

**PROMOTION INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS  
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR FULL-TIME PARTICIPATING FACULTY  
(REVISED January 2, 2024)**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Promotion Calendar Deadlines</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Promotion Criteria</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Promotion Review Procedures</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Promotion Levels with Associated Committees</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Department Level – Independent Faculty</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Faculty Letters</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Department Recommendation</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>College / School / Area Level – Local Promotion and Committee</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Dean Level – College / School Dean</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Provost Level – University Provost</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>President Level – University President</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Dossier Preparation</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Dossier Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Instructions for Completing the Dossier</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.0 Introductory Information</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.1 Promotion Proposal Form</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.2 Checklist / Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.3 Explanation of Appointment</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>1.4 Curriculum Vitae</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>1.5 Department and/or Local Criteria</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>2.0 Data on Teaching</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>2.1 Candidate’s Teaching Philosophy Statement</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>2.2 Course List Table</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>2.3 Graduate Student Committee History Table</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.4 Mentoring Table</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>2.5 Student Letters</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>2.6 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>2.7 Peer Review Evaluations</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>2.8 Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>2.9 Teaching Summary Statement</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>3.0 Data on Additional Activities as Required by Appointment</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>3.1 List of Publications, Creative Work, and Presentations</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.2 List of Clinic and/or Administrative Activities</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.3 List of Service Activities</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.4 List of Other Activities</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>3.5 Relevant Grants, Awards, and Honors</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>3.6 Summary Statement of Additional Activities as Required by Appointment</b> .....	<b>16</b>

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Periodic and/or Annual Reviews .....	16
4.2	Faculty Letters .....	16
4.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation.....	16
4.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation .....	16
4.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation .....	17
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Candidate Addendum.....</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1	Addendum Materials .....	17
<b>Appendix A – Participating Faculty Promotion Proposal Form.....</b>		<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix B – Checklist / Table of Contents Form .....</b>		<b>19</b>

**PROMOTION INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS  
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR FULL-TIME PARTICIPATING FACULTY  
(REVISED January 2, 2024)**

**Introduction**

This document provides information about the promotion process and is intended for **full-time participating (i.e., non tenure-track)** faculty going through the process as well as those who participate in the review process at any of the following levels: department, local (local is defined as college/school or area), Dean, Provost, and President. Categories of participating faculty covered by this document include, but are not limited to: adjunct, artistic, clinical, research, and legal writing faculty (see *Faculty Handbook*, Chapter 301.02 for full list of titles). In this document, the titles “Participating Assistant Professor”, “Participating Associate Professor”, and “Participating Professor” will be used to represent the faculty ranks in each of these categories.

The instructions in this document, unless otherwise specified, are mandatory directives approved and issued by the Provost in his authority as Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. As such, they are binding on all promotion committees, deans, department chairs, dossier preparers, and candidates. They are not intended to alter the substantive criteria for promotion, but rather to elaborate on how a candidate’s satisfaction of these criteria is to be systematically and rigorously demonstrated and assessed.

The University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure (University Committee) hopes to clarify the process through this document and to answer questions that commonly arise. With that said, however, there are other important documents that must be carefully reviewed such as the *Faculty Handbook*. These documents can be found on the Provost’s [website](#).

**Promotion Calendar Deadlines**

Promotion [deadlines](#) are promulgated by the Office of the Provost in March of each year. Dossier preparers should review the timeline carefully.

**Promotion Criteria**

University criteria for appointment and promotion are provided in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (See Chapters 301, 302, 303 and 304). The information contained herein neither supersedes nor repeats information found in the [Faculty Handbook](#), but rather, it is supplemental. Committee members and candidates must review the statutes and apply the criteria in a rigorous fashion.

