

**[Faculty represented by United Academics need to refer to their collective bargaining unit agreement.]**

## **Guidelines for the Preparation and Evaluation of Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Dossiers**

**PLEASE NOTE:** This document is not intended to supersede, invalidate, or replace the information on reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) decisions included in the *Officers' Handbook*. Rather, it seeks to complement the *Officers' Handbook* by providing some practical guidelines which may help candidates describe and document their professional achievements in a way which will be comprehensible and compelling to those charged with evaluating RPT cases.

Candidates for RPT action should familiarize themselves fully with the criteria included in section 200 of the *Officers' Handbook*, including the criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (§223). Officers of Research, Extension, and the Libraries should consult both §220, portions of which apply to all University Officers, and the section of the *Handbook* devoted to their specific university role: §400 for Officers of Research, §500 for Officers of Extension, §600 for Officers of the Libraries. The criteria included in the *Officers' Handbook* are mandatory, and all RPT dossiers are expected to fulfill them.

These guidelines should serve University Officers in all categories as they prepare evaluation documentation.

\*\*\*

*Prepared by Faculty Affairs Committee, September 15, 1999. Approved by the Faculty Senate October 6, 1999.*

*References to Faculty Handbook sections updated by the Faculty Affairs Committee, November 12, 2001.*

*NOTE: Candidates should verify that they are using the most recent version of this document.*

## CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT

I	Brief Overview of the RPT Process	3
II	General Purpose of this Document	4
III	Creating the RPT Dossier	5
	A. Documenting Teaching and Advising	5
	1. Candidate's Responsibilities	6
	2. Chair's Responsibilities	6
	B. Documenting Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work	10
	1. Candidate's Responsibilities	10
	2. Chair's Responsibilities	11
	External Evaluator Letters	12
	C. Documenting Service	13
	1. Candidate's Responsibilities	13
	2. Chair's Responsibilities	14
IV	Green Sheet Checklist	15
	A. Candidate's Responsibilities	15
	<b>B.</b> Chair's Responsibilities	16
	C. College and University Level Review	18

## I. Brief Overview of the RPT Process

Before undergoing a reappointment, promotion, or tenure ("RPT") action at UVM, it may be useful to understand the general sequence of events involved in such decisions.

**A. Creation of Dossiers:** The dossier for RPT actions (commonly called "Green Sheets" because of the color of the headings on the stationery) is typically created primarily by the candidate and the candidate's Chair. Often the Chair will appoint an RPT committee charged with assembling the major components of the documentation. Some departments have a standing RPT committee that takes part in putting together the dossier.

The candidate's primary responsibilities are:

- 1) to provide a self-evaluation, describing his/her own performance in scholarship, teaching, and service (or whichever combination of those duties is consistent with the candidate's job responsibilities), and
- 2) to provide a clear and up-to-date *curriculum vitae* (*c.v.*).

The Chair's duties are more extensive, but also may be broken down into two basic categories:

- 1) The Chair is responsible for the preparation of an evaluative narrative statement containing an objective assessment of the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching, and service (or whichever combination of those duties is consistent with the candidate's job responsibilities). The Chair must also append thorough objective documentation to substantiate the assessment provided in the Chair's written evaluation.
- 2) The Chair is required to solicit and present peer reviews of the candidate's work. On a departmental level, the Chair must solicit input from all departmental faculty and provide an explanation of the advice received and the process by which it was solicited. When external evaluator letters are required, the Chair must solicit those evaluations of the candidate's achievements from qualified "arm's length" evaluators (usually a balanced list chosen from among a list of names suggested by the candidate and a list suggested by the Chair or relevant departmental committee). The Chair should provide a clear explanation of the professional qualifications of the evaluators and the process by which they were selected.

**B. Sequence of Institutional Reviews:** After its initial departmental review, typically in early Fall, the candidate's Green Sheet dossier is forwarded to the Dean of the candidate's College or unit, who then sends the file to the Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) of that unit. After being reviewed and voted upon by the FSC, the dossier returns to the Dean for evaluation, typically in late Fall. If that review is favorable, the file is then sent to the Provost, the chief academic officer for the University, who forwards the file to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), a standing

committee of the Faculty Senate, for review. After being reviewed and voted upon by the FAC, typically during Spring semester, the dossier returns to the Provost for evaluation. After review by the Provost, the recommendation is forwarded to the President, and finally to the University Trustees. This process and the process to be followed in the case of a negative decision at any level appears in the *Officers' Handbook* §230. A brief overview of the primary duties of those involved in the RPT process appears in the Green Sheet checklist at the end of this document.

**C. Relevant Documents:** Those involved in RPT actions should familiarize themselves with the following additional relevant documents:

- the portion(s) of the *Officers' Handbook* that describes RPT expectations for the candidate's particular university role (§200 for all Officers; additionally, §400 for Officers of Research, §500 for Officers of Extension, §600 for Officers of the Libraries);
- departmental and/or College/unit/division guidelines for RPT actions, if any exist.

