

## **GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND INTERIM REVIEW FILES**

### **I. PROMOTION AND TENURE FILES**

The *Faculty Handbook* requires that “each recommending authority” in actions relating to retention, promotion and tenure “consider all relevant information obtained for the evaluation...” To ensure that each recommending authority has sufficient information to discharge the responsibilities described, the following Promotion and Tenure File Guidelines apply.

Each recommendation submitted to the provost for promotion and/or tenure shall be supported by a file containing at least the following items:

1. The dean’s recommendation, which should be a statement describing the criteria used in arriving at the recommendation and conveying the dean’s independent judgment of the merits of the case.
2. The report of the appropriate faculty committee(s), which is to be evaluative and not merely descriptive and which records the committee’s vote totals, the number of faculty eligible to vote and the date of that vote. Dissenting report(s), if any, must also be sent forward.
3. The report of the faculty meeting, if any, at which the recommendation of the faculty committee is discussed and voted upon. The vote totals, the number of faculty eligible to vote and the date of that vote must also be sent forward.

In order to provide more complete input and information, it is preferable that all faculty at or above the rank and status for which the candidate is being considered, should be involved in this discussion and vote. However, schools or departments which prefer to have only a faculty committee evaluate the candidate may do so.

Untenured faculty may not participate in decisions on promotion and tenure in any formal way. Should an untenured faculty member submit an unsolicited letter in support of a candidate, that letter is to be forwarded with the file, with, as with other materials in this process, the candidate having the opportunity to respond to the letter.

4. The report of the department chair, when appropriate.
5. The curriculum vitae of the candidate. Refereed publications and peer reviewed creative activities must be clearly indicated. Citations must be complete, to include page numbers. Candidates must distinguish clearly among work already published, accepted for publication, work being considered for publication, and work in progress. In cases of co-authored work, the candidate’s contribution to the publication *must* be indicated and inform the evaluation. Without an understanding of the candidate’s contributions, it is impossible to properly assess the record.

6. A self-evaluation by the candidate of his/her teaching, scholarship and service, and a statement of future plans in all three areas.
7. An evaluation of teaching, to include use of student teaching evaluations (both numerical scores and comments) and at least *one other* method of evaluation. A summary of *all* student evaluations is very useful for all reviewing the candidate's materials.
8. At least four letters from appropriate external reviewers, solicited through a procedure that insures the integrity of the evaluative process. These letters are to be used by the relevant faculty committees and by the dean in evaluating the candidate's scholarship.
  - a. Letters should not be solicited from the candidate's dissertation director, co-author(s), or other individuals with whom a professional or personal relationship exists such that might reduce the objectivity or perceived objectivity of the review, what is often called "arm's length." This standard is not the same as a conflict-of-interest standard, which is lower. Rather, the intention is to have reviews from individuals without possible personal or professional bias. In some fields or cases, this may mean trading off a degree of expertise for added distance, and in some cases, especially where there are many authors, exceptions to this standard may be appropriate. In the latter situation, the chair should consult with the dean *in advance* of soliciting letters. Outside evaluators should come from programs, institutions or agencies of a quality commensurate with the reputation and standards of the College of William & Mary. Letters should be solicited whenever possible from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate is being promoted. Any exceptions to "arm's length" reviewers or reviewers at or above rank must be explained. All letters solicited are part of the file and must be forwarded.

External evaluators must be sent the candidate's C.V. and copies of those scholarly and/or creative works which the candidate and his or her dean or department chair have agreed should be sent out.
  - b. A copy of the letter or letters written to external reviewers to solicit the evaluation. The same letter should be sent to all reviewers unless the candidate works in more than one field. Consistent with the approved practices of the school, external evaluators may be assured that their letters will be shown to the candidate only after all identifiers have been redacted so that their identity will remain unknown to the candidate.
  - c. An explanation of how the reviewers were chosen (e.g., from a list provided by the candidate, a list drawn up by the evaluative committee in the department or school, or some combination of the two), and why these particular individuals were chosen. Not all evaluators may be chosen from the list provided by the candidate unless there are compelling reasons to do so. C.V.s of the reviewers should be included as part of the file.
9. Any commentary or other information provided by the candidate subsequent to the vote of the faculty and/or the determination of the chair/dean consistent with approved unit personnel policies and procedures.

