

PREPARATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PORTFOLIOS
A&S Dean's Instructions
May 1, 2008

Preface

Tenure Cases. Granting tenure to an individual represents a long-term commitment on the part of the University and is done in recognition of the past achievements and future potential of the individual to succeed here as a teacher, scholar, colleague, role model, and citizen of the University. As one of the most important events in the career of a faculty member and one of the most significant responsibilities of the faculty and administration of the University, the tenure decision demands a very thorough and professional evaluation of the relevant achievements, skills, and characteristics of each candidate. In particular, this evaluation is conducted within the context of the responsibilities and expectations outlined in the By-Laws of the University and in the *Faculty Handbook*.

To be most effective, the tenure process should start at the time of initial appointment of the faculty member to the University. Appropriate guidance and help in developing the desired professional skills, accomplishments, and characteristics, fostered by regular annual evaluations that provide clear communication of expectations and assessment of performance, should lead to positive faculty development and a fair and responsible tenure decision.

Promotion Cases. Granting a promotion in rank is one of the more salient means by which the University recognizes and rewards faculty for high performance, special achievement, and sustained development as teachers, scholars, colleagues, role models, and citizens of our academic community.

Consistent with the norms governing the awarding of tenure, promotion in rank will depend upon the fulfillment of the responsibilities and expectations outlined in the By-Laws of the University and in the *Faculty Handbook*. Most especially, it will depend upon the quality of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. To merit promotion, a candidate will be expected not only to have maintained a steady record of high-quality performance in these three areas, but also to demonstrate continuing development as a teacher, scholar, and citizen of the University.

Guidelines for the preparation of tenure and promotion portfolios

These guidelines have been revised for 2008 to parallel the revised School of Arts and Sciences tenure and promotion process. All faculty are encouraged to review the revised process, which is a part of the *Faculty Handbook*.

I have outlined the preparation of the tenure/promotion portfolio process in nine sections and eight appendices covering the following points:

Section	Page
1. Solicitation of external reviews of scholarly and creative work.....	2
2. Solicitation of student letters.....	3
3. Solicitation of service letters.....	4
4. Core portfolio binder.....	4
5. Binders containing appendices	6
6. The department assessment	7
7. Important process issues	10
8. Overview of major target dates.....	11
9. Concluding comments.....	12

Appendix A: Exemplar e-mail to potential outside reviewers in tenure cases	13
Appendix B: Exemplar e-mail to potential outside reviewers in promotion cases ..	14
Appendix C: Exemplar letter to outside reviewers in tenure cases	15
Appendix D: Exemplar letter to outside reviewers in promotion cases	16
Appendix E: Exemplar letter to former and current students in tenure cases ...	17
Appendix F: Exemplar letter to former and current students in promotion cases...	19
Appendix G: Exemplar letter to service reviewers in tenure cases.....	21
Appendix H: Exemplar letter to service reviewers in promotion cases.....	22

1. Solicitation of external reviews of scholarship and creative work

The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following responsibilities of the candidate:

In preparation for a tenure and/or promotion review, the candidate and his or her department chair will consult to identify the candidate's field of scholarship. The candidate shall then offer his or her chair the names of four or five people outside the university who are recognized as experts in that field. These experts should be chosen carefully from among those unlikely to have an undue interest in the outcome of the review. The candidate should not contact these suggested reviewers about their willingness to serve in this capacity. The candidate may also name potential referees who, for good reasons, should not be invited to comment on his or her work.

To complete this component of the review the candidate should provide his/her chair with the following by May 10th:

- The names and addresses (email and department) of four or five persons from outside the University who are recognized as experts in the candidate's field and who may be contacted by the chair for confidential assessments of the candidates achievements.
- For each suggested name, a paragraph on why that person has been recommended and description of the personal/professional relationship (if any) the candidate has with each person.
- A list of any potential referees who should not be invited to comment on his/her work and the reason for exclusion.
- An up-to-date curriculum vitae
- Copies of scholarly and creative work (reprints or analogous materials) to be sent to the outside reviewers. It is important that work from your time at Richmond be the basis of the review. Please consult with your chair as to which work should be included and the number of copies required. Electronic copies of the work may be used for this purpose.