Chairs should also consult "Instructions for the Preparation of Green Sheets," provided by the Provost's Office, which includes detailed information on the preferred organization of the Green Sheet dossier.

\*\*\*

## II. General Purpose of this Document

**Overview:** Because much of the evaluation of an individual's qualifications for reappointment, promotion, and tenure occurs outside the candidate's department, it is of the utmost importance that all individuals involved in the preparation of the dossier (principally the candidate and the candidate's Chair) strive to provide a persuasive, well-reasoned, and well-documented accounting of the candidate's professional achievements. The following document is designed to assist those engaged in Green Sheet preparation in the presentation and documentation of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service achievements. For convenience, a "Green Sheet Checklist" appears in the final section, following the narrative description of each of the three principal areas of professional responsibility.

**Organization of this document:** The *Officers' Handbook* (§223.2-223.4) breaks down faculty duties into three basic categories: teaching (§223.2), research, scholarship and creative work (§223.3) and service (§223.4). In the course of RPT actions, candidates must present and document their achievements in these three categories, or in whichever combination of these categories constitutes their responsibilities to the University according to the terms of their individual contracts (for example, clinical track faculty are not required to perform research). The following sections of the present document will offer some practical guidelines which may assist

in documenting the candidate's achievements in these areas. For candidates, the guidelines listed below relate primarily to the creation of the self-evaluation document ("Page 2" of the Green Sheets) and the *c.v.* For Chairs, these guidelines relate primarily to the creation of the Chair's statement ("Page 3" of the Green Sheets) and the presentation of appropriate supporting documentary evidence.

**Please note:** Many departments of the University possess departmental RPT guidelines documents which include more specific expectations for job performance in each of the three principal areas of evaluation (scholarship, teaching, service). Units not currently possessing such documents are being encouraged to prepare them. Such documents should be included in the Green Sheet dossier so that reviewers beyond the departmental level may familiarize themselves with the expectations placed upon the candidate under review. If no such document is provided in the Green Sheet dossier, the candidate will be evaluated in accordance with the language of the *Officers' Handbook*.

\*\*\*

### III. Creating the RPT Dossier

#### A. Documenting Teaching and Advising

**Preamble:** The *Officers' Handbook* clearly defines effective teaching as a crucial component of successful RPT review for University Officers involved in the institution's educational mission. Regarding Officers of Instruction, the *Handbook* states:

"Effective teaching is an essential criterion for initial appointment as an associate professor or professor, for reappointment at any rank, or for tenure or promotion." (§223.2)

Similar requirements for effective instruction appear in §523.2 and 523.2.a (regarding Officers of Extension) and §620.1-2 (regarding Officers of the Libraries).

The task of those candidates whose university role includes teaching responsibilities is, therefore, to ascertain that the Green Sheet dossier contains ample, clear documentary evidence supporting the effectiveness of his/her teaching. It is also important that the impression of the candidate's record presented in the narrative portions of the dossier (i.e., the candidate's self-evaluation and the Chair's statement) correspond to the impression provided in the attached documentation. It is very important that any discrepancies which might appear to exist between the narrative assessment and the attached documentation, as well as any mitigating circumstances which might be relevant to the interpretation of the teaching evaluations or other corroborating documentation, be clearly explained in the narrative portion of the dossier.

Again, please note that if the department or College possesses a document detailing RPT expectations for teaching achievement, it should be included in the Green Sheet dossier.

## 1. Candidate's Responsibilities

**1a. Candidate's Self-Evaluation:** The candidate's self-evaluation (included as "Page 2" of the Green Sheets) allows the candidate the opportunity to provide a *concise* statement of teaching philosophy, and a *concise* narrative description of the courses he/she teaches and how they contribute to the needs of the candidate's department and/or the institution as a whole. Section 223.2 of the *Officers' Handbook* (§ 2) provides examples of some areas of a candidate's teaching experiences and approach which may be relevant to such self-evaluation for all University Officers of Instruction. Additional guidelines for Officers of Extension and the Libraries appear in §523.2.a and §620.2, respectively. Please note that the role of the candidate is to describe what he or she does; it is the Chair's responsibility to evaluate the quality of that work.

Candidates may also find it desirable to include an explanation of any relevant aspect of the courses he/she teaches which might not be evident to an individual who does not work in the candidate's discipline. Examples might include a candidate's individual contributions to particular courses or to the departmental curriculum; issues regarding class size; co-taught courses; courses serving as core requirements (and which might attract a somewhat different audience than elective offerings); multi-section courses which use a common syllabus (which the candidate may or may not have had the opportunity to develop); frequency of new courses; or any aspect of his/her teaching workload which may appear unusual (in terms of number or types of courses taught, etc.). Special teaching honors or awards should be cited, with appropriate description of their nature and/or importance.