University criteria supersede college or department specific criteria. College and department criteria provide an interpretation of the University criteria. They are formulated by faculty, approved and signed by the Dean, submitted to the University Committee for review with respect to congruence with University statutes, and submitted to the Office of the Provost with evidence of University Committee endorsement for final approval. New faculty must be clearly apprised of these criteria by the Department Chair, Dean or Dean’s designee. College and/or department criteria must be explicitly stated so that faculty going through the process, as well as those on review committees, are able to evaluate where each faculty member stands in relation to these expectations. In general, highly ambiguous statements are to be avoided in favor of statements with greater specificity; however, caution is advised about developing statements that are too specific.

Departmental, college, and university promotion decisions must apply the written criteria that are published in the unit and within the university statutes. Unwritten or undocumented criteria cannot be applied.

### **Promotion Review Procedures**

In terms of helping faculty know where they stand relative to promotion, all participating assistant and associate professors must receive regular feedback, every 2-3 years if not annually, regarding their progress toward promotion.

Because participating faculty are not on the tenure-track, they are not time bound, but departmental or local unit guidelines may specify a recommended number of years of experience in the position prior to seeking promotion (the “recommended year”). As there is no time bound year established for participating faculty, assistant or associate participating professors may apply for promotion when the criteria as set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#) as well as those articulated within their college and/or department have been met. Exceptions may apply in cases where a faculty member spent time in a comparable position at another institution or in a commensurate position within an organization outside the academy.

Candidates turned down for promotion may reapply, but a candidate should not apply the following year, except under extraordinary circumstances. Significant new data, clearly evidencing that the criteria for promotion have been met, must be garnered before a candidate should consider reapplying for promotion.

Faculty members may be nominated or may self-nominate for review for promotion. Once nominated the following sequence is typical, although some departments and colleges may have additional steps.

- A dossier is completed for each faculty member up for promotion.
- Each department (except in colleges without departments) reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the local committee.
- The local committee reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the Dean.
- The Dean reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the Provost.
- The Provost reviews the dossier and provides a recommendation to the President.
- The President reviews the dossier and makes a determination whether or not to confer promotion.

The promotion review at each level considers the recommendations at all previous levels. All recommendations are advisory. The President’s determination is final.

### **Promotion Levels with Associated Committees**

The proceedings of the promotion review at all levels are to be honored by strict confidentiality, except as otherwise noted herein. A breach in confidentiality may lead to removal from a committee or other, more consequential disciplinary actions.

*Department Level - Independent Faculty (units without departments - skip this section)*

In colleges and schools where departments exist, the Department Chair normally facilitates a departmental vote after all evidence has been gathered. Faculty members within the department thoroughly review the dossier of each candidate and subsequently render an independent

recommendation regarding promotion. In keeping with the ideals of faculty representation, it is recommended that participating faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate be included in the departmental review and vote (procedures may, however, be configured to meet the specific needs of the college or school).

Committee composition and voting eligibility shall be determined by departmental procedures. Participating faculty candidacies may be reviewed and voted on by regular faculty only, by participating full-time faculty only, or by a combination of regular and participating faculty. Regardless of committee composition, reviewing and voting faculty should normally be at or above the rank sought by the candidate; thus, Associate Professors and Professors should vote on candidacies for Associate Professor, while Professors alone typically vote on candidacies for Professor. Situations that require a different voting group must be approved in advance by the dean of the college and explained in the dossier.

If the candidate has made prior unsuccessful attempts at promotion, those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies must be noted in the *Department Evaluation with Recommendation* section of the dossier (Section 4.3).

Faculty Letters - All departmental faculty, including the Department Chair, who cast a ballot regarding the promotion of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 4.1) clearly noting their particular vote and articulating the reasons, including both positive and negative aspects of the case, that the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for promotion (procedures may, however, be configured to meet the specific needs of the college or school). Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's performance and are to acquaint themselves fully with the candidate's dossier before writing their letters. *If any faculty member who is eligible to participate and vote on a particular candidate chooses not to do so, their non-participation must be clearly explained by the Department Chair.* Only current faculty vote and write letters. Retired and emeriti faculty typically do not participate in the promotion process. If unusual circumstances warrant the inclusion of a letter from a retired or emeritus faculty member, justification must be provided in the dossier.