The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following responsibilities of the chair:

The department chair consults tenured members of the candidate's department and outside experts to identify at least five qualified external reviewers from the candidate's field. At least two of the final five committed referees will be chosen from the candidate's list, and at least two will come from the chair's list. Every possible effort should be made to ensure that the number of outside reviewers drawn from the candidate's recommended list does not exceed the number independently identified by the department. The department will not inform the candidate of the identity of any of the persons invited to serve as external referees.

To complete this component of the review the chair should complete the following by May

15th:

- Consult with other tenured members of your department and outside experts on the identification of other well-qualified external reviewers.
- Consult with other tenured members of the department as to which materials are to be sent to which outside reviewers (in most cases the same material to all reviewers). Care should be taken to send the candidate's most important work done at Richmond as only then do we have an assessment of the quality of the candidate's work completed in the setting where he/she would hold tenure/promotion.
- Complete consultation with the dean regarding outside reviewers and solicit the commitment of at least five outside referees.

In completing the above components of the process the chair should use the following procedures:

- In the past, considerable success has been achieved by the chair first sending an e-mail inquiry to potential outside reviewers as to their availability and willingness to complete this responsibility (please see Appendix A & Appendix B).
- An exemplar letters requesting an external evaluation are found in Appendix C and Appendix D. I ask that these letters be used to solicit external reviews, but I also recognize that some disciplines may have particular needs that are not well suited to the proposed format. If any changes in the solicitation letter are needed, please review those changes with me in advance and keep in mind the following:
 - ✓ We want to craft solicitation letters that are written in a neutral fashion, asking for an evaluation without indicating whether the department is leaning for or against the candidate. Every effort should be made to obtain objective evaluations of the candidate's work that include a concrete analysis of the enclosed work rather than a general (and hence possibly vague) overall evaluation.
 - ✓ We find critical, analytical assessments of specific works are much more informative and helpful than broad, descriptive generalities about a candidate's work. For this reason, referees should be asked to give an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or creative work, not a recommendation regarding the conferral of tenure/promotion. The latter requires additional information that the reviewer will not have.

By the end of May or sooner, letters and materials should be sent to all external reviewers. The candidate is not to be informed of the identities of any of these referees.

2. Solicitation of Student Letters

The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following responsibilities of the candidate:

The candidate may submit a list of up to five students whom she or he wants the chair to contact and up to five whom she or he does not want the chair to contact. The candidate should not contact the suggested student reviewers about their willingness to serve in this capacity.

To complete this component of the review the candidate should provide his/her chair with the names of students by May 10th.

The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following responsibilities of the chair:

Following the Dean's guidelines, the department chair is responsible for soliciting letters from a minimum of 80 students randomly selected from courses that the candidate has taught.

The chairperson is responsible for the solicitation of student letters according to the following guidelines.

- The chairperson should use the Report Request Form available at the Registrar's Office web site < <http://oncampus.richmond.edu/academics/registrar/>> to obtain class lists for all classes taught by the candidate during his/her probationary period.
- The former students contacted by the chairperson should be randomly selected and include both majors and non-majors.
- The number of students randomly selected from each course taught should be based upon the credit hour value (or teaching unit value) of the class and not class size. For example if the candidate taught 27 three-credit classes during the probationary period, at least three unique names should be drawn from each class (yielding a total of 81 students). Alternatively if the candidate taught 10 three-credit courses, 4 four-credit courses, and 6 six-credit courses, 3 unique names should be drawn from each three-credit class, 4 unique names should be drawn from each four-credit class, 6 unique names should be drawn from each six-credit class (yielding a total of 82 students). This approach is recommended in lieu of drawing names based on class size; otherwise large enrollment classes have a disproportional representation in the assessment of the candidate's overall teaching record.

An exemplar letter requesting a student evaluation is found in Appendix E and Appendix F. I ask that this letter be used to solicit student reviews, but I also recognize that some disciplines may have particular needs that are not well suited to the proposed format. Please review any changes with me in advance.

To assure a timely return of letters, student solicitation letters should be mailed by the end of May. A reminder letter should be sent to non-responders by August 1st to insure as high a response rate as possible.

