

CAS Tenure and Promotion Dossier
CAS Faculty Council Approved Revisions, February 2019
UCART Review Completed, April 2019

3.1 Candidate's Part of the Dossier

A: Candidate CV

The information in the CV should appear in the following order.

Fill in all categories. If an item is not applicable, mark N/A.

1. General Information

- a. Name, present rank, and department affiliation(s).
- b. Degrees earned, including institutions and dates.
- c. Academic experience, including institution(s), rank, and dates.

2. Teaching

- a. List of courses taught at Saint Louis University during the last five years.
- b. List of teaching awards, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- c. Grants or fellowships for teaching innovations, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- d. New courses prepared. Candidates should distinguish between courses that are entirely new to the department and courses included in the catalog but reconceived by the candidate.
- e. Involvement in curricular development.
Sample materials such as syllabi and exams are not a part of the dossier but may be included in the appendices.
- f. Other pedagogical activities.

3. Advising and Mentoring

- a. List of advising and mentoring assignments at SLU.
- b. Evidence of advising effectiveness. This may include information about undergraduate and graduate advising as well as involvement in student professional development, counseling, and extracurricular activities.
- c. Awards for advising and mentoring, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- d. Grants or fellowships for advising and/or mentoring innovations, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.

4. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Endeavor

- a. Publications critically evaluated by experts.

Indicate at each citation the nature of critical evaluation; i.e., is it a refereed journal? Do the editors do the evaluation?

If a publication is in press, include in the appendices the referees' reports as well as the contract from the press or letter from the editor stating a commitment to publish and expected date of publication.

- b. Other publications.
- c. Production, performance, exhibition of creative works. In an addition to a list of productions, performances and/or exhibitions of creative works, candidates may provide a brief narrative summary (no more than 1/2 page) of reviews of creative works. The full text of reviews should not be included in item 4c but rather placed in the appendices.
- d. Work in progress.
- e. National or international awards for research, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- f. Grants, scholarships, fellowships for research (external/internal, proposed/funded), including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- g. Lectures, papers, speeches (contributed/invited) presented at professional meetings or educational institutions.
- h. Other.

5. Service

- a. Professional
- b. University
- c. College
- d. Department
- e. Community
- f. Awards for service, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
- g. Grants or fellowships to pursue service, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection
- h. Other

B. Candidate's Statement

This statement gives the candidate's assessment of the candidate's role in the missions of the University, College, and Department. The statement must not exceed two pages.

C. 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.

D. Appendices

Include appendices when appropriate (e.g., copies of books, reviews of the candidate's publications or creative work, referees' reports on publications in press, letters from editors and/or contracts from presses regarding commitments for future publications, reprints, preprints, student evaluations, etc.).

3.2 Department's Part of the Dossier

The Department Chair is responsible for assembling the departmental dossier. In some departments, a departmental committee is responsible for assembling the departmental dossier. If the Department Chair is the candidate, the Dean will consult with department members to select a faculty member to assemble the dossier and shepherd the evaluation process.

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.

1. Front Matter

- a. UCART Cover Sheet
- b. CAS Department Vote Report Form
- c. If applicable, documentation regarding negotiated years of credit toward tenure

2. The candidate's part of the dossier

3. Chairperson's form and recommendation. 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.

4. Recommendation of the departmental committee, if this is a part of the departmental process.

5. If requested by the candidate, an evaluation by the affiliated Program Director. Forms are available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website.

6. 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. (See item 10 for selection process.)

7. Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure.

8. 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 Chair chooses the evaluators (see item 10 for selection process).

9. 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.

10. 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.

3.3 College's Part of the Dossier

The Dean adds the following to the dossier:

1. The vote of the College's Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee. The Dean adds the result of the vote to the cover sheet.
2. Recommendation of the Dean. The Dean places this recommendation before the candidate's part of the dossier.
3. Recommendation of the College's Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee. The Dean places this recommendation after the Dean's recommendation.

**College of Arts and Sciences
Tenure/Promotion Vote Report**

Candidate Name:

Department:

Date of Department Vote:

Department Vote: Supporting _____ Opposing _____ Abstentions _____ Recusals _____

Recusals are for departmental colleagues who vote later in the process, such as members of the CAS Rank and Tenure Committee or UCART, or colleagues with a conflict of interest, such as a spouse.

Abstentions are for departmental colleagues eligible to vote who choose not to vote at all.

CAS R/T Committee Vote: Supporting _____ Opposing _____ Abstentions _____ Recusals _____
(To be added by CAS Dean)