

Promotion and Tenure

Department of Mathematical Sciences

Version 2019.1.1: revised 2/24/19

Final Approval: April 2019

Promotion and tenure of faculty in the Mathematical Sciences Department are governed by the Faculty Handbook and the College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Promotion and Tenure. Candidates for promotion and tenure should familiarize themselves with these documents. This document specifies departmental procedures for evaluating candidates and additional requirements for promotion.

1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee

1.1. Membership

The Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) consists of the following faculty who have primary appointment in the Department:

- tenured faculty, except the chair
- continuing track (CT) faculty who have completed their 6-year review or been promoted beyond assistant professor

(Faculty serving in administrative positions outside the department will be considered on a case-by-case basis.) The entire committee selects officers and revises general procedures of the committee. Other tasks are done by subcommittees of participating members, as described below:

- promotion of and approval of academic rank for tenure-track (TT) faculty: tenured faculty at or above the desired rank
- promotion of and approval of academic rank for CT faculty: P&T members at or above the desired rank
- 6- and 13-year renewals of CT faculty: tenured faculty at or above the candidate's rank, CT faculty at or above the candidate's rank and serving longer than the candidate
- nonrenewals of CT faculty: tenured faculty at or above the candidate's rank, CT faculty at or above the candidate's rank and serving longer than the candidate
- revision of procedures pertaining only to TT faculty: tenured faculty

The term "committee" will be used herein to refer to whichever body is appropriate for the matter at hand.

Faculty on leave from the department are not considered eligible voting members of the committee unless they notify an officer of the P&T in writing of their intention to participate in committee actions. Such notification should be received by August 15.

Since retention and advancement of faculty are of paramount importance to the Department, all resident members of the committee should participate in its deliberations and actions.

1.2. Selection and Duties of the Officers

- (i) By April 1, the Chair of the P&T will conduct the election by P&T of a Chair and Secretary. These will be chosen from among the tenured full professors by majority vote. Their term of office is one year, unless actions initiated while they are in office are not concluded, in which case they will continue in office on an ad hoc basis until these actions are resolved. Consequently, two sets of officers may hold office simultaneously.
- (ii) The Chair of the P&T will call and conduct meetings and will be the representative of the committee in matters of communication about its policies or actions.
- (iii) The Secretary of the P&T will maintain a record of attendance, minutes of meetings, prepare and distribute material for meetings and with the Chair of P&T prepare and oversee the preparation of materials to be placed into the formal personnel process by the committee.
- (iv) The Chair and Secretary of the P&T and the Department Chair will serve as a group to determine the issues to be brought before the committee and to observe that departmental policies and procedures conform to practices set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
- (v) The officers of the P&T will assist the candidates in the preparation of the dossiers.
- (vi) The officers of the P&T will convey to the committee, in a timely fashion and in full, any information they receive concerning each case.

1.3. Meetings

- (i) A quorum for the committee is 2/3 of all eligible voting faculty.
- (ii) If a quorum for a meeting on non-personnel matters of the committee is not realized, the officers of the P&T will call another meeting for the same purpose within three working days. If a quorum is not reached at the second meeting, any necessary voting will be conducted by remote secret ballot (mail, electronic, or using a staff member).
- (iii) Any member of the committee who wishes to present an issue before the committee should present a request to the group mentioned in Section 1.2(iv). If that group denies the request or does not bring that issue in a timely fashion for consideration by the committee, the concerned member should submit a written request signed by at least five members of the committee. The officers of the P&T must then call a meeting of the committee for the presentation and discussion of the issue within ten working days of receiving the written request.
- (iv) Actions and discussions regarding candidates will occur in reverse order of seniority/rank.

1.4. Voting

- (i) All eligible voting members are expected to attend the meetings prior to balloting. Absentee ballots may be employed only if a committee member must be absent from a meeting at which balloting is scheduled.
- (ii) Application for an absentee ballot must be made prior to leaving campus and will be granted at the discretion of the officers of the P&T. To be valid, absentee ballots must be received by the secretary of the P&T before the official vote takes place.