3. Solicitation of Service Letters

The candidate is responsible for providing a complete listing of service activities (including the Core course) and representative committee chairs to his/her department chair by May 15th. Service to external professional groups may also be included on this list.

The department chair is responsible for the solicitation of letters from the appropriate heads of the committees or groups on which the candidate has served.

An exemplar letter requesting a service evaluation is found in Appendix G and Appendix H. I ask that this letter be used to solicit service reviews.

To assure a timely return of letters, service solicitation letters should be mailed by the end of May.

4. Core Portfolio Binder

The first notebook of the portfolio represents the core of a tenure/promotion case. I ask that candidates organize this notebook in a uniform manner. If each candidate uses the same organizational structure, readers at each decision-making level will have an easier time processing the material. The proposed structure is centered on a single Core Portfolio Binder

that is supported by appendices of supplemental information in additional binders. This system is most effective when the candidate takes considerable care in referring the reader to materials in the appendices via thoughtful referencing in the candidate's Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Statements.

The candidate is responsible for providing all the materials for sections A-F as well as labeled file dividers for sections G-N (with supporting material as described below). N.B., Please do not use plastic folders.

- A. Curriculum vitae.** Two types of vitae are requested:
- ✓ An up-to-date vita.
 - ✓ An annotated copy of this vita. Annotation should indicate scholarly/creative work that was completed prior to coming to Richmond; work that was begun prior to coming to Richmond but completed since the candidate's arrival (with relative percentage completed in each locale); and work begun and completed, or with completion pending at Richmond. Also for all co-authored work (except for student co-authors), candidates should indicate their contribution to the work in both descriptive and relative percentage terms. Please use the following system to indicate University of Richmond undergraduate (*) and graduate (**) student co-authors on presentations and publications.
- B. Teaching and Advising Statement.** This document is the candidate's statement regarding his/her approach to teaching and advising (goals, methods, self-evaluation, etc.), including a statement of plans for the enhancement of his/her teaching and advising over the next five years. The candidate should take care to refer the reader to materials in the appendices and to highlight any materials revealing the development of innovative courses, curricula, or instructional methods, and provide brief explanations (if necessary) to insure that all of the submitted material is properly understood. The Tenure and Promotion Committee is especially interested in the candidate's critical self-analysis of his/her teaching and advising including quantitative and qualitative support for this self-assessment. This analysis should be the foundation of your goals for the next five years.
- C. Scholarship Statement.** This document is the candidate's statement regarding his/her scholarly or professionally relevant creative activities (objectives, approach, self-evaluation, etc.), including a statement of plans for the further development of these activities over the next five years and a statement about the significance of these activities for the advancement of the candidate's field in the past and in the future.
- D. Service Statement.** This document is the candidate's statement regarding his/her involvement in the service activities and responsibilities of the department, of the School of Arts and Sciences, and of the University, including a statement of expectations regarding his/her service activities over the next five years. If applicable, this statement may include comments on service rendered to appropriate professional groups and organizations outside the University.
- E. Personnel Reports & Annual Reviews.** This section should include copies of each of the candidate's annual Faculty Personnel Reports and each of his/her Chairperson's Annual Reviews. Please put these reports together by year.
- F. Mid-course Review.** This section includes a copy of the department's mid-course review and the dean's mid-course evaluation of the candidate.
- G. Student Letters.** The candidate should leave a labeled file divider in this location.

Once the candidate has submitted his/her materials, the chair should add the following:

- A list of all 80(+) students asked to provide evaluations and reasons why individual students declined to write (if a reason is given).
- The original letters received from students.
- To allow for variability in student preparation, as possible, letters by majors should be distinguished from those by non-majors through a note in the upper right hand corner of each letter.

H. **External Review Letters.** The candidate should leave a labeled file divider in this location and include a copy of his/her suggested reviewers (including explanation of existing relationship with each reviewer). Once the candidate has submitted his/her materials the chair should add the following:

- A listing of all referees solicited and in cases of declined invitations, the reason provided (if any).
- For each outside reviewer who writes an evaluation, a brief explanation of who each referee is, why he/she was chosen (what his/her qualifications are), and what sort of personal relationship, if any, he/she has with the candidate or with any other member of the department.
- The candidate's recommended reviewer list (with explanations).
- A copy of the e-mail inquiry sent to potential outside reviewers.
- A copy of the cover letter sent to outside reviewers.
- A listing of which reviewers received which materials.
- The original letters received from the outside reviewers.