Inasmuch as the *Officers' Handbook* also stipulates the need for all candidates who do advising to document such advising in their RPT dossier (§223.2 ¶ 3), the candidate may, in his/her self-evaluation find it useful to provide specific information on the number of advisees, and a narrative description of the type of advising duties undertaken (including research advising, other mentoring activities, etc.).

**1b. Curriculum vitae:** The candidate's *curriculum vitae* is included as item 1 on as "Page 1" of the Green Sheets. It is useful for the candidate's *c.v.* to include reference to teaching duties and achievements, including, for example, teaching awards, grants for professional development in teaching, etc.

## 2. Chair's Responsibilities

**2a. Chair's Statement:** The Chair's statement (included as "Page 3" of the Green Sheets) should offer a clear, documented analysis of the candidate's teaching record, including specific reference

to the candidate's fulfillment of departmental expectations for the particular type of RPT action involved. If advising evaluations exist, these should be discussed as well. There should also be an *objective* rendering of the advice received from other faculty members within the candidate's department (both favorable and unfavorable) regarding the candidate's teaching record. The Chair's comments should, in all cases, be even-handed, pointing out both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record. Please note that it is the Chair's responsibility not merely to describe the candidate's work, but also to evaluate and document the quality of that work. Similarly, it is the Chair's responsibility (not the candidate's) to assemble the documentation on teaching effectiveness described in section 2c. below.

The Chair's statement should cite qualitative and quantitative evidence (e.g., drawn from student evaluations) to support his/her evaluation, including contextual information allowing reviewers outside the department to understand its relevance. If evaluations are cited in evidence, for example, the Chair should clearly explain the rating system used in student evaluations, clarifying whenever possible how the candidate's ratings compare with departmental norms. Similarly, it is useful for the Chair to include an explanation of any relevant aspect of the courses that the candidate teaches which might not be evident to an individual who does not work in the candidate's discipline. Examples of the latter might include issues regarding class size, co-taught courses, courses serving as core requirements (which might attract a somewhat different audience than elective offerings), multi-section courses which use a common syllabus (which the candidate may or may not have had the opportunity to develop), etc. In the event that the Chair believes that any of the documentary evidence may, in some way, be misleading, unreliable, or of an idiosyncratic nature (for example, if the Chair believes that certain negative comments in student evaluations of a particular course may have stemmed from issues unrelated to the candidate's performance), it is important that this matter be clearly presented in the Chair's statement as well.

The Chair's statement should be followed by thorough documentation of the candidate's teaching record (as stipulated under item 5 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets). This documentation is expected to serve as validation for the Chair's narrative evaluation of the candidate. Thus, if the Chair bases a conclusion upon documentary evidence, that documentation should be appended to corroborate the assessment. The process of preparing some common forms of teaching documentation is described more fully in section 2c. below.

**2b. Presenting Departmental Opinions:** The Chair is expected to "request the advice of all probationary and tenured department members" in the course of RPT actions (§231.2; see also §531.1 and §631.1). Further, a report of the advice received is required on the Green Sheets. The Chair's statement should, therefore, include a faithful summary of advice received, both favorable and unfavorable, from department colleagues regarding the candidate's teaching and advising, as well as an explanation of the process by which colleague recommendations were solicited, and any mitigating circumstances (personality conflicts, etc.).

**2c. Documenting Teaching Effectiveness:** The *Officers' Handbook* clearly states the need for regular evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness for those candidates whose university role includes those duties. Regarding Officers of Instruction, the *Handbook* states:

"Teaching and academic advising must be evaluated regularly and the results of such evaluation must be presented systematically and considered in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions." (§223.2 ¶ 4)

In the same subsection, the *Handbook* also provides an elaboration of various kinds of evaluations which may be used for this purpose (223.2 ¶ 5), including, but not limited to, course evaluation instruments (e.g., student and peer evaluations), development and/or publication of instructional tools, and teaching awards. The paragraph also stipulates that "no single set of satisfactory measures can be prescribed" as specific requirements for any individual RPT case; indeed, there is broad leeway in the selection of measurement instruments, provided that those chosen are *evaluated and documented* appropriately.

Although the *Handbook* makes clear that departments may evaluate teaching in a variety of ways, it is also clear that it is imperative that there be sufficient documentation to allow for satisfactory verification of the teaching assessments included in the candidate's self-evaluation and Chair's evaluation, and that there be a clear explanation of the bases for determining the materials to be included in (and/or excluded from) the file. It is important always to remember that the decision on any RPT action depends wholly upon the contents of the candidate's dossier, and hence, skimpy, inconsistent, or ambiguous supporting documentation is not helpful to the candidate's case.

