Promotion and Tenure Review: Credential File Preparation

Chair/Director Responsibilities and General Information

Certification of File Accuracy

The Chair/Director provides guidance in the construction of the credential file relative to content and format *throughout* the probationary period. Working closely with the candidate, s/he ensures that all items on the candidate's list of responsibilities have been properly addressed and that the file is in order *before* it is presented for review within the academic unit. (See *Candidate Responsibilities* and *Order of Contents for Promotion and Tenure Credential Files*.)

Supporting Evidence for Review

Materials in the credential file must be sufficient to support evaluative statements about the quality and impact of the work.

- Provide evidence of the *teaching quality* and support with multiple measures.
 - Systematically conduct peer reviews according to agreed-upon procedures in the department/school/division/program. Include a comprehensive overview of written materials as well as observations of classroom activity.
 - The Chair/Director is responsible for compiling data from multiple courses that compare the candidate's student evaluations to department averages.
 - Include student letters only if they are unsolicited and representative, not just a selection of the best.
- Assess the *quality of research or creative work* and support with multiple measures.
 - Include evidence that people have read or reviewed the work and are influenced by it (e.g., book reviews, citations of candidate's work, external letters).
 - Compare the quality of scholarly journals used by the candidate to other journals in your discipline.
 - Verify the quality of the work itself. Although assessment of the quality and circulation of the journal in which the work appears is necessary, such information is not sufficient.
 - Verify the extent of the candidate's contribution to the work (i.e., order of authorship, role in grant writing and grant execution).

External Reviews

The Chair/Director is responsible for soliciting objective external reviews, although the candidate should have the opportunity to help develop the list of potential reviewers. (Refer to *Guidelines for Soliciting External Reviews* for further explanation.)

- Avoid conflict of interest when selecting prospective reviewers. Candidate's dissertation directors, mentors, joint authors, friends, etc. should not be asked to serve as reviewers.
- > Convey to reviewers that they are to submit objective letters of evaluation—not letters of reference or support.
- Ask reviewers to evaluate the quality and impact of the research or creative work in the context of the discipline as a whole, not in terms of BGSU's criteria.
- > Request copies of reviewers' curriculum vitae to use in assessing their evaluations.

Evaluation Content and Function

The Chair/Director's letter should be evaluative rather than descriptive.

- ➤ Identify weaknesses as well as strengths, and provide an assessment of their significance and relationship. Descriptive statements might be used as a reference for evaluative statements, but the focus should be on your evaluation. For example:
 - The candidate's work breaks new ground in the discipline, as evidenced by the large number of times the work is cited in the current literature.
 - The candidate is a popular teacher, as seen in the student evaluation scores that are in the top quartile of all student evaluations for courses at a comparable level in the department.
- ➤ Contextualize your evaluation in terms of the department/school/division/program's allocation of effort for teaching, research and service. For instance, if the unit places greater allocation of effort on teaching, there is a corresponding responsibility to evaluate the amount and quality of teaching more fully.

As a rule, hiring is based on potential; tenure and promotion are based on productivity. For tenure and promotion, continued expectation of potential cannot substitute for demonstrated work products.