I. **Service Letters.** The candidate should leave a labeled file divider in this location. Once the candidate has submitted his/her materials the chair should add the following:

- A list of service reviewers from whom assessments were sought.
- A copy of the cover letter sent to service reviewers.
- The original letters received from the outside reviewers.

5. Binders Containing Appendices

After the Core Portfolio Binder, the candidate should include clearly labeled supplemental binders that provide evidence in support of his/her effectiveness as a teacher, scholar/creative artist, and university citizen.

Supplemental Teaching and Advising Binder(s) providing information supporting candidate's effectiveness as a teacher:

- A semester-by-semester list of all courses taught including enrollments and credit/contact hours for each course. If a course was team-taught, the candidate's role in the course should be indicated.
- For all courses taught: illustrative materials demonstrating development of each course including syllabi, statements of course goals and objectives, major tests/examinations, and reading assignments from the most recent offering of each course.
- All student course evaluations. Please remember that course evaluations are to be given each semester during the probationary period, although the candidate may choose not to share the results of evaluations given in his/her first semester at

- Richmond.
- Student Evaluation of Instruction forms and the computer-scored summations of their quantitative results are to be submitted. (All of the original forms are to be submitted since they contain summative narrative responses.)
 - As possible the Tenure and Promotion Committee also finds very valuable an illustrative sample of marked and graded papers.
 - This information should include a list of all advising responsibilities.
 - Finally, the candidate is invited to indicate any special workshops, training sessions, or other evidence of efforts to improve his/her teaching effectiveness.

Supplemental Scholarship/Artist Binder(s) providing information supporting candidate's effectiveness as a scholar or artist:

- Copies of all scholarly, artistic, or other appropriate creative work completed by the candidate.
- The Tenure and Promotion Committee would like to know about the quality of journals, galleries, musical series, and other sources in which this work appeared as defined by such measures as the journal's general reputation in the field, its acceptance rates, whether or not submissions are blind-reviewed, etc.
- Please note that the candidate should enclose any reviews of his/her work, such as book reviews, reviews of grant proposals, reviews of theatrical presentations, etc.
- The candidate may also submit evidence of work-in-progress, such as outlines, drafts, sketches, or grant proposals.

Supplemental Service Binder(s) providing information supporting the candidate's record as a faculty citizen:

- Information that may be used to evaluate the candidate's service to the department, to the institution, and (if appropriate) to other professionally relevant groups and organizations.
- This information should include a list of all committees on which the candidate has served, and it should highlight any significant contributions the candidate made in that committee service.
- The candidate may also include a listing of any informal associations and activities that exemplify good citizenship and collegiality.

Optional Supplement Binder(s) providing optional information supporting candidate's professional record:

- The candidate may also wish to request letters from other individuals either inside or outside the University.
 - ✓ These written evaluations of his/her scholarly or creative activities should be submitted directly to the department chairperson.
 - ✓ The chairperson should receive these letters by mid-September at the latest in order to insure their consideration by the department review committee.
 - ✓ These letters carry less weight than those requested by the review committee, and candidates should not feel compelled to seek these additional letters.
 - ✓ Letters received before the department review begins may become part of the tenure portfolio.
 - ✓ Asking untenured colleagues to submit a letter of support on your behalf creates a potentially problematic situation. As such requested letters of this type will not be added to the portfolio.

- ✓ The department chair is responsible for inserting solicited letters in the portfolio; the candidate should leave a labeled file divider for this purpose.
- The candidate should use this binder to provide any additional information that he/she deems relevant to the tenure decision. There is no expectation that the candidate offer additional information; instead, this provision is made to allow for instances where additional information falling outside the described categories may be submitted. If additional information is provided, the candidate should take care to direct readers to this information via the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Statements in the Core Binder.

6. The department assessment

The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following responsibilities of the tenured members of the department and the department chair:

Tenured members of the candidate's department should prepare for the department's assessment by reviewing the candidate's portfolio and supporting materials.