- (iii) Balloting related to personnel recommendations will be written and private, and will take place at a separate meeting after discussion of all candidates has been completed, except as specified in section 6.3. Balloting related to non-personnel issues may be either by a show of hands or by written ballot (upon request of a member of the committee).
- (iv) Motions with regard to personnel recommendations require a majority of all eligible voting members. (Note this means that an abstention has the same practical effect as a vote against.) All other decisions require only a simple majority of all members present.
- (v) Ballots will be counted only after voting has taken place on all candidates.
- (vi) All eligible faculty are encouraged to vote; abstentions are discouraged.

1.5. Reports

For promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, the recommendation from the committee should include an explicit statement as to whether or not the candidate has earned a ranking of “Excellent” in the main area of evaluation (as determined by assigned workload throughout the period of evaluation) as well a summary of the arguments supporting this view. The recommendation should also reflect the deliberations of the committee. Minority opinions are appendices to the recommendation, jointly comprising the committee’s “report”. Thus the entire report is subject to examination by the committee and must be produced in a timely manner.

- (i) With the consent of the committee (by a vote if necessary), at the voting meeting the officers of the P&T will appoint a subcommittee to draft the committee’s recommendation. Once drafted, the recommendation shall be placed in a secure location for review and written comment by the committee. At their discretion, the officers may securely send an electronic version to committee members off campus. Under no other circumstances shall draft reports be circulated electronically.
- (ii) After the initial review period, the officers will finalize the recommendation and submit it for approval.

1.6. Appeals

- (i) A written notification of intent to appeal any recommendation of the committee must be received by the secretary of the P&T within five working days of the candidate receiving the recommendation. The candidate then has five working days from the notification of intent to submit a written appeal to the officers of the P&T. The officers of the P&T will distribute the appeal to the committee. The committee will have five working days from the filing of the appeal to meet and to approve a written response to the appeal.
- (ii) A written notification of intent to appeal any recommendation of the Department Chair must be received by the Department Chair within five working days of the candidate receiving the recommendation. The candidate then has five working days from the filing date to submit a written appeal. The Department Chair will respond within five working days of the filing of the written appeal.

2. Indicators of Quality

Minimum standards for promotion are given in the Faculty Handbook. Additional departmental requirements or clarifications are as follows.

If an activity falls into more than one of the three categories below, the candidate should make a case as to which category or categories the activity pertains.

2.1. Teaching

Claims of high quality or excellence in teaching must be thoroughly documented. Possible evidence of such claims may include all categories detailed in the Faculty Handbook.

Candidates must include the following indicators of quality in their dossiers:

- A narrative statement that contains a description of their primary teaching activities, primary teaching and learning goals for these courses, and teaching philosophy, which will serve to contextualize the other evidence.
- Numerical teaching evaluations and all free-response student comments for each of the courses taught. The numerical scores should be considered in the context of departmental norms for the relevant courses, including the size of the course.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.

Teaching is an activity that is evaluated as a whole, and undue emphasis should not be placed on any one indicator of a candidate's performance. In particular, strong student and peer evaluations are necessary but not sufficient to document teaching effectiveness.

The manner in which individuals provide a high-quality teaching environment may vary. The department also recognizes that the candidate may also provide evidential material of the following:

- Successful teaching of courses with a value-added component, such as honors, discovery learning, second writing, or capstone courses.
- Contributing to the development, design, or revision of courses or department curricula or programs.
- Successful supervision of undergraduate research, independent study, and internships.
- Supervision of graduate student research.
- Receipt of teaching grants such as course enrichment grants.
- Competitive nominations for teaching awards.
- Professional development through participation in teaching-related workshops, meetings, or professional societies.
- Teaching-related outreach activities, especially as performed on an ongoing and regular basis.
- Developing training materials relevant to the teaching of the course.
- Other items appropriate to the particular case.

Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated in many ways. In evaluating excellence of teaching, the committee will look for intensive effort in the above areas. In evaluating the pursuit of excellence in teaching, the committee will look for effort in the areas below. Excellent teaching may also consist of some of the following:

- Effective and rigorous teaching and design of courses. Learning goals, outcomes and (if available) achievement data would be useful evidential material. A candidate's teaching materials might be annotated with comments about the significance of or success of teaching methods, courses and assignments.
- Professional development that results in improved effectiveness in the classroom. Evidence could include participation in faculty learning communities.
- Leadership in the educational mission of the department, such as developing innovative courses, enhancing courses by the addition of classroom technology, or teaching problem-based learning courses.
- Regional or national leadership in effective teaching methods. Evidential material can include conference presentations that are teaching-related, publication and/or dissemination of original teaching materials such as study guides, problem sets, textbooks, or training manuals, including the presentation of such materials in an online format such as a website.
- Successful coordination of courses with multiple sections and/or large enrollments.
- College, university, regional, or national teaching awards.
- Competitive internal and external teaching-focused grants.

2.2. Scholarship

Claims of excellence in scholarship must be thoroughly documented. Possible evidence of such claims may include all categories detailed in the Faculty Handbook. In addition, the department also recognizes the following evidential material:

- Publication of refereed research monographs, the publication of peer-reviewed articles in journals and conference proceedings, the publication of books or book chapters related to the candidate's scholarship, and the production of innovative scientific software for public use.
- External funding will be viewed as an important indicator of the quality of the candidate's scholarship. As appropriate, the source of funding may also be used to evaluate quality.
- Supervision of completed Ph.D dissertations.
- Collaborative scholarship is encouraged and shall be viewed positively.
- Presentations and talks at professional meetings, other universities and at research labs, especially plenary and invited talks. As appropriate, the meeting acceptance rates may also be used to evaluate quality.
- Other items appropriate to the particular case (for CT faculty, see section 4.3.2.2).

Evidence of high quality scholarship might include any of the above items, but must include evidence of inquiry into a substantive issue in mathematics, applied mathematics, or mathematics education with the evaluation of progress and quality of scholarship weighted by the proportion of workload assigned to scholarly activity.

In no instance will the presence or absence of a single item above be considered dispositive; rather, the entire case must be considered as a whole. Similarly, the determination of whether the candidate's scholarship is "high quality" or "excellent" must also be based upon a holistic view of the entire dossier taking into consideration the elements most relevant to the candidate's status (CT or TT).

In most cases, the primary indicator of the quality of the candidate's scholarship is publication in refereed journals and/or refereed conference proceedings. The quality and significance of professional publications will be evaluated carefully by members of the Department and leaders in the candidate's field of research. It is incumbent upon the candidate to disseminate the results of his/her scholarship through publication in high quality refereed journals. Depending on the candidate's area of interest, not all of these journals need be mathematical ones. In no case will a minimum number of publications alone be considered sufficient for meeting research criteria for promotion.

It is expected that the candidate will have regularly presented his or her research at external conferences or other scientific meetings.

Evaluation of the candidate's scholarly achievements will also be based on the following considerations:

- External reviews of the candidate's scholarship. Departmental faculty work in a wide range of sub-disciplines, which can be unfamiliar to others in the department. Hence expert opinions from outside the University are critical to evaluating the quality and impact of a candidate's scholarship. See Section 5.3 for procedures for selecting external reviewers.
- Assessment of the journals in which publications have appeared.
- Opinions of colleagues in the department.

If the following items are used to assess quality:

- Journal impact factors
- Citation counts
- Journal acceptance rates

then the evaluator must take into consideration the particulars of the research field. It is the nature of mathematical sciences that journal impact factors, for example, are much less than in other scientific fields. The candidate should be encouraged to list statistical data (medians, etc.) in the dossier to provide context. In no case will simple numerical measures of journal citations or similar measures alone be used to evaluate journal quality.

2.3. Service

Claims of high quality or excellence in service must be thoroughly documented. In accordance with their workload, faculty are expected to share the service responsibilities of the Department and are encouraged to provide service to the University through participation in College or University committees and boards.

The committee understands that scholarship and service can be synergistic. However, for the purposes of allocating work between scholarship and service, we note that if the candidate performs scholarly activity analyzing the effectiveness and impact of service activities, the scholarly output (papers, presentations, etc.) shall be counted as scholarship, while the object of study (activity) shall count as service.