The Department Chair should meet with the candidate to communicate the outcome of the departmental vote, indicating whether there was a positive or negative vote, *if* the candidate requests such knowledge. No further information, however, should be shared with the candidate by the Department Chair.

Department Recommendation (not required in units without departments) - The Department letter is written on behalf of the department by the dossier preparer and is meant to summarize the discussion and vote of department faculty members. The letter must include the vote and articulate the extent to which the candidate meets stated departmental criteria. In situations where the vote is not unanimous, the minority view(s) must be explained in the summary letter, including as specifically as possible, an assessment of the candidate's performance in relation to departmental criteria.

#### *College / School / Area Level - Local Promotion Committee*

After the department vote has been completed, the local committee reviews the dossiers of all candidates and renders the unit (college, school or in the case of the Way Klingler College of Arts & Sciences, the area) judgment on whether or not the candidate meets stated criteria for promotion.

Local promotion committees must provide an impartial and thorough analysis of each case. Issues raised by evaluators including faculty colleagues and students are to be fully debated and addressed in the local committee report. At the discretion of the local committee chair, Department Chairs and/or dossier preparers may be invited to the meeting to answer questions from the local committee. All members of the local committee are required to vote. Abstentions are not permitted unless a conflict of interest exists.

For colleges and schools without departments, all members of the college or school committee who cast a ballot regarding the promotion of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 4.1) clearly noting their particular vote and articulating the reasons they determined the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for promotion. Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's performance in relation to the departmental or local criteria and are to fully acquaint themselves with the candidate's dossier before writing their letters. *If any faculty member who is eligible to participate and vote on a particular candidate chooses not to do so, their omission must be clearly explained.* Only current faculty vote and write letters. Retired and emeriti faculty do not participate.

Committee composition and voting eligibility shall be determined by college/school/area procedures. Participating faculty candidacies may be reviewed and voted on by regular faculty only, by participating full-time faculty only, or by a combination of regular and participating faculty. Regardless of committee composition, reviewing and voting faculty should normally be at or above the rank sought by the candidate; thus, Associate Professors and Professors should vote on candidacies for Associate Professor, while Professors alone should vote on candidacies for Professor. Situations that require a different voting group must be approved in advance by the dean of the college and explained in the dossier. Finally, the chair of the local committee must not simultaneously be a sitting department chair.

The chair of the local committee writes a letter on behalf of the committee that notes committee membership and presents the vote of the committee and its evaluation of performance in relation to departmental or local criteria (Section 4.4). In situations where the vote is not unanimous, the minority view(s) must be explained in the summary letter, including as specifically as possible, an assessment of the extent to which the candidate meets stated departmental or local criteria.

When a local committee votes not to support a candidate for promotion, it must provide a reasonable explanation of its action in its letter to the Dean, i.e., one that is sufficiently specific to enable the candidate to make appropriate plans, which may include either replying to the committee's critique in a special addendum (Section 5.0) at the end of the dossier or withdrawing his/her nomination from consideration.

#### *Dean Level – College / School Dean*

After the local vote has been completed, the Dean reviews the dossier including determinations made at the department and local levels. The Dean then makes an independent recommendation regarding promotion and writes a letter (Section 4.5) addressing the candidate's performance in relation to departmental or local criteria. In doing so, the Dean should specifically address both strengths and weaknesses identified by faculty, students, or external reviewers. The Dean (or Dean's delegate) is then required to communicate the outcome of the local vote to the candidate, indicating whether there was a positive or negative vote and providing a detailed explanation as to the basis for the vote.

Within the discretion of the Dean, the actual vote of the local committee may be provided. The Committee letter, however, shall not be shared with the candidate. At the same time, the Dean must communicate his or her own recommendation to the Provost. A candidate may include an addendum in the dossier (Section 5.0) if the Dean does not recommend promotion, regardless of the vote at the local committee.

#### *Provost Level - University Provost*

The Provost reviews the dossier and makes an independent judgment on the case. The Provost may seek clarification from the Dean or the Department Chair as deemed necessary. The Provost makes an independent recommendation to the President on each case under consideration.

