and, where appropriate, evaluators holding the rank of professor. The committee will also heed closely the comments of evaluators who are documented as among the outstanding leaders in the field. It is suggested that, at a minimum, six of the letters be selected from evaluators who are not the candidate’s mentors and collaborators. Up to two additional letters (for a total of at least eight) may be from a mentor or collaborator as long as sufficient explanation is provided by the Chair of the APT Review Committee and/or Department Chair. An allowable exception is the case where an appropriately small number of the six letter writers have had a one-time or temporally distant collaboration.
The Committee must include a list of all the evaluators to whom a formal request was sent, even if the evaluators do not reply or decline to write. Copies of the letters (or emails) of refusal should be included in the dossier. Verbal communications will not be accepted, and any prejudicial discussion regarding declines or non-answers is discouraged. In the log, the initial date that the evaluator was contacted should be included, when candidate materials were sent (if different from initial) and the date of response (either when the evaluation was received or the reviewer declined to review). The Letter Log Template provides the appropriate format for the letter log. The order of letters in the dossier should correspond to the order of letters in the log, and the letters should be grouped by requestor (candidate or review unit). Within each group the letters should be alphabetized. Because all APT review committees should have access to the same external letters, late arriving letters should not be included in the dossier, nor be used for evaluative purposes during deliberations. Unsolicited letters do not belong in the dossier and should not be relied on for evaluative purposes during deliberations.

The letter log should indicate which evaluators are collaborators with, or mentors of, the candidate, and in the credentials section justify their inclusion as an evaluator.

#11. Credentials of External Evaluators: The credentials of each external evaluator should be provided in a paragraph, though not CVs of evaluators. The order of the credentials paragraphs should mirror the order of entries in the log and the order of inclusion of letters in the dossier.

It is important for the Department APT Review Committee to justify the choices of evaluators and to indicate the type and quality of the institution or program with which the evaluator is associated.

#12. Sample Letter Used to Solicit External Evaluations: The letter used to solicit external evaluations is usually sent by the Chair of the Department APT Review Committee. The letter should be neutral, asking for an honest evaluation rather than for support for the faculty member’s promotion. It should ask if the reviewer is a co-author or collaborator. The letter should ask the evaluator to comment on:

- the nature of the evaluator’s professional interactions with the candidate;
- the candidate’s ranking among his or her professional peers (or cohort);
- the candidate’s chances for promotion and, where appropriate, tenure in the evaluator’s own institution, noting expressly that information on this point is an important consideration;
- the impact of the candidate’s work on the field;
- clarification of the candidate’s collaboration with other scholars in his/her field;
- the quality of the candidate’s teaching, if known.

Departments have the option of sending teaching dossiers including syllabi, examinations and other instructional material to external reviewers for their evaluation. Reviewers may be asked to comment on the scope and currency of the instructional materials and their appropriateness to the discipline and to the level of the course. Attachments to the letter should include the criteria for promotion, the candidate’s CV and Personal Statement and a list of scholarly and teaching materials being sent, or made available, to the evaluator. The attachments should be listed within the sample letter.
#13. Responses of External Evaluators: The Chair of the Department APT Review Committee should receive suggestions of potential external evaluators from the candidate. The Committee should select evaluators from the candidate’s list and must also choose evaluators from their own list.

The most reliable way to get external evaluators to engage in a review is for the Committee to solicit letters well in advance of their deadline.

*An excessive number of letters (e.g., 10 or more) should be avoided. Should an insufficient number of letters be timely received, the case may still go forward. However, Units should be aware that the absence of the requisite number of letters may weaken the case for the candidate. Although the contents of the letters are to be shared with eligible voters at each level of review, these letters are highly confidential and should not be shared with the candidate or others who will not be voting on or evaluating the candidate for promotion. Candidates may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to enquire about the contents of the evaluation.*

The following guidelines should be followed in presenting letters:
- All letters received in response to solicitation must be included in their entirety if the letters arrive for timely consideration by the Department APT Review Committee.
- Letters in a foreign language must be accompanied by an English translation.
- Each letter should clearly indicate whether the evaluator was selected by the candidate, or by the committee.
- Dossier preparation and evaluation is facilitated if letters from external evaluators are sent as searchable electronic attachments.

*Committees and candidates should take into account the following issues in selecting their evaluators.*

- An evaluator who is the candidate’s dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author, or student should be avoided.
- When a candidate is re-reviewed, as in the case of someone coming up for Professor shortly after being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor, new evaluators should be chosen unless there are strong justifications for repeated selection.
- Evaluators should ordinarily hold the rank of Professor or its equivalent.
- Because evaluators are asked whether the candidate would be promoted at their institutions, the prestige of the evaluators’ institutional affiliations and their accomplishments should be taken into account in selecting them.
- Candidates should be informed of the University’s perspective on appropriate evaluators and the right of the Department to select from the candidate’s nominations those evaluators that the APT Review Committee deems appropriate. Candidates should also be informed about University rules of confidentiality.