The following paragraphs offer guidelines for presenting some common types of teaching evaluation documentation. These guidelines include some options regarding the selection of documentation materials and also some suggestions regarding the ways in which the Chair can help reviewers outside the department interpret those materials.

These guidelines are not meant to be exhaustive. It is recognized that the most appropriate forms of documentation will vary from candidate to candidate, in accordance with his/her university role. Officers of Extension and the Libraries may consult *Handbook* §523.2 and §620.1, respectively, for further information on the evaluation of teaching/educational efforts in their disciplines.

**(i) Student evaluations:** In accordance with the above-cited *Handbook* requirement that "teaching [...] must be evaluated regularly and the results of such evaluation must be presented systematically," it is typical and appropriate that such student evaluation documentation as may exist be included in the RPT dossier for the courses the candidate has taught since his/her last RPT action.

It is typical to include quantitative data, wherever available, with respect to the candidate's individual teaching record as well as departmental evaluation statistics. When evaluation processes include open-ended or narrative student comments, inclusion of such comments may help put numeric evaluations in context. Indeed, because of limitations of strict numerical evaluations, it adds considerably to the dossier if some form of narrative commentary (whether from student evaluations, student letters, or other sources) is provided. If the Chair's narrative

includes such student comments, the accompanying documentation should be sufficient to verify that the student comments selected were representative. If data summaries are used, the Chair's evaluation should explain clearly the basis used in their creation.

To the extent that the student evaluation documentation included in a given candidate's dossier may differ from the above (i.e., if only certain courses are included, if quantitative data are limited, etc.), the criteria for the selection of the course evaluations included in (and excluded from) the dossier should be clearly explained by the Chair.

**(ii) Peer observations:** It is typical for peer evaluations, where available, to be included in the candidate's dossier. If included, the departmental policy of soliciting such evaluations should be explained, and any data which might be useful in helping reviewers outside the department to interpret the evaluations should be provided by the Chair. The Chair should also address inconsistencies among the various peer evaluation letters or between the peer and student evaluations. Inasmuch as the *Handbook* requires "regular" evaluation of teaching, it is preferable that peer evaluations not be limited entirely to the period immediately preceding the RPT action. It is helpful for peer evaluations to span the period since the candidate's last RPT review.

**(iii) Advising evaluations:** As mentioned above, the *Officers' Handbook* stipulates (§223.2, ¶ 4) that academic advising, if performed, should be regularly evaluated. Documentation of any such evaluation should be included in the dossier, and addressed in the Chair's statement.

**(iv) Solicited student/alumni/client letters:** If solicited student, alumni, or client letters are included, the Chair should indicate the process by which those evaluators were selected. Should any such letters be unsolicited, this point should be explained as well.

**(v) Development/Publication of instructional techniques/materials:** The *Handbook* (§223.2 ¶ 5) stipulates that "effective" instructional techniques or materials may be used as evidence of a candidate's teaching excellence (see also §523.2.a ¶4 and §620.2). Thus, it is important that a listing of such activities be accompanied by careful evaluation (e.g., by peers and/or other qualified persons, awards received) in order to confirm that the techniques/materials are indeed effective. Such materials may be especially significant for candidates in certain disciplines, such as Officers of Extension, Officers on the Clinical Track, and Officers of the Library.

**(vi) Other teaching documentation:** In certain cases, the Chair may have access to other forms of teaching/advising documentation, such as external evaluators' review of course syllabi, statements from graduate student committees, and the like. To the extent such documentation is included, the Chair should provide adequate background for its interpretation, including information on how the materials were solicited, discussion of inconsistencies, etc.

The documentation of teaching effectiveness selected for inclusion in the candidate's dossier should be placed in Tab 5, as stipulated under item 5 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets.

\*\*\*

## B. Documenting Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work

**Preamble:** The *Officers' Handbook* defines high quality scholarship as a crucial component of successful RPT reviews for all University Officers whose duties include scholarly achievement. Regarding Officers of Instruction, the *Handbook* states:

"There must be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in scholarly activity of high quality and significance." (§223.3 ¶ 1)

Similar requirements for continuing, effective scholarship also appear in §523.2.b (Extension), and §620.3 (Libraries). Per §420, Officers of Research are bound by the criteria included in §223.3.

The task of those candidates whose university duties include scholarly/creative activities is, therefore, to ascertain that the quality and significance of his/her achievements in these areas is effectively communicated in the RPT dossier. It is important to recognize that, because the candidate's scholarly/creative achievements must be reviewed by a number of individuals whose areas of specialization do not routinely coincide with those of the candidates whose dossiers are under review, it is not typical for committee members and administrators to read and qualitatively evaluate the articles, books, creative work, or other components of a candidate's record for themselves. Rather, they seek to locate evidence of the quality of the candidate's scholarly achievement by examining the various evaluations of that work included in the candidate's dossier itself.

