

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUILDING AND PRESENTING
THE PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE CASE
2007-08 Campus Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee
January 11, 2008**

Building the Case

In evaluating a case, the Campus P&T Subcommittee will look for certain types of evidence that should have been collected on an ongoing basis throughout the probationary period (or time since last promotion). This is especially true for establishing the teaching portion of a case; teaching performance cannot be adequately assessed on a “one-shot” basis. The guidelines below are meant to help the candidate understand the types of evidence that should be collected as the case is being built.

- Policy Documents
 - Read and be sure that you understand the requirements of campus P&T policies and guidelines. See the *OAA Promotion and Tenure Resources* web page at <http://www.ipfw.edu/vcaa/promotion/default.shtml> for copies of all relevant campus documents.
 - Discuss departmental requirements with your chair and mentoring committee. Be sure you understand the difference in criteria for competence and excellence in teaching, research, and service.
 - Ask if department standards align with the accepted standards of the discipline.

- Multiple methods of teaching effectiveness
 - Consult departmental documents (and resources on the *OAA P&T Resources* web page noted above) for examples of evidence from multiple sources and examples of rubrics for distinguishing satisfactory from excellent.
 - Note that student evaluations indicate student satisfaction with teaching, but do not assess student learning. Go to <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/tseot.html>
 - Pay special attention to evidence of student learning as a result of your teaching (e.g. scores on national exams, student research, pre-post tests, curriculum development, assessment results) and collect any relevant score results.

- Student evaluations
 - Include copies of student evaluation rating sheets, reports, and any summaries of student comments for each course. Go to http://www.ipfw.edu/celt/insite/teaching_rating_2.shtml and OAA Memo 99-1 (<http://www.ipfw.edu/vcaa/promotion/PDFs/OAA99-1RevisedJan08.pdf>) Section IV, B.3.

- Advising
 - Use available evaluation instruments or other methods to collect information assessing your advising effectiveness, especially if the case is to be based on teaching excellence. Go to www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse/links/assessment.htm

- Reappointments/Annual Reviews
 - Save copies of reappointments/annual reviews at all levels since your initial appointment or last promotion.

Presenting the Case

A case will be unsuccessful if the committee cannot find evidence that the candidate's work meets department and university criteria. It is the candidate's job not only to present evidence of the work, but also to show how it meets the criteria. It is essential that the case be written in terms that can be understood by those outside of the candidate's discipline. Clarity and organization are critical; writing that exceeds suggested length limits tends to obscure rather than enlighten, and also tends to frustrate committee members. The guidelines below are meant to help ensure that committee members can clearly see the merits of a case.

- Format/presentation
 - Proofread carefully. Careless spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors are distracting.
 - Write in the first rather than the third person.
 - Limit Section IV of the case, not counting the CV and External Letters, to 30 pages. Section III should be no more than 2 pages.
 - Remember to write for readers outside your field. Ask someone outside your department/school/college to read the case for clarity and completeness.
- Candidate's Statement
 - Stay within recommended 1,000 word limit (approximately two pages).
 - Be sure that the statement focuses on your teaching philosophy, explains your research agenda, and articulates your service approach.
 - Do not simply describe your activities/accomplishments.
- Student evaluations
 - Present student evaluation averages by question, by course or type of course (e.g. upper level vs. introductory level), and by semester over time.
 - Do not simply average over courses, questions, or time. "Means-of-means" across multiple questions or multiple courses or multiple years are discouraged.
 - Include the number of students enrolled and the number of students completing an evaluation for each course.
 - Provide an analysis of ratings and comments (strengths, areas for improvement and steps taken to address). Reflective analysis is strongly encouraged and is viewed positively.
 - Provide comparison to department and /or course means (if available and appropriate). Comparative information is particularly important for teaching cases.
 - Summarize common threads in student comments rather than string together multiple quotes. Put original comment sheets or transcriptions in the appendices.
 - Include evaluations from all questions for all available courses in appendices.

- Peer reviews of teaching
 - Encourage your department to establish a systematic peer review process for teaching.
 - Ask for peer reviews over time (not just before preparing the dossier), using a standard rating or comment sheet.
 - Include peer reviewers from outside the department.
 - Ask your chair or dean (or CELT) for models.

- Research/creative endeavor section
 - Address your long-term research agenda in the candidate's statement.
 - Include the complete corpus of your work; clearly identify what has been accomplished at IPFW since obtaining the terminal degree or since your last promotion.
 - Provide complete citations of published work, identifying refereed and non-refereed items.
 - Separate books, articles, and proceedings as suggested in OAA 99-1: *Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format Guidelines*.
 - Explain the significance of proceedings, including the nature of peer-review if relevant.
 - Provide information about the quality of the journals, such as acceptance rates, circulation, and rank or impact factor if available.
 - If appropriate for your discipline, it would be helpful to provide a citation analysis (e.g. Social Science Citation Index or Science Citation Index). The Subcommittee judges citation information to be particularly important in establishing a national or international reputation to support a case for promotion to Professor based on research. The Library can provide assistance.

- Co-authored publications, grants, etc.
 - Describe the conventions for ordering of authorship in your discipline.
 - Explain your particular contribution to each co-authored article/project/grant important to your case. Explanation is essential if most of your work is collaborative or with the same co-author(s).
 - Give amount of grant and explain involvement as appropriate.
 - Identify student co-authors and explain their contribution.

- External reviews/reviewers
 - Present independent, external reviews from 4-6 well regarded experts in your field who can evaluate your work objectively. Dissertation advisors, book editors/publishers, employees, co-authors and long time professional colleagues are not considered independent external reviewers.
 - Credible external reviewers should be recognized authorities at or above the rank the candidate is seeking. Recognition might include publication, institutional affiliation, and other accomplishment appropriate to the discipline.
 - Explain how and why reviewers were selected. Append a sample letter of solicitation. The letter of solicitation should include information about campus and department expectations and should include a copy of departmental criteria.
 - Refer to "Best Practices in Dossier Management" on the OAA website for a recommended solicitation timeline.

- Describe your relationship to each reviewer and give reviewer credentials (brief paragraphs in text preferred or vitae in appendices).
 - Evaluations from co-authors about your contributions may be included as appropriate but in a separate “letters of support” appendix.
 - Put any letters from thesis advisors, editors/publishers, employees, or long time professional colleagues in a separate “letters of support” appendix.
 - Do not string together direct quotes from reviewers. A summary is acceptable. PTS members will read the original letters carefully. Quoting is a distraction and unnecessary.
-
- Awards
 - Provide information about the source and selectivity of any awards.
-
- “Padding”
 - If the same item appears more than once, explain why.
 - Do not claim unwarranted responsibility for syndicated work.
 - List concisely any workshops, etc. attended.
 - Eliminate service presentations/writings such as club presentations and newsletter notes unless directly related to your area of expertise.