#14a. Student Evaluations of Teaching: Data on teaching evaluations must be analyzed and summarized. (See Teaching Evaluation Sample) Actual electronic evaluations (or other such data) should be uploaded in the separate area on the APT website for supplemental materials. These documents can also be presented in the form of a teaching portfolio, to be included in the supplemental website. Sometimes departments include a summary in their APT report.
If so, the page where the summary can be found should be indicated in this section. **Materials should not be doubly included in personal statements.** For clarity:

- An explanation of the rating system should be included, as well as a comparison with the norms of the Department and/or college.
- An explanation of the level and student composition of the courses should be provided, and a sample questionnaire. If a particular instructor’s teaching load for a period of time consisted principally of generally unpopular required courses, or if there was a particularly significant event in a given semester that might have influenced student opinion, such facts should be made known.

#14b. Peer Evaluations of Teaching: Many Departments engage in systematic peer review of teaching based on classroom visits by colleagues. **Peer evaluation should include evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, and other instructional material by members of the Department or external evaluators, and discussions of curriculum development, introduction of innovative uses of technology, special contributions to the teaching mission of the department or to special programs and teaching awards received by the candidate.** Departments may require a teaching portfolio including syllabi, examinations and other instructional material. These portfolios should be uploaded to the supplemental materials area of the APT website. **Reports provided only months ahead of the APT review (as opposed to those based on systematic visitation) tend not to be given much credence by higher levels of review.**

#14c. Mentorship, Advising, Research Supervision: A list of past and current undergraduate and graduate students for whom the candidate has served as principal advisor should be provided in the CV in separate sections. **These should include evaluative discussion of undergraduate and graduate advising, supervision of theses and dissertations and mentoring of students and colleagues.**

Appendices to the Dossier, such as teaching dossiers, are encouraged and may be uploaded to the supplemental materials of the APT website. These can also include direct links to teaching evaluations and up to two candidate-selected samples of scholarship.

**The Candidate Is Responsible For:**

- Providing the *Curriculum Vitae* in the approved format, signed and dated. This Document should be submitted before external letters are solicited.
- Signing and dating the **Summary Statement of Professional Achievements. (APT Policy 868-871)**
- Providing a signed and dated **Personal Statement. (APT Policy 684-687)** This document should be prepared before external letters are solicited.
- **Suggesting the names of qualified external evaluators. (APT Policy 798-800)**
- Providing documentation on teaching (e.g., syllabi, examinations, instructional materials, teaching evaluations in a teaching portfolio).
- Providing publications or other forms of scholarship to the Department Committee.
- Selecting samples of scholarship for reviews by higher-level review Committees and working with the APT Review Committee to select materials for external reviewers.
- Providing any other relevant information requested by the Department Review Committee (e.g., of scholarly work, grant proposals, notification of awards).
The Department APT Committee Is Responsible For:

- Gathering information and documents listed in the preceding section from the candidate.
- Drafting the Summary Statement of Professional Achievements and presenting it to the candidate for approval two weeks prior to the time it will be distributed to the faculty and ensuring its prompt return. (APT Policy 860-871)
- Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate’s list), using the candidate’s input to select the sample of material for evaluators to evaluate, and providing a brief summary of the qualifications of the evaluators. (APT Policy 796-800)
- Obtaining documentation on teaching and mentorship from students and colleagues.
- Obtaining available documentation on service.
- Evaluating journals and other outlets in which candidate’s scholarship is disseminated.
- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service (APT Policy 697-708), based on the candidate’s CV, personal statements, external letters, scholarly and teaching materials, and internal reports.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate’s case for tenure and/or promotion. (APT Policy 716-727)
- Writing reports on: (a) the decision meeting including a record of the vote, the Committee’s recommendation, and a justification for it, and the date of the meeting; and (b) a separate evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions. (APT Policy 880-884) This latter report is often prepared by an advisory committee and is usually available to faculty at or prior to the voting meeting.
- Reviewing the Chair’s summary notification letter to the candidate for accuracy. (APT Policy 1025-1031) (Usually done by APT Chair)
- Representing the Department APT Review Committee’s perspective to higher levels of review, if the need emerges. (APT Policy 930-939)

The Department Chair is Responsible for:

- Ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted, and that the appropriate material is available to eligible voting faculty.
- Writing a letter to the administrator at the next higher level making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case, and including the Department’s promotion criteria. (APT Policy 890-893)
- Notifying candidates in writing, summarizing both the Chair’s and Department APT Review Committee’s decisions and reasoning within two weeks of the Committee’s decision meeting (APT Policy 1016-1028; Appendix A, Table 6). A copy of this summary letter should be available for faculty who participated in the deliberations who wish to see it, and it should be included in the dossier. If both the Department APT Review Committee and Chair vote to deny tenure and/or promotion, the letter must be sent by certified mail. (APT Policy 1103-1104)
- Inspecting dossiers for accuracy, completeness, and conformity to these guidelines.
- For new appointments, including the length of appointment year, start date, and projected salary in a separate memo (see Table 5, Appendix A) accompanying the appointment request. If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- Sending the dossier to the next level of review, and if the candidate does not pass the initial review, providing sufficient information for the administrator at that
level (Dean or Provost) to determine that the review was conducted appropriately. (APT Policy 851-853)

- Answering questions putatively posed by upper-level review committees. (APT Policy 930-939; 984-994)
- If candidates withdraw from the process, forwarding a copy of the letter of withdrawal to the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. (APT Policy 857-859)
- Reviewing the Department’s Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the conduct of reviews, and that the review conforms to the guidelines.
- Being aware of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and disseminating these changes to the faculty. The Office of Faculty Affairs web page should be consulted for updates: www.faculty.umd.edu/policies.
- Meeting with new tenured and tenure-track faculty to provide APT information, such as Department and University policies, this Manual, and Department promotion criteria. Subsequently, administrators should notify faculty in writing of changes to the criteria. (APT Policy 389-393; 671-676)

Upper-level APT Committees Are Responsible For:

- Carefully reviewing and evaluating the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, mentoring, and service.
- Meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate’s case for tenure and/or promotion.
- Meeting with lower level APT representatives when there is a possibility that a negative recommendation will be made. Questions in writing should be provided in advance. (APT Policy 930-939; 984-994)
- Writing a report that includes an evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments and potential for future contributions, a record of the vote, the Committee’s recommendation and the justification for it, the membership of the Committee, and the date of the decision meeting. (APT Policy 940-943; 995-997)
- For the College Review Committee, when either the Dean or the Committee makes a negative recommendation, ensuring that the Dean’s summary letter notifying the candidate of the negative recommendation accurately reflects Committee deliberations.

The Dean of a College is Responsible for:

- Reviewing the College’s Plan of Organization to ensure it contains sufficient procedural guidelines for the appointment of a College Review Committee and the role of the Dean with respect to the Committee.
- Ensuring that the review conforms to those guidelines.
- Reviewing and approving College and Department promotion criteria.
- Recommending appointees to the Campus APT and Campus Appeals Committee. (APT Policy 962-964; 1188-1190)
- Informing Chairs of changes in the APT Policy and Guidelines, and discussing with Chairs their evaluation of the preceding year’s APT process and outcomes.
- Preparing a schedule for submission of dossiers to the Departments in the College, and informing them of that schedule in a timely manner.
- When candidates are denied tenure and/or promotion at a lower level of review, certifying the procedural appropriateness of the review, and writing a letter sent by certified mail to the candidate within two weeks of the decision that informs the candidate of the outcome, the procedural appropriateness of the review, and
the consequences of this denial. (APT Policy 851-856) Copies should be sent to the Chair and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. The correspondence and the dossier should be retained. (A summary letter is not necessary if at least one Department-level recommendation is positive.)

- Appointing members of the College APT Review Committee in accordance with its Plan of Organization. (APT Policy 905-907)
- Providing staffing for the College APT Review Committee and ensuring that the APT decision meeting is properly conducted.
- Reviewing recommendations of the prior level of review and the College APT Review Committee, and writing a letter to the Provost making an independent judgment about each promotion and/or tenure case. (APT Policy 926-929; 943-945)
- When either the Dean or the College APT Review Committee make(s) a negative APT decision, writing a brief summary letter informing the candidate, the Department Chair, and Chair of the Department APT Review Committee summarizing the outcome of the College APT Review Committee’s and Dean’s deliberations, and the rationale behind it. (APT Policy 1023-1025; see Table 6, Appendix A) This summary letter should be available to members of the College APT Review Committee who can decide to amend it, and the letter should be included in the dossier. (APT Policy 1028-1038)
- Inspecting the dossier for accuracy, completeness and conformity to these guidelines.
- Forwarding an electronic file and a hard copy of the original material plus another hard copy to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
- Meeting with the University APT Review Committee to address questions they may raise. (APT Policy 984-994)
- For new appointments, including in a separate memo accompanying the dossiers, the terms of appointment, start date and projected salary in appointment requests. (See Table 5, Appendix A) If the appointment is accepted by the candidate, notifying the Office of Faculty Affairs.