Tenured departmental faculty then meet to discuss the tenure and/or promotion case, reviewing and assessing the portfolio submitted by the candidate, the external review letters, and the candidate's performance in relation to the criteria above. At this meeting, the tenured faculty vote on the candidate's tenure and promotion through a confidential ballot. The result of the vote is kept separate from the departmental report.

Based on this meeting, the chair of the department forwards a written report and the departmental vote to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean. The departmental report is to be a fair and balanced assessment of both the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The report should express the range of opinion in the department, the presence of any dissenting views, and the strength of any consensus, but it should not resemble in any way a transcript of the department's confidential deliberations. Before being forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean, the departmental report is circulated, revised as necessary, and the final version signed by all tenured members of the department. Signature only means agreement that the letter fairly represents the departmental discussion, and is by itself not a vote on the case.

The Department Report, after vetting by the Dean for legal and procedural issues, is shared with the candidate. If the report includes quotations from easily identifiable sources, the confidential information must be redacted before transmission to the candidate.

Normally, drafting the departmental report is the responsibility of the department chair, but in unusual circumstances this responsibility may be designated to another member of the department. In such circumstances, unless the Dean has approved an exception, the chair retains the responsibility of submitting the report to the Dean, indicating his or her role in preparing the document.

The department report is due by October 10th

Beginning in 2008 the departmental report replaces the chair's teaching, scholarship, service, and overall statements. The information below was provided previously to help guide the chair in writing those statements and is included here as potentially useful in the preparation of the new department report.

Previous instructions for Chair's Statement on Teaching. A statement, with supporting data, assesses the effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher. The chair's analysis should include:

- An evaluation of the quality of the candidate's syllabi, of his/her commitment to continued growth as a teacher, of the development of the candidate's teaching skills over his/her time at the University, and of such factors as his/her effectiveness in communicating, counseling, and motivating students, in working with different types of students, in evaluating student progress, in developing and implementing course goals and objectives that are rigorous and challenging, and in relating course work to the overall curricular goals of the department and the University.
- A description and evaluation of any innovative courses, curricula, and instructional methods developed by the candidate.
- An assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness as represented by the student evaluations submitted for each course and by confidential responses received from students who were taught by the candidate and have been contacted by the chairperson.
- The Tenure and Promotion Committee expressly asks for a summary of Student Evaluation of Instruction results on a course-by-course (rather than overall) basis.
- The Tenure and Promotion Committee would also like to receive data and assessments regarding the candidate's teaching effectiveness in comparison to others teaching the same courses, or the same types of courses.
- As appropriate within departmental norms, the chairperson's statement regarding teaching effectiveness should also be based upon classroom visitation. In all cases, the anonymity of tenured faculty who have provided confidential evaluations based on classroom visitation should be preserved.

Previous instructions for Chair's Statement on Scholarship. A statement assesses the accomplishments and promise of the candidate as a scholar or creative artist in his/her discipline. This statement should be based upon a careful assessment of all the information at hand, including all submitted work as well as the evaluations provided in confidential letters solicited from outside experts. Because this statement will be shared with the candidate, it should be carefully worded in order to preserve the anonymity of referees.

Previous instructions on Chair's Statement on Service. A statement assesses the candidate's service activities, including student advising (for both undeclared and declared students), membership on committees, and participation in the non-curricular life of the department and the University. If appropriate, the statement should also address the candidate's service to relevant professional groups and organizations outside the University. In support of this evaluation, the chairperson should review available ratings of student advising. Information from these letters should be used in a way that will preserve the anonymity of letter-writers.

Previous instructions on Chair's Overall Statement. A statement, with supporting data, assesses the effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher, scholar/artist, and University citizen. This statement should include:

- A description of the position the candidate was hired to fill and a summary of any shifts in the duties of the position since that time
- A clear statement of how the position as currently defined is related to the needs and aspirations of the department and University.
- A statement summarizing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. It should be noted that appropriate criticisms in an otherwise positive case often enhance statements' and department's credibility, and hence enhance a candidate's case for promotion.
- Preserving appropriate confidentiality, this statement should include a summary of the deliberations that have been held among the tenured members of the department.
- The departmental recommendation (but not the actual vote) regarding promotion; please state only whether the recommendation was positive or negative with no

- modifying language (e.g., please don't say "a unanimous positive recommendation" or "a mixed positive recommendation"). Also include an expression of the reasons for this recommendation including an accounting of varied opinions expressed by the vote.
- In calculating the vote, it is important to remember that positive tenure recommendations require an affirmative vote as such tie votes are considered to be negative recommendations.
 - The department chair should send the dean a separate letter indicating the actual vote. Again the actual vote should not be shared with the candidate.