High-quality service might include activities such as:

- Successful nonacademic undergraduate/graduate advisement and mentorship, such as career or internship placement, placement into graduate programs or jobs.
- Effective work on department, college or university committees.
- Active engagement as a faculty advisor for a student organization.
- Extensive service on student thesis committees (not the advisor).
- Seminar presentations or lectures to members of the university community.
- Administrative assignments within the university.
- Directing a program.
- Securing external funds to support a department or college initiative.
- Taking responsibility for a major departmental or university function, such as coordinating multiple sections of high enrollment courses.
- Service-related leadership. Some of this leadership may be local, but some must be regional or national, such as conference presentations that are related to the candidate's service, publication and/or dissemination of original ideas or materials related to the candidate's service, including presentation of such materials in an online format such as a website, or taking a leadership role in service-related organizations on or beyond campus.
- Developing or improving upon programs that serve the mission of the department, such as admissions, placement, tutoring, learning laboratories, advisement of majors, or outreach to local schools and/or the larger community. Evidence of professional development in the area of the service, such as attendance at professional development conferences, workshops, or faculty learning communities relevant to the candidate's assigned or anticipated service responsibilities. Professional development may include further education in areas relevant to the candidate's service. Published papers might also be seen as evidence of professional development as such scholarly activity could easily be associated with improved service.

Service to the profession that enhances the reputation and visibility of the Department and the University will be considered favorably in the promotion process. Such activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Appointments on state, regional, national, or international committees.
- Extensive service as a reviewer for peer-reviewed journal manuscripts and/or conference proceedings.
- Service as editors or on editorial boards of journals or funding agency panels.
- Service as an advisory board member or consultant on externally funded projects.

- Presentations or lectures related to the candidate's service work to members of the profession at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- Organization of conferences or workshops or membership on program committees for professional conferences.
- Significant participation in community activities advancing the appreciation, understanding and learning of mathematics (*e.g.*, design and/or delivery of professional development opportunities for mathematics teachers).
- Other significant outreach activities.
- Major roles with professional societies.

Excellence in service requires thoughtful, substantial and sustained effort to improve the Department, the University or the broader community. Excellence will be determined by the impact of these efforts on developing human or institutional capital, and the extent to which this capital broadens the appreciation, understanding and learning of mathematics locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

3. Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Minimum standards for promotion are given in the Faculty Handbook. Additional departmental requirements or clarifications are as follows.

3.1. Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires excellence in scholarship.

3.1.1. Teaching

The Department will recommend for promotion only those individuals who exhibit high-quality teaching (taking into account the distribution of workload), regardless of the intensity and vigor of the candidate's research.

3.1.2. Scholarship

The Department will recommend for promotion only those individuals who are actively engaged in a continuing research program which is demonstrably excellent and which has progressed significantly beyond the level of the individual's doctoral work. This holds regardless of the intensity and vigor of the candidate's teaching.

Candidates should demonstrate sustained effort to obtain research funding, either individually or as part of a collaborative group.

3.1.3. Service

While service cannot normally be considered equivalent to teaching or research, a high-quality service contribution is necessary for advancement. It is expected that the candidate will have served on at least one committee (University, College or Department) each year at rank.

3.2. Promotion to Professor

Throughout his/her career as Associate Professor a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must have performed at a level of effectiveness and accomplishment consistent with criteria for advancement to Associate Professor; in addition, he/she will normally be expected to meet all of the following criteria:

3.2.1. Teaching

The procedures for evaluation and indicators for promotion are the same as those outlined for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.2.2. Scholarship

To demonstrate the level of excellence in research required for promotion to full professor, the candidate should be an authority in his/her field, widely recognized for the extent and significance of his/her contributions to the discipline. The qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the candidate's work will be based principally on research, funding, and publication occurring during the candidate's tenure as an Associate Professor. The procedures for evaluation and indicators of performance are the same as those outlined for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.2.3. Service

During his/her career as Associate Professor, the candidate must have played an active part in the service activities of the Department, and the University or the profession, taking into account the distribution of workload.