#### *President Level - University President*

The President makes the final decision to promote or not promote.

### **Dossier Preparation**

Review for promotion of participating faculty requires preparation of a comprehensive dossier providing evidence that the candidate has met published criteria. Responsibility for preparation of the dossier belongs to the Dean, but it may be delegated to a Department Chair, a senior faculty member in the department, or other faculty member as deemed appropriate. The burden of proof in matters of promotion lies with the candidate and with those who prepare the dossier. All claims, therefore, must be substantiated with evidence. As a matter of longstanding practice, if there are significant concerns, questions, or doubts that are not satisfactorily addressed in the dossier, a negative decision will most likely be rendered.

Although materials invited and received for inclusion in the dossier may not be modified or culled, material that was not explicitly requested may be excised if it is not pertinent or was offered in error. Any omissions of this nature must be noted with an accompanying explanation.

The dossier must account for any leaves of absence granted to a particular candidate. The candidate is not expected to produce evidence of progress in relation to departmental or local criteria during the time of an approved leave of absence.

Each dossier must contain a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's performance in relation to criteria for promotion. Some evaluative letters, such as those from faculty and the Dean, must address all relevant areas. Other evaluative letters may focus more narrowly on one area (e.g., letters from students should focus on teaching). The local committee evaluates all required areas rigorously in accordance with departmental, local, and university criteria. The dossier is to be carefully reviewed for compliance with the Dossier Table of Contents (see p.9) before submission to the next level. Any missing data should be added and evaluated before advancing the dossier.

One original hard copy dossier for each candidate containing original letters and signatures on the *Promotion Proposal* form (Appendix A) and the *Checklist / Table of Contents* (Appendix B) must be delivered to the Office of the Provost on or before the due date. An electronic dossier must be completed for each candidate at the same time. Care must be taken to economize a candidate's supporting materials so as to keep dossiers to a reasonable length.

A new dossier must be prepared in the event the candidate is making a successive attempt at promotion. In such cases, the new dossier may include relevant material from the previous dossier(s), as well as new material that evidences how the candidate's performance has changed since the prior review and now meets criteria. Previous dossier(s), in full, will be made available to the Provost and the President. Department Chairs and dossier preparers should consult with their University Committee representative as needed to address questions that arise.

The original hard copy dossier for the Provost must be double-sided and submitted in a one-inch binder that is three-holed punched on the left side of the page. The name of the candidate is to be affixed to the binding edge. The document must be printed in readable fashion (12pt font), carefully edited, indexed, tabbed, and paginated within subsections. The Provost's copy must remain unmarked by annotations from any readers.

The candidate must not prepare the dossier but may be asked to provide and may have access to factual material in the dossier to ensure it is complete and factually accurate. While atypical, the candidate may add material in an "Addendum," a discrete section at the end of the dossier. A detailed explanation of why the material was added must be provided by the candidate at the beginning of the section. Candidates are encouraged to discuss the desire to create an "Addendum" with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so. Most typically, an addendum is included only when either the local committee or the Dean or both do not recommend the candidate for promotion.

Confidential letters and evaluations must remain confidential. Letters inviting student reviews as well as external reviews (as required) are to indicate that their letter will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by a judicial or adjudicatory body or unless the reviewer specifies the conditions under which its contents may be disclosed to the candidate.



## **Dossier Table of Contents**

The following table of contents must be strictly adhered to when compiling a dossier. Each section is described in greater detail on the pages that follow.

