APPENDIX X: COMMENTS ON THE CONTENTS OF REVIEW FILES

Departmental Chair’s Letter. Chairs should be strongly encouraged to submit for review concise letters that summarize the essential judgements: How does the candidate compare to the detailed expectations of the department in each of the three (or four) areas of review? Does the candidate teach a normal load? How does the quality of the teaching compare to the norm in the department? Why are the publications important? What impact have they had on the field? What are the most important service contributions made by the candidate? How do the quality of the service and the burden of that service compare to the normative contributions in the department? The best Departmental letters often provide readily understandable summaries in tabular formats. This style of presentation, when appropriate, is often clearer than textual material.

Teaching. The most essential information should be summarized on one or two pages that include a numerical summary of student teaching evaluations. For promotions, more than one form of evidence is required to support the departmental judgement of the quality of teaching. Peer evaluations of a teaching dossier are one valuable means of accomplishing that goal. Many faculty teach or supervise variable unit courses with small numbers of students that are not evaluated and/or not considered by the department to be part of the basic teaching load. Unless such courses are considered to be a fundamental part of the teaching load that would be evaluated as substitutes for “podium” courses, there is no need to include these as part of a teaching summary. This information should be available as supporting documentation of additional teaching activities, but should not be included in the summary submitted for evaluation.

Research. The presentation of publication lists and other summaries of creative activities varies greatly among departments. For routine merits, long and complicated presentations greatly hinder the review process. We propose that candidates present a research record relevant only to the current review period and that the complete list of publications or creative work be available as supporting documentation. The abbreviated list should have the same subheadings and the same enumeration and format as the complete list. When appropriate, a copy of each new publication may be forwarded, but for routine merit actions, the candidate may wish to choose only a representative sampling.

Service record. The service record of candidates should be concise and easy to evaluate. Currently, the various sources dealing with service are sometimes inconsistent and incomplete, e.g. the candidate’s statement, list of service activity, updated biography form, and the annual reports of professional activities. All service during the review period should be presented in one place in the file. All reviewing parties should be able to easily understand the importance of service contributions, e.g. quality, breadth and depth of the entire service record. Although service to professional organizations or disciplines does not have a formal place in the evaluation of faculty, it is a valuable indicator that is most efficiently included in this section.

Professional Competence. The Committee was provided documents from the Law School and School of Veterinary Medicine that defined expectations in the area of professional competence and clinical practice, which could be used as models for defining expectations in the area of professional competence. For units that have substantial clinical, extension, and other client-oriented activities, the expectations should be clearly articulated in the Chair’s letter. Every effort should be made to evaluate professional competence at the department level, particularly if as an activity, it diminishes the amount of time that may be directed at traditional teaching and research activities.