As indicated above, please note that, in the event the candidate's department or College possesses a document stipulating expectations for scholarly production (types of work expected, means by which it is evaluated, etc.), this document should be included with the Green Sheet dossier.

### 1. Candidate's Responsibilities

**1a. Candidate's Self-Evaluation:** The self-evaluation statement ("Page 2" of the Green Sheets) provides the candidate an opportunity to offer a *concise* narrative overview of the development of his/her research, scholarship, and/or creative work with indications of future plans. A description of the types of scholarly or creative activities which may be included, as well as indications regarding proper presentation and documentation of such work, appears in the *Officers' Handbook* §223.3. Officers of Extension and the Libraries should additionally consult §523.2.b and §620.3, respectively. Please note that the role of the candidate is to describe what he or she does; it is the Chair's responsibility to evaluate the quality of that work.

Candidates may also find it desirable to include an explanation of any component of his/her scholarly or creative record whose relevance might not be clear to an individual who does not work in the candidate's discipline. It is, for example, useful to provide a clear explanation of the ways in which the candidate has made his/her work known to others in the field, including pertinent information about the particular journals, conferences, and other venues in which the work has appeared, as well as specific information on the nature and importance of grants, awards, or other recognition achieved. The self-evaluation also provides the candidate an opportunity to address any aspects of his/her scholarly or creative work which might appear unusual to extra-departmental evaluators (number of publications, unusual venues of publication or exhibition, relevant information on status of submitted or forthcoming work, etc.). It may also be useful, in some cases, to provide a brief overview of the candidate's scholarly/creative production, emphasizing work since the previous RPT action. It is, however, *not* necessary merely to replicate the listing of scholarly or creative achievements which appears in the candidate's *c.v.*

**1b. Curriculum vitae:** The *curriculum vitae* (item 1 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets) should be complete and clear. Documentation of publications should include complete bibliographic information, including page numbers. References should be listed chronologically. Books authored, books edited, articles, conference papers, reviews, etc., should be listed in separate categories, with distinction between peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed materials, with co-authorship clearly identified. Listings of grants should be similarly complete, clearly indicating all relevant information such as project title, funding amount, duration, granting organization, and the candidate's role in the project. If grants applied for but not received are listed, they should be clearly identified as such.

## 2. Chair's Responsibilities

### 2a. The Chair's Statement:

**(i) Presenting the candidate's scholarly record:** The Chair's statement ("Page 3" of the Green Sheets) should provide precise evaluation of the candidate's scholarly contribution to his/her discipline (see §223.3, §523.2.b, §620.2). Where departmental or College RPT guidelines exist, there should be a clear effort to address the candidate's fulfillment of those expectations, taking into account the type of RPT action involved in the present case. Background information on the nature and importance of grants or awards received, and on the journals, conferences, and other venues in which the candidate's work has appeared should be provided, including such things as: acceptance rates, professional reputation, scholarly/creative focus, likely audience, etc. Any unusual aspects of a candidate's scholarly record (regarding type of scholarship, unusual venues of publication, etc.) should be clearly addressed within the Chair's statement. The Chair should distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications, and, as stipulated in the *Handbook*, present an evaluation of the candidate's role in co-authored works (see §223.3). For the benefit of reviewers outside the department, it is also important to explain discipline-specific protocols regarding the listing of co-authors in scholarly publications. In the event a candidate's scholarship involves other forms of creative production, the bases for evaluating such activity must be clearly

provided. Throughout, emphasis should be placed on effective peer review of the candidate's materials. Please note that it is the Chair's responsibility not merely to describe the candidate's work, but also to evaluate and document the quality of that work.

**(ii) Presenting departmental opinions:** The Chair's statement should include a faithful summary of advice received, both favorable and unfavorable, from department colleagues regarding the candidate's research, scholarship, and/or creative work, in accordance with the guidelines provided for "Presenting Departmental Opinions" in the section on teaching and advising above (see section III.A.2b).

**(iii) External evaluator letters:** In accordance with the *Officers' Handbook* §223.3 ¶ 8, it is necessary to provide external evaluator letters for all RPT actions involving tenure or promotion to associate or full professor. They may be included, though are not required, for other RPT actions. When external evaluation letters are included, the Chair's statement should indicate what materials were provided to the evaluators, as well as the basis for selecting those evaluators and a description of their qualifications.

Inasmuch as the external evaluation letters serve as documentary verification of the candidate's scholarly excellence, it is imperative that the analysis included in the letters be objective and reliable. Thus, the dossier should contain compelling evidence that the candidate's work has been reviewed by arm's-length evaluators who are active scholars in the candidate's field of scholarly/creative endeavor.