10. The final file should be reviewed by the dean (or his/her designee) and candidate in one another's presence and a cover page included that lists the contents of the file and a statement that the dean and candidate certify that the file includes these items. This should be signed and dated by the dean and the candidate. To ensure confidentiality of external reviewers during this certification, the external letters and the letters of solicitation and explanations of why these particular reviewers were chosen (see 8.a., 8.b. and 8.c above) should not be included in the materials reviewed by the candidate.
11. In cases where an initial hire will involve tenure, the same principles apply, with possible modest modifications. Tenure earned elsewhere is not transferred; tenure is awarded by William & Mary. Therefore, it is necessary to have external review letters at arm's length as part of the process, along with the other components of the tenure review. Letters used by the candidate as part of the application process are generally unacceptable as part of the tenure file, although in some instances it may be possible to use the same individuals as tenure references. The selection of external letters should be decided by the department or appropriate faculty committee in consultation with the candidate. In the interest of time, it may be advisable to streamline the selection process, but objectivity in these letters remains essential. No more than two external tenure review letters from a recent tenure process at the candidate's home institution may be used to support a William & Mary grant of tenure, unless the provost determines that compelling cause exists to permit more than two letters to be used. Please consult the Office of the Provost in such cases.

## II. INTERIM REVIEWS

For a faculty member scheduled to be reviewed for tenure in the sixth year of his/her appointment at the College, the interim review shall normally be completed no earlier than the fourth semester and no later than the sixth semester of the appointment in a tenure-eligible position. The dates of this interim review must be noted in the dean's letter of intent to the candidate.

For a faculty member with a shorter probationary period resulting from credit given for academic employment elsewhere, the dean's letter of intent will schedule a mid-probationary period review, except in cases where a tenure review is scheduled during the first three years of service at William & Mary. Normally, a faculty member who is hired without tenure must have completed at least one full year of service in a tenure-eligible position at the College before being considered for tenure.

All interim reviews must be forwarded to the provost by the dean by the date specified annually by the Office of the Provost, with a recommendation as to whether the employment should be continued or whether the individual should be given notice of termination according to the schedule set out in the *Faculty Handbook* (§III.B.2).

The file sent to the Provost shall include at a minimum:

1. The dean's recommendation, which will be a considered statement describing the criteria used in arriving at the recommendation and give the dean's independent judgment of the merits of the case.
2. The report of the appropriate faculty committee(s), which is to be evaluative and not merely descriptive and which records the committee's vote totals, the number of faculty eligible to vote and the date of that vote. Dissenting report(s), if any, must also be sent forward.
3. The report of the faculty meeting at which the recommendation of the faculty committee is discussed and voted upon. All faculty in rank above the candidate should participate in that meeting and the vote, the number of faculty eligible to vote and date of that vote must also be sent forward (see I.3. above).
4. The recommendation of the department chair, where appropriate.
5. The candidate's C.V. Refereed publication and peer reviewed creative activities should be clearly indicated. Citations should be complete, to include page numbers, and in cases of co-authored work, the candidate needs to indicate his/her contributions to the publication.
6. A self-evaluation by the candidate of his/her teaching, scholarship and service, and a statement of future plans in all three areas.
7. An evaluation of teaching, to include use of student teaching evaluations (both numerical scores and comments) and at least one other method of evaluation. A summary of *all* student evaluations is very useful for all reviewing the candidate's materials.
8. Any commentary or other information provided by the candidate subsequent to the vote of the faculty and/or any determination of the chair/dean. (In order to provide constructive guidance, the evaluation should be shared with the person being reviewed, who is given the opportunity to comment.)
9. The final file should be reviewed by the dean (or his/her designee) and candidate in one another's presence and a cover page included that lists the contents of the file and a statement that the dean and candidate certify that the file includes these items. This should be signed and dated by the dean and the candidate.

*Note that external letters are not required for interim reviews.*

Revised 30 March 1996  
August 15, 2003  
September 8, 2006  
August 25, 2010  
April 14, 2014  
May 11, 2015  
April 11, 2016