4. Promotion and Renewal of Continuing Track Faculty

4.1. 6-Year Renewals

To be successfully renewed, the candidate should exhibit high-quality work in the main area of workload with clear evidence of the pursuit of excellence following the guidelines and evaluation criteria in Section 2.

4.2. 13-Year Renewals

To be successfully renewed, the candidate should exhibit high-quality work in the main area of workload with clear evidence of the pursuit of excellence following the guidelines and evaluation criteria in Section 2.

4.3. Promotions

All candidates for promotion are expected to perform teaching, scholarship, and service. In general, the standards and indicators used to assess the quality of the candidate's contributions will be the same for all faculty, but applied as dictated by workload assignment. The candidate must demonstrate excellence in his/her primary area of workload (teaching or service).

4.3.1. Promotion to Assistant Professor

4.3.1.1. Teaching

The candidate should exhibit high-quality teaching under the guidelines and evaluation criteria in Section 2.1.

4.3.1.2. Scholarship

The primary scholarly activity required for promotion to assistant professor is the attainment of a doctoral degree related to mathematics or mathematics education. The quality of the research should be equivalent to that required for hiring at the rank of assistant professor.

4.3.1.3. Service

It is expected that the candidate will have competently exercised any service duties assigned.

4.3.2. Promotion to Associate Professor

4.3.2.1. Teaching

A high-quality teaching contribution as described in Section 2.1 is necessary for advancement. However, if teaching forms the bulk of the workload, the candidate should submit a detailed teaching portfolio as part of the dossier, including, but not limited to, syllabi and other course materials; testimonials from former students; evidence of improvements in the candidate's teaching; and a statement explaining the candidate's instructional goals, methodologies, and impact on student learning. The candidate must exhibit excellent teaching under the guidelines and evaluation criteria in Section 2.1.

4.3.2.2. Scholarship

CT faculty are expected to pursue scholarly activity. CT faculty must show evidence of high-quality scholarship with the expectations for and evaluation of their scholarly contributions weighted by the assigned workload.

The committee understands that the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) is a synergistic activity. However, for the purposes of allocating work between scholarship and teaching, we note that if the candidate performs scholarly activity analyzing the effectiveness and impact of courses or instructional material as described in Section 2.1, the scholarly output (papers, presentations, etc.) shall be counted as scholarship, while the object of study (course or instructional innovation) shall count as teaching.

The department recognizes the following evidence for high-quality scholarship:

- Any material that qualifies as evidence from section 2.2.
- Publication of papers in peer-reviewed pedagogical journals.
- Scholarly presentations, including those within the University.
- Engagement in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) focused on classrooms and other learning spaces as sites for inquiry, innovation, and knowledge-building. Teaching is approached as a form of scholarly work, providing a setting in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning – the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth — and does so with an eye not only toward improving one's own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it. Research methods may include: reflection and analysis, student interviews and focus groups, observational research, case studies, and quasi-experimental research such as comparison of two sections of the same course.

In addition, the candidate must provide evidence that their scholarly activities address specific questions relating to an area of study in mathematics, applied mathematics, mathematics education, or scholarship of teaching and learning.

4.3.2.3. Service

A high-quality service contribution as described in Section 2.3 is necessary for advancement. It is expected that the candidate will have coordinated a course or served on at least one committee each year.

If service forms the bulk of the workload, excellence in the service domain is required for advancement, in which case the candidate should submit a detailed service portfolio as part of the dossier, including a statement explaining the candidate's service goals, methodologies, and evidence of impact toward the assigned service goals. Documentation such as reports, assessment data, and testimonials should also be included in the service portfolio. The evaluation of quality will be guided in part by the proportion of workload dedicated to service.

4.3.3. Promotion to Professor

Throughout his/her career as Associate Professor, a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must have performed at a level of effectiveness and accomplishment consistent with criteria for advancement to Associate Professor. In addition, he/she will normally be expected to be truly outstanding, demonstrating a reputation in the main area of workload as described in the Faculty Handbook.

