

CAS Tenure and Promotion Dossier Checklist

The various committees consider many candidates; therefore, it is important that the dossiers be assembled in a standard order. The following order is from the top down.

Document Categories	Document
	All guidelines in the SLU Faculty Manual and the CAS Policy Manual must be followed.
	1. Completed Cover Sheet / Vote Summary Form provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs: http://www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure-resources/index.php If applicable, documentation regarding negotiated years of credit toward tenure
Candidate's Submission	2. Candidate's curriculum vitae, as stipulated in CAS Dossier Guidelines in the CAS Policy Manual. Note: a new structure was adopted in Spring 2019. The information in the CV must appear in the order outlined. Candidates should fill in all categories. If an item is not applicable, mark N/A. 3. Candidate's statement/application letter(s) (not to exceed 2 pages) 4. Summary of Candidate's Teaching Evaluations Student evaluations should be periodic and systematic; that is, evaluations should be given for most courses taught. The summary should include at least the course name, the semester taught, the number of students in the section, the number of students responding, the questions being asked, and a report of the student responses. A one-paragraph narrative of the candidate's teaching philosophy and statement on teaching effectiveness can precede the summary of evaluations
College/School/Center/Library Level	5. Recommendation of the dean or director (CAS Admin will provide; See 3.3) 6. Letter(s) from the college/school/center/library, committee indicating the committee's vote count (CAS Admin will provide; See 3.3) 7. Mid-point review report (if applicable)
Departmental Level	8. Chairperson's form and recommendation. If requested by the candidate, an evaluation by the affiliated Program Director. Forms are available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website. If the chairperson is the candidate, a colleague appointed by the Dean in consultation with faculty will write the evaluation. To the extent possible, letters from Deans and Chairs should address both positives and negatives in the candidate's dossier. Especially important is to explain the reasons behind any dissenting votes in the committees at the school or department level. Specific votes totals should always be included in the chair's letter. Avoid "unanimous" as a substitute for vote totals. Provide totals as follows: # in support, # opposing, # of abstentions, # of recusals. Chairs should explain the nature of recusals and, when possible, the motivations for any abstentions. If applicable to the candidate, the chair's letter must include the number of years of credit toward tenure negotiated at time of hire. (See also Sec. 4.3 of the CAS Policy Manual.) The chair must also provide documentation of any negotiated terms of service, to immediately precede the candidate's part of the dossier. 9. Recommendation of the departmental committee, if this is a part of the departmental process. 10. Two recommendations from colleagues. The candidate selects one colleague, and the Chair selects one colleague. Forms are available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website. As stipulated in the Faculty Manual, "Ordinarily, peer evaluators will hold a higher rank than that of the applicant." If the chair determines a colleague at or below the rank of the candidate is more appropriate, an explanation must be offered in the Chair's letter. 11. Recommendations of SLU colleagues outside of the candidate's department (if applicable). Forms are available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website .

Applicable Criteria	12. Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure.
External Evaluations	<p>13. Three or more letters from outside evaluators. The candidate should not see these letters. The outside evaluators should be recognized scholars in the candidate's field. The outside evaluators primarily evaluate the candidate's research and professional reputation but may add any relevant information. Outside evaluators must be sent the department criteria for promotion and tenure. Outside evaluators must submit letters on letterhead. As stipulated in the Faculty Manual, "Ordinarily, peer evaluators will hold a higher rank than that of the applicant." If the chair determines a scholar at or below the rank of the candidate is more appropriate, an explanation must be offered in the Chair's letter. The Chair should avoid requesting evaluation by scholars with conflict-of-interest affiliations, including the candidate's mentors and scholars who have been co-authors and/or co-collaborators with the candidate within the past five years. The CAS Rank and Tenure Committee generally disregards letters that evidence close connections or conflicts of interest. Outsider evaluators must be asked to comment in their letters on any connections with the candidate, i.e., mentoring, collaboration, co-authorship. The candidate should provide a list of potential evaluators. The Chair can add names to that list. The selection process for choosing peer reviewers and any comments about the selection of additional colleague or student evaluation letters should be explained in the chair's letter, i.e., which respondents were selected by the candidate, recommended by the candidate but chosen by the chair/committee, or selected independently by the chair/committee. The latter two methods lend credibility to the reference and are viewed as preferable practices.</p>
Student Evaluations	<p>14. A minimum of two recommendations from students, unless the department requires more. The candidate provides a list of students from which one student is chosen. The Chair chooses a second student. Forms are available on the CAS webpage.</p>