7. Important Process Issues

Preparation of the Portfolio. The Tenure and Promotion Committee believes that a clear and persuasive case, besides being as succinct as possible, will exhibit careful analysis, coherent organization, and adequate, easy-to-locate documentation. It truly helps if the portfolio is neat and sufficiently sturdy to withstand considerable handling by the Committee and by the other persons responsible for making recommendations about tenure cases. Any questions about the selection and arrangement of materials, or about any other aspect of the portfolio-preparation process, should be referred to the department chair or dean.

Contents of Portfolio. Once the portfolio is submitted to the Dean's Office, it is considered to be part of the candidate's personnel file and may not be returned to the candidate during the remainder of the tenure-decision process. Ordinarily, portfolios have been returned at the end of the following academic year, after the vita, confidential letters, and other appropriate materials have been removed. If the candidate wishes to have any of the materials available prior to that time, copies should be made before the portfolio is submitted. Any items that cannot be copied (e.g., pictures, books, etc.) but will be needed before the end of the subsequent year should be so designated at the time of submission.

Completeness of the portfolio. The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following :

Once the candidate submits the portfolio, no materials, other than notification of the receipt of a major award or grant, the acceptance of a manuscript for publication, or some similar development of major consequence, may be added.

Length of the Portfolio. Please do not conclude that a longer portfolio is necessarily a more complete or more persuasive portfolio. In fact, the Tenure and Promotion Committee wants me to convey the unambiguous message that a case will be clearer and more persuasive if it is to the point, reasonably succinct, and well organized. Toward this end, the Committee and I ask that the essential core of each case be placed all together, up front, in the first binder, and that all other materials and documentation relevant to these statements and evaluations be placed in logical, well marked, and easily comprehended order in appendices to which references can be made.

Responses to department report and filing of grievances. The School of Arts and Sciences Tenure and Promotion Procedures specify the following :

At each stage of review, the candidate will be notified of a positive or negative recommendation.

The candidate will receive the departmental report, the Tenure and Promotion Committee report, and the Dean's report. In each case, the candidate will have a week to respond if he or she desires. Any response by the candidate is included in the portfolio as it moves forward.

The candidate has the right to file a grievance following the procedures defined in the Faculty Handbook, (see III.H.), should he or she believe there has been a violation of the university's established procedures. The candidate must act in a timely manner to file a grievance and should not postpone action until the end of the process.

At each stage, the candidate will be advised of the recommendation that has been made. If when notified of a negative recommendation, a candidate feels that the tenure-decision process at that stage has been inappropriate, the candidate may appeal to the Grievance Committee *within fourteen days* of notification. Such appeals may be made only on procedural grounds or in response to a perceived violation of the University's employment policies. The 14-day limit for filing a grievance ensures that substantive errors in process that might affect the outcome at each stage could be corrected at the time, rather than being carried forward to subsequent stages. In cases of a grievance, the *Faculty Handbook* states that the progress of the review process for a tenure and promotion case is suspended until the Grievance Committee completes its report. Please refer to the *Faculty Handbook* for more detail on grievance policy and procedure.

8. Overview of Major Target Dates

By early May	Dean distributes dean's instructions on preparation of portfolios
By early May	Dean holds meeting(s) with candidates and chairs. Candidate submits information on external reviews, students, and service.
By the end of May	Chair solicits letters from external reviewers, students, and service committee chairs
Around August 1	A reminder letter should be sent to students who have not responded to the chair's request to evaluate the candidate's teaching.
By September 1	Candidate submits well-organized portfolio materials to chair.
In September	Chair convenes tenured members to review portfolio and arrive at final recommendations regarding tenure/promotion.
By October 10	Chairperson submits portfolio with with department report to dean
By December 10	Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean share recommendations.
By early March	Provost shares recommendation with candidate, department chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, and dean, and forwards recommendation to the President. Only positive recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Trustees.
By early March	Dean shares Trustees' decision with candidate and chair.