5. Policies and Procedures Related to the Promotion and Tenure Process

In order that there be sufficient time for deliberation, candidates are required to submit their dossiers to the committee by 15th August. All access by candidates to their dossiers will end at that point. No meeting at which the candidacies are to be discussed will take place before 1st September. The officers of the P&T must place the entire report (recommendation and final versions of minority reports) in the dossier, and make the dossier available to the Department Chair, by October 1.

5.1. Work Completed Prior to Employment at UD

As stated in the University P&T document, "Promotion Dossiers", generally postdoctoral work cannot be used for promotion and tenure considerations without a prior agreement at time of hire. At-rank work at another institution may be considered in the promotion decision, but must be clearly labeled as such.

5.2. The Dossier

With the exception of solicited peer evaluations, the responsibility for preparing and presenting a promotion dossier is entirely the candidate's; however, he/she will have the help of the officers of P&T. Except as noted below, the dossier should be organized per the Faculty Handbook.

- (i) The Department Chair will provide the candidate with a statement for inclusion in the dossier comparing the candidate's workload division to departmental averages.
- (ii) Peer-reviewed publications should be listed as such.
- (iii) Collaborative grant awards should be clearly labeled as such. The contribution of the candidate to the project should be listed.

The committee or the Department Chair may request additional evidence be added to the dossier. Information added to the dossier at the request of the candidate after August 15 shall be made available to the committee. No material may be replaced in the dossier after it has been submitted by the candidate.

5.3. Selection of External Reviewers

It is the responsibility of the officers of the P&T to compile a master list of potential external evaluators for each candidate in accordance with Faculty Handbook, with the exception that the Chair of the Department will also be solicited for suggestions. Taking into consideration the restrictions below, the candidate will be asked to submit at least six names of reviewers outside the University.

The officers of the P&T will inform the candidate of the master list and request a short bio of each reviewer, the extent to which they know the reviewer, and in what capacity, paying particular attention to possible conflicts of interest. The officers of the P&T will propose a final list of evaluators. Before May 15th in the academic year preceding the application for promotion, the committee will meet to review the master list and approve the final list of evaluators. The final list of evaluators may be modified by the committee (by a majority vote of those present) but must be selected from the master list provided by the officers.

Six letters of recommendation shall be obtained (at least three from the candidate's list). A statement shall be added to the "External Reviewers" section indicating which reviewers came from which list. All reviewers will judge in the main area of evaluation.

- If the primary workload is scholarship, external reviewers shall be selected based upon their knowledge of the relevant research subject area(s), their ability to evaluate the candidate's scholarly activity, and their ability to comment on the national and international visibility of the candidate.
- If the primary workload is teaching, external reviewers shall be selected based upon their ability to competently evaluate mathematical instruction in the teaching format used by the candidate and on their ability to evaluate the candidate's innovative teaching methods.
- If the primary workload is service, external reviewers shall be selected on their ability to competently evaluate the efficacy of the candidate's service work, as well as its impact on the wider community.

In all cases, the reviewers' institution shall be considered secondary to their ability to knowledgeably evaluate the candidate's work.

The following people shall not be selected (subject to the exceptions listed in following subsections):

- Those employed concurrently with the candidate at a campus while a faculty member, postdoc, or grad student.
- Co-authors of papers, books, and software.
- Collaborators on grants. In the case of far-flung centers or consortia, collaborators may be selected if the committee can establish that there is no conflict of interest.

5.3.1. Continuing-Track Faculty

The candidate will be asked to submit at least three names of University reviewers. Of the six selected reviewers, at most three may be from within the University.

Any reviewers from within the University:

- must not have held an appointment in the College of Arts and Sciences during the candidate's employment at UD.
- must not have held an appointment in any department concurrent with the candidate.
- must not be scheduled to participate in the formal levels of evaluation of the candidate.

5.3.1.1. Promotion to Assistant Professor

Subject to restrictions in the Faculty Handbook, in this case it is permissible for all letters to be solicited from persons within the University of Delaware and from persons who have worked closely with the candidate such as the candidate's PhD Advisor or co-authors.