By "*arm's-length evaluator*," it is meant that the evaluation letters should include reports by individuals who do not have a significant personal relationship with the candidate. Letters from former students, thesis advisors, colleagues, co-authors, or collaborators, for example, generally do not constitute arm's-length evaluations. While such letters are useful, and are often included in Green Sheet dossiers, it is appropriate that they be accompanied by other "arm's length" letters to insure objectivity. Generally speaking, it is desirable that at least some of the evaluators be selected by the Chair (or by a departmental RPT committee, etc.), rather than by the candidate, in order to insure objectivity. Each evaluator letter should specify the nature of the evaluator's personal knowledge of the candidate and his/her work. If, for some reason, arm's-length evaluators cannot be found, the reasons should be specified in the Chair's statement.

By "*active scholars*," it is meant that the evaluators must have a track-record of published scholarship in a field of study with bearing on the candidate's scholarly endeavors. While it is not necessary that every evaluator work in exactly the same field as the candidate, the justification for including a particular evaluator in the body of outside readers should be clear.

It is incumbent upon the Chair to provide validation of the credentials of evaluators, either by including a *c.v.* or by providing a brief biographical description, to be included in the candidate's dossier along with the evaluator letters.

External evaluation letters should be placed in the candidate's dossier under tab 6, as described in item 6 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets. It is useful to provide a copy of the letter requesting the

evaluation as well. This letter typically requests that evaluators assess the quality of the candidate's work and the candidate's present and/or future projected standing in the field. Evaluators should be asked to specify the nature of their personal knowledge of the candidate and his/her work.

\*\*\*

**C. Documenting Service:** The *Officers' Handbook* defines effective service as an important component of successful RPT reviews for all University Officers whose duties include service activities. The *Handbook* also enumerates various types of service activities which may be submitted for evaluation in the course of RPT actions, with recognition that the type and extent of an individual faculty member's service contributions may vary in accordance with his/her discipline (see §223.4 regarding Officers of Instruction, §523.2.c regarding Officers of Extension, §620.3 regarding Officers of the Libraries).

The task of those candidates whose university responsibilities include service, therefore, is to present his/her service activities in such a way that the extent and importance of his/her service achievements are clearly communicated. It should be noted, as with the other areas of achievement considered in RPT actions, that a mere enumeration of service activities is insufficient. The *Officers' Handbook* makes clear that service contributions must be evaluated and documented as well:

"All of the candidate's professional service activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and of leadership in the field. [...] Evidence must be provided of the quality of the service rendered, including evaluations by persons or agencies served." (§223.4 ¶ 5; see similar statements in §523.2 and §620.1).

In this category, as in some others, there may be a substantial difference among the various units within the university regarding service expectations. For example, greater emphasis on service activities may apply to Officers of Extension, Officers of the Libraries, and Officers on the Clinical Track. Candidates should refer to the specific *Officers' Handbook* guidelines relating to their own discipline for further clarification.

As indicated above, if the candidate's department or College possesses a document detailing departmental expectations for service achievement, such document should be included in the Green Sheet dossier.

## 1. Candidate's Responsibilities

**1a. Candidate's Self Evaluation:** The self-evaluation statement ("Page 2" of the Green Sheets) provides an opportunity for the candidate to offer a *concise* narrative description of his/her service activities, detailing the importance of these activities to the department, to the university, to the profession, and/or to the community at large. Where relevant, there should be attention to the relationship between the candidate's service and his/her scholarship and/or teaching

accomplishments. To the extent that some of the candidate's service activities may not be included in the *c.v.*, it is pertinent to include them in the self-evaluation. Any service activities which were particularly noteworthy, time-consuming, or otherwise deserving of special attention should be described, particularly in cases in which the quantity of service might be considered to affect other aspects of the candidate's professional record. Please note that the role of the candidate is to describe what he or she does; it is the Chair's responsibility to evaluate the quality of that work.

**1b. Curriculum vitae** The *curriculum vitae* (item 1 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets) should include a listing of the candidate's service activities, with years of service to each included, where applicable.

## 2. Chair's Responsibilities

**2a. Chair's Statement:** The Chair's statement ("Page 3" of the Green Sheets) should provide an evaluation of the importance of the candidate's service contributions, indicating any relevant information regarding the ways in which departmental responsibilities are assigned, and to explain clearly any aspects of the candidate's service record which might have particular bearing on the candidate's RPT case. In cases, for example, where a candidate may have a particularly heavy service load, thus possibly limiting the time a candidate may devote to his/her other professional responsibilities, it is important for the Chair to explain the bases for the extent of the candidate's service responsibilities (e.g., whether they were necessitated by the nature of the candidate's job description or departmental circumstances). The candidate's service record should be placed in the context of departmental and/or college-wide expectations for service, as broken down by particular type of RPT action. It is also suitable for the Chair to report any advice received, both favorable and unfavorable, from departmental colleagues regarding the candidate's service contributions. Please note that it is the Chair's responsibility not merely to describe the candidate's work, but also to evaluate and document the quality of that work.