9. Concluding Comments

If I can provide any other information, I shall be happy to do so. For now, I want only to add that we go to all this effort in preparing tenure/promotion portfolios in order to insure the best possible decision with regard to each and every tenure/promotion case in the School of Arts and Sciences. The accumulation of evidence and analysis in these portfolios provides a much fuller set of materials, information, and assessment than was available at any single previous point. Because of the clearer view afforded by these portfolios, it is always possible that performance judged to be satisfactory at various stages along the way will be seen to be less than sufficient for tenure/promotion at the end of the process. For this reason, no one should take the construction of tenure/promotion portfolios less than completely seriously.

Appendix A: Exemplar e-mail to potential outside reviewers in tenure cases

Dear Professor X:

I'm writing to ask a favor of you. We will be considering Dr. Lee Smith for tenure and promotion to associate professor this fall, and I wonder if you would be willing to be among the outside evaluators assessing his/her scholarship. We would want your report by late August.

If you agree, I'll send you an official invitation and the material to be evaluated immediately, so you could work this in at your convenience over the summer. I sincerely hope you can find the time for this important (and interesting!) service.

Lee has written:

(Include representative works here)

He/She is now working on a study of (include brief description here).

Sincerely,

Appendix B: Exemplar e-mail to potential outside reviewers in promotion cases

Dear Professor X:

I'm writing to ask a favor of you. We will be considering Dr. Lee Smith for promotion to full professor this fall, and I wonder if you would be willing to be among the outside evaluators assessing his/her scholarship. We would want your report by late August.

If you agree, I'll send you an official invitation and the material to be evaluated immediately, so you could work this in at your convenience over the summer. I sincerely hope you can find the time for this important (and interesting!) service.

Lee has written:

(Include representative works here)

He/She is now working on a study of (include brief description here).

Sincerely,

Appendix C: Exemplar letter to outside reviewers in tenure cases

[Date]

[Address]

Dear Professor X:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Dr. Lee Smith's scholarship as part of our consideration of his/her candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Enclosed are:

- Dr. Smith's curriculum vitae
- Listing of selected materials

In reviewing these materials, please bear in mind that:

- We most value your assessment of the quality and impact of Dr. Smith's scholarship (rather than its quantity).
- We would appreciate, along with an overall assessment of this body of scholarship, specific commentary on specific works.
- We are not seeking your recommendation about tenure and promotion, the criteria for which depend on local circumstances unfamiliar to you.

Your letter will, of course, be kept in the strictest confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding Dr. Smith's tenure and promotion.

As our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by late August/early September.

Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. If you have any further questions, don't hesitate to contact me at 804-289-xxxx or yourname@richmond.edu.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Chair

Appendix D: Exemplar letter to outside reviewers in promotion cases

[Date]

[Address]

Dear Professor X:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Dr. Lee Smith's scholarship as part of our consideration of his/her candidacy for promotion to full professor.

Enclosed are:

- Dr. Smith's curriculum vitae
- Listing of selected materials

In reviewing these materials, please bear in mind that:

- We most value your assessment of the quality and impact of Dr. Smith's scholarship (rather than its quantity).
- We would appreciate, along with an overall assessment of this body of scholarship, specific commentary on specific works.
- We are not seeking your recommendation about promotion, the criteria for which depend on local circumstances unfamiliar to you.

Your letter will, of course, be kept in the strictest confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding Dr. Smith's promotion.

As our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by late August/early September.

Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. If you have any further questions, don't hesitate to contact me at 804-289-xxxx or yourname@richmond.edu.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Chair

Appendix E: Exemplar letter to former and current students in tenure cases

[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Student]:

In the next few months, Dr. Smith of the XXX Department will be considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor. This will be an important decision for Dr. Smith, for the University, and for its students.

In arriving at a recommendation regarding his/her tenure and promotion, the Department will evaluate Dr. Smith's teaching, scholarship, and service. I am writing to ask if you could help us assess his/her teaching.