5.4. Solicitation of External Reviewers

The Chair of P&T shall write to evaluators requesting advice before May 29. The solicitation should be accompanied by a web link to an online repository of the following material (the reviewer may request hardcopy of this material):

- (a) The candidate's curriculum vitae,
- (b) The candidate's statement (if one has been submitted),
- (c) Links to the department, college, and university promotion and tenure documents.
- (d) Other materials appropriate to the case:
 - If the main area of evaluation is scholarship, the candidate's publications (including those "in press" or "submitted") resulting from at rank studies.
 - If the main area of evaluation is teaching, a teaching portfolio as described in Section 4.3.2.1. At the discretion of the candidate, video or other recordings of class meetings may also be included.
 - If the main area of evaluation is service, a service portfolio as described in Section 4.3.2.3.

The web repository should be password protected and set up in such a way that the candidate cannot track hits on the site, and should only contain the above documents (which may link to one another). The candidate should have access to the site and an opportunity to check its contents before it is opened to reviewers.

The solicitation should request the evaluator to:

- (a) Describe the nature of his/her relationship with the candidate, if any,
- (b) Analyze and critically evaluate the candidate's body of work and accomplishments,
- (c) Compare the candidate with others in the same general area at a comparable career level,

- (d) Comment on the candidate's potential for future development,
- (e) Submit a copy of his/her curriculum vita. As required by the University P&T document, "Promotion Dossiers", the CV shall be placed in the dossier.

Though letters shall be held in strict confidence, the solicitation should not promise anonymity.

5.5. Summary of Important Dates

The timetable for promotion decisions is governed by the dates in the Faculty Handbook. The committee will adhere to the following timetable.

Date	Event
April 1st	Deadline for election of new officers Recommended that candidates declare*
April 15th	Officers determine next year's contract renewals
May 15th	Deadline for choice of peer reviewers
May 29th	Deadline for request for advice from reviewers
August 15th	Deadline for availability of dossiers to the committee Deadline for notification of intent to participate by faculty on leave

* In many years, the committee begins meeting in early May to discuss the external reviewers. Therefore, candidates are strongly encouraged to declare their intentions by April 1.

6. Procedures Related to Other Personnel Actions

6.1. 6- and 13-Year Renewals

By April 15, the officers of the P&T should obtain a list from the Department Chair of possible 6- and 13-year contract renewals. By May 15, the committee will meet to select a panel of three peer reviewers according to the following guidelines:

- (i) The chair shall be a full professor.
- (ii) At least one tenured and one CT faculty member shall serve on the panel. A second CT member will be included in the CT panel for renewal if such a person is eligible and available.
- (iii) At least one member of the panel should be familiar with the courses the candidate normally teaches.
- (iv) The composition of the panel must be in accordance with Section 4.3.5 of the Faculty Handbook.

The panel shall request a dossier from the candidate documenting performance in the areas of workload and conduct the actual peer review. Copies of the panel's findings shall be provided to the candidate. Upon receipt of the completed peer reviews for all candidates, the officers of the P&T shall place the reviews and accompanying candidate dossiers in a secure location, and the committee will be given ten working days to review them.

The committee will then consider the case using the criteria in Section 4.1 and the Faculty Handbook. The committee will discuss, vote, and produce reports following the procedures in Section 1.

6.2. Nonrenewals

- (i) The Department Chair will notify the officers of the P&T of the potential for nonrenewal, and provide the officers and the candidate with any relevant documentation.
- (ii) The officers of the P&T will ask the candidate for nonrenewal for a written response, including any relevant documentation.
- (iii) Both sets of documentation will be placed in a secure location, and the committee will be given ten working days to review them.
- (iv) Using the criteria in Section 4.1 and the Faculty Handbook as a guide, the committee will discuss, vote, and produce a report (following the procedures in Section 1) within ten working days after the conclusion of the review period.

6.3. Approval of Rank for Professorial Hires

Any panel recommending CT or TT hires at the associate professor level or above will submit its report to the department chair and the committee simultaneously. Within five working days, the committee will meet to vote on the academic rank of each recommended candidate. Each candidate must be discussed individually unless a 2/3 majority of the committee agrees to approve the academic rank of the entire hiring slate in one vote. Discussion and voting may occur on the same day. The committee's judgment will be forwarded to the chair.