**2b. Presenting Departmental Opinions:** The Chair's statement should include a faithful summary of advice received, both favorable and unfavorable, from department colleagues regarding the candidate's service, in accordance with the guidelines provided for presenting departmental opinions in the section on teaching and advising above (see section III.A.2b).

**2c. Documenting Service Achievements:** Inasmuch as the *Officers' Handbook* stipulates the need to provide evidence of the quality of service provided (see §223.4 ¶ 5; also §523.2 and §620.1), documentary confirmation of the candidate's service should be provided wherever possible. This documentation might include such things as letters from committee chairs, letters from student or community groups or agencies served, client feedback, etc. To the extent such documentation is included, the Chair should provide adequate background for its interpretation, including information on how the materials were solicited, discussion of inconsistencies, etc. Any supporting documentation may be included in the dossier as "Miscellaneous supporting information" as described on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets.

## IV. Green Sheet Checklist

**Preamble:** The following checklist includes some of the most important components of the various sections of the RPT dossier. Parenthetical references to Green Sheet page numbers have been provided to assist in the correct ordering and assembly of the dossier materials, in accordance with the instructions provided on the Green Sheet documentation itself. Please note that this checklist is not intended to supersede or substitute for the narrative descriptions provided in the preceding sections.

As indicated earlier, the distribution of teaching, scholarly/creative, and service responsibilities varies greatly among Officers of Instruction, Officers of Research, Officers on the Clinical Track, Officers of Extension, and Officers of the Libraries. Therefore, not all entries on the following checklist will be applicable to all candidates.

### A. Candidate's Responsibilities

**Summary:** The candidate is responsible for completing "Page 2" of the Green Sheets (the self-evaluation statement) and for providing an up-to-date *curriculum vitae* (item 1 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets).

#### 1. Self-Evaluation Statement ("Page 2" of the Green Sheets)

##### a. *Teaching/Advising:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Describe courses taught, their importance to department/university.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Describe advising duties, if any.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Explain any aspects of teaching/advising record which might not be evident to reviewers outside the department but which may have bearing on assessment (new courses, team-taught courses, required vs. elective courses, etc.).
- \_\_\_\_\_ List any teaching awards, with appropriate explanation of their nature/importance as needed.

##### b. *Research/Scholarship/Creative Work*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Discuss scholarly/creative accomplishments and future scholarly/creative program.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Explain any aspects of scholarly/creative record which may be unusual.
- \_\_\_\_\_ List any grants, awards, etc., with appropriate explanation of their nature/importance as needed.

##### c. *Service:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Describe all service activities at departmental, university, professional, or community level.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Explain importance of these activities to department/university/community and/or to candidate's own professional development.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Explain any aspects of service record which might have bearing on assessment of other areas of candidate's record (e.g., heavy service loads).

## **2. Curriculum vitae (Item 1 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Include breakdown of educational background, professional experience, scholarly record, service, other professional activities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide full bibliographic information, including page numbers, for all publications.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Separate professional papers, articles, reviews; books authored vs. edited; peer-reviewed vs. non-peer-reviewed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide full description of all grants, separating grants sought from grants received, and including other relevant identifying information.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Verify that all information is accurate.

## **B. Chair's Responsibilities**

**Summary:** The Chair must provide a narrative evaluation of the candidate's record ("Page 3" of the Green Sheets). The Chair is also responsible for soliciting and reporting advice from members of the candidate's department ("Page 4" of the Green Sheets) and from other relevant parties as may be appropriate (e.g., external evaluators). The Chair's duties also include assembling much of the required accompanying documentation stipulated on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets.

### **1. Soliciting Information from Others**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Solicit advice from all probationary and tenured departmental members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide a numeric tally on "Page 4" of the Green Sheets of any departmental vote taken, with reasons for abstentions explained. Numeric vote tallies should be included even in the case of unanimous votes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ If applicable, solicit statement from joint-appointing units (Item 3 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets).
- \_\_\_\_\_ If applicable, solicit evaluations of the candidates scholarly and/or creative work from external evaluators who are active in the candidate's discipline, some of whom must be 'arm's length' evaluators (Item 6 on "Page 1" of Green Sheets).
- \_\_\_\_\_ If desired, solicit input from other relevant parties (former students, clients, etc.).