Could you please send me your candid and honest opinion of Dr. Smith's abilities as a teacher? As you gather your thoughts, think about such questions as:

- How much (and what kind of things) did you learn from him/her?
- Was he/she knowledgeable and organized?
- Did he/she challenge you to think?
- Did he/she motivate you to learn?

Now that you are looking back on your experience with him/her, you should be able to address these questions from a thoughtful perspective.

If Dr. Smith directed any of your research, or served as your academic advisor, we very much want to hear your comments about that too.

Please feel free to write back in any form you find easiest, hand-written, typed, or e-mail. I have attached a form that includes some background information. If you use email instead of the attached form please duplicate the entries on the form and include that information in your email. Most important, we want to hear from you. Please send your evaluation to me no later than **September 1**. Be assured that we will not share your letter with Dr. Smith. It will only be used by those faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation about Dr. Smith's tenure and promotion.

Thanks for your help with this very important decision!

Sincerely,

Chair, XXX Department
yourname@richmond.edu

**TEACHING EVALUATION
JANE DOE**

Your name _____

Signature _____

Course(s) you took with Prof. X Sr, Grad)	When?	Your level at the time (Fr, So, Jr,
--	--------------	--

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Are or were you a X major (Y or N)? _____

When did, or do you expect, to graduate? _____

++++
Please provide your evaluation below. Continue on the backside.

Appendix F: Exemplar letter to former and current students in promotion cases

[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Student]:

In the next few months, Dr. Smith of the XXX Department will be considered for promotion to full professor. This will be an important decision for Dr. Smith, for the University, and for its students.

In arriving at a recommendation regarding his/her promotion, the Department will evaluate Dr. Smith's teaching, scholarship, and service. I am writing to ask if you could help us assess his/her teaching.

Could you please send me your candid and honest opinion of Dr. Smith's abilities as a teacher? As you gather your thoughts, think about such questions as:

- How much (and what kind of things) did you learn from him/her?
- Was he/she knowledgeable and organized?
- Did he/she challenge you to think?
- Did he/she motivate you to learn?

Now that you are looking back on your experience with him/her, you should be able to address these questions from a thoughtful perspective.

If Dr. Smith directed any of your research, or served as your academic advisor, we very much want to hear your comments about that too.

Please feel free to write back in any way you find easiest, hand-written, typed, or e-mail. I have attached a form that includes some background information. If you use email instead of the attached form please duplicate the entries on the form and include that information in your email. Most important, we want to hear from you. Please send your evaluation to me no later than **September 1**. Be assured that we will not share your letter with Dr. Smith. It will only be used by those faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation about Dr. Smith's promotion.

Thanks for your help with this very important decision!

Sincerely,

Chair, XXX Department
yourname@richmond.edu

**TEACHING EVALUATION
JANE DOE**

Your name _____

Signature _____

Course(s) you took with Prof. X Sr, Grad)	When?	Your level at the time (Fr, So, Jr,
--	--------------	--

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Are or were you a X major (Y or N)? _____

When did, or do you expect, to graduate? _____

+++++

Please provide your evaluation below. Continue on the backside.

Appendix G: Exemplar letter to service reviewers in tenure cases

Dear Professor X:

I'm writing to ask a favor of you. We will be considering Dr. Lee Smith for tenure and promotion to associate professor this fall, and I wonder if you would be willing to provide your assessment of his work on the following committees:

- List committee's here

Your letter will, of course, be kept in the strictest confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding Dr. Smith's tenure and promotion.

As our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by late August/early September.

Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. If you have any further questions, don't hesitate to contact me at ext. xxxx or yourname@richmond.edu.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Chair

Appendix H: Exemplar letter to service reviewers in promotion cases

Dear Professor X:

I'm writing to ask a favor of you. We will be considering Dr. Lee Smith for promotion to full professor this fall, and I wonder if you would be willing to provide your assessment of his work on the following committees:

- List committee's here

Your letter will, of course, be kept in the strictest confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding Dr. Smith's promotion.

As our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by late August/early September.

Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. If you have any further questions, don't hesitate to contact me at ext. xxxx or yourname@richmond.edu.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Chair