### **2. Chair's Evaluation ("Page 3" of the Green Sheets)**

#### *a. Presenting the candidate's record:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evaluative overview of candidate's record in scholarship, teaching, and service (as appropriate), supported by quantifiable data wherever possible.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Explain the terms of the candidate's contract, if unusual, with attention to the impact which the candidate's individualized contract terms might be expected to have on his/her professional record.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evaluative information on the journals, etc., through which the candidate has made his/her scholarship available to the profession (acceptance rates, refereed/non-refereed, etc.).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evaluative information on grants, honors received (how awarded, importance, etc.).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Carefully explain any other aspects of the candidate's record which may depart from university norms (e.g., unusual publication pattern, unusually heavy service load, etc.) or which might otherwise be difficult to interpret or misleading to a reviewer outside the department.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ascertain that claims based on documentary evidence in the narrative evaluation are appropriately substantiated by inclusion of corroborating documentation (see section 3 below).

b. *Explaining external evaluation process (if applicable)*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide description of how external evaluators were selected, including candidate's role in selection.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include explanation of professional qualifications of external evaluators.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide evaluative presentation of opinions expressed in external evaluation letters, including contextualizing information as needed for the benefit of reviewers outside the department.

c. *Explaining evaluation of teaching (if applicable)*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Include a clear description of bases upon which evaluation of the candidate's teaching has been made, including: explanation of the evaluation rating system, explanation of selection of evaluations to be included, quantitative statistics on departmental evaluation averages (where available).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Carefully explain any aspects of the teaching documentation which might seem unclear, or might prove misleading, to extra-departmental reviewers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide description of how any supporting letters were solicited.

d. *Presenting Departmental Views*

- \_\_\_\_\_ Clearly explain how departmental views/votes were solicited, how many departmental colleagues participated in the assessment, how many were eligible to participate.
- \_\_\_\_\_ In cases of a mixed departmental vote, accurately and objectively present both viewpoints.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include any message which the department wishes to record with respect to progress which is expected prior to any subsequent RPT action.

### **3. Providing Accompanying Documentation to Substantiate Record**

a. *Teaching/Advising* (Item 5 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets):

- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching evaluations: If included, these typically include courses taught since the previous RPT action, with particular emphasis on quantifiable data

(where available). If selection of evaluations differs from these norms, the basis for the selection should be clearly explained by the Chair.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Peer evaluations: If included, the assessments provided in these evaluations should be commented upon by the Chair, particularly in cases of disagreement or of discrepancy between peer and student evaluations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Solicited student/alumni/client letters: If included, the Chair should describe how the selection of letters was determined. If any such letters were unsolicited, this point should be noted as well.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other teaching documentation: If included, be sure sufficient explanatory information is provided in the Chair's statement to allow reviewers to interpret.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ascertain that dossier contains a clear description of: 1) the system used to select the teaching documentation included in the dossier; 2) the rating system used on the department's student evaluation forms; 3) any aspect of the candidate's teaching record which might be difficult to interpret or misleading to an extra-departmental reviewer.

b. *Research/Scholarship/Creative Work* (Item 6 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets):

- \_\_\_\_\_ Attach letters from external evaluators, if applicable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Attach copy of letter requesting external evaluations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ If desired, attach other relevant documents containing peer review of candidate's scholarly/creative accomplishments.

c. *Service*:

- \_\_\_\_\_ If letters, evaluations, surveys, or other evidence of the candidate's service contributions are included, the selection and assessment of such materials should be addressed in the Chair letter. These may be included as "Miscellaneous supporting information" as described on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets).

d. *Other Documentation*:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Include a copy of departmental RPT guidelines, if available.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include a copy of the candidate's personnel profile, as requested in Item 2 of "Page 1" of the Green Sheets".

\*\*\*

**C. College- and University-Level Review** ("Page 4" of the Green Sheets)

**1. Faculty Standards Committee Recommendation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide a narrative assessment of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service contributions (as appropriate), in accordance with Item 4 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ascertain that recommendation is consistent with *Officers' Handbook*

- \_\_\_\_\_ RPT guidelines and with departmental/College RPT guidelines, if provided.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include a numeric tally of the committee vote, indicating reasons for abstentions. Numeric vote tallies should be included even in the case of unanimous votes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ In the case of mixed votes, clearly present both viewpoints.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include any message which the FSC wishes the candidate to receive with respect to progress which is expected prior to any subsequent RPT action.

## **2. Dean's Recommendation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provide a narrative assessment of the candidate's scholarly, teaching, and service contributions (as appropriate), in accordance with Item 4 on "Page 1" of the Green Sheets.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ascertain that recommendation is consistent with *Officers' Handbook* RPT guidelines and with departmental/College RPT guidelines, if provided.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Clearly indicate reasons for approval or disapproval of the candidate's case, in light of departmental and FSC recommendations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include any message which the Dean wishes the candidate to receive with respect to progress which is expected prior to any subsequent RPT action.

## **3. FAC Recommendation**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Ascertain that recommendation is consistent with *Officers' Handbook* RPT guidelines and with departmental/College RPT guidelines, if provided.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include a numeric tally of the committee vote, including those abstentions due to conflict of interest. Numeric vote tallies should be included even in the case of unanimous votes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ In the case of mixed votes, clearly present both viewpoints.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Include any message which the FAC wishes the candidate to receive with respect to progress which is expected prior to any subsequent RPT action.