**Key: R = Required                      A = As Applicable**

<b>Item</b>		<b>R/A</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b><i>Introductory Information</i></b>	
1.1	Promotion Proposal Form (Appendix A)	<b>R</b>
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)	<b>R</b>
1.3	Explanation of Appointment	<b>R</b>
1.4	Curriculum Vitae	<b>R</b>
1.5	Department and/or Local Criteria	<b>R</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b><i>Data on Teaching</i></b>	
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement	<b>A</b>
2.2	Course List Table	<b>A</b>
2.3	Graduate Student Committee History Table	<b>A</b>
2.4	Mentoring Table	<b>A</b>
2.5	Student Letters	<b>A</b>
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching	<b>A</b>
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations	<b>A</b>
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors	<b>A</b>
2.9	Teaching Summary Statement	<b>A</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b><i>Data on Additional Activities as Required by Appointment</i></b>	
3.1	List of Publications, Creative Work, and Presentations	<b>A</b>
3.2	List of Clinic and/or Administrative Activities	<b>A</b>
3.3	List of Service Activities	<b>A</b>
3.4	List of Other Activities	<b>A</b>
3.5	Relevant Grants, Awards, and Honors	<b>A</b>
3.6	Summary Statement of Additional Activities as Required by Appointment	<b>A</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b><i>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations</i></b>	
4.1	Periodic and/or Annual Reviews	<b>R</b>
4.2	Faculty Letters	<b>A</b>
4.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation (Required except for units without departments)	<b>R</b>
4.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation	<b>R</b>
4.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation	<b>R</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b><i>Candidate Addendum</i></b>	
5.1	Addendum Materials	<b>A</b>

## **Instructions for Completing the Dossier**

The dossier is to be prepared electronically in accordance with the Checklist (above) and using the process described in the following pages. *All Checklist items should be included in the dossier, using exact numbers and titles, each as a separate pdf* (each pdf should have its own page numbering, beginning with page 1). Sections that are “as applicable” should still be included with a page noting “*This Item is Not Applicable*” if the candidate has no information to include. One original paper copy of the dossier must also be submitted to the Office of the Provost.

### **1.0     *Introductory Information***

Include the proposal form, checklist, explanation of appointment, curriculum vitae, and relevant local criteria.

### **1.1     Promotion Proposal Form (Required)**

Please complete the form located in *Appendix A* in its entirety. This form must be printed for signatures and then scanned and uploaded to the dossier. Place the original, signed document in the binder for the Provost.

### **1.2     Checklist / Table of Contents (Required)**

Please complete the form located in *Appendix B* in its entirety. This form must be printed, signed and then scanned and uploaded to the dossier. Place the original, signed document in the binder for the Provost.

### **1.3     Explanation of Appointment (Required)**

Complete the following table using the activity categories provided (add categories as necessary). Please indicate the percent of the total appointment next to each category (total must equal 100 percent). Finally, provide details of the specific responsibility within the activity category. Please note, the table below is provided as an example only. Appropriate categories, percentages and responsibilities will be unique and specific to each candidate.

<b>Activity Category</b>	<b>Percent of Appointment</b>	<b>Explanation of Responsibility</b>
Teaching	50%	Teaches two courses per term (fall and spring)
Scholarship/Research	0%	Not Applicable
Clinic	20%	In clinic 1 day per week
Administrative	20%	Program coordinator
Service	10%	Departmental committee work
Other	0%	Not Applicable
Total	100%	

## **1.4 Curriculum Vitae (Required)**

A current copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae (CV) must be included. Candidates may use Faculty Success to create the CV or use an alternative style if desired. For each listing of items, begin with the most current and work back toward the earliest works.

## **1.5 Department and/or Local Criteria (Required)**

Please include the criteria used to evaluate the dossier. Note that some units use department criteria exclusively; others rely on both departmental and college criteria; finally, some use only college / school criteria. On a cover sheet preceding the criteria, please indicate that the criteria were used consistently during the evaluation of the dossier and that all who assessed the dossier used this set of criteria.

## **2.0 Data on Teaching**

Teaching is an integral part of many Marquette participating faculty members' experience and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for candidates with teaching responsibilities. For these candidates, the dossier must provide a full evaluation of teaching effectiveness including several pieces of evidence that are more fully articulated below in sections 2.1 through 2.9.

Some of the sections below may be applicable even for candidates without teaching responsibilities. It is recommended that candidates and dossier preparers discuss which, if any, are applicable.

### **2.1 Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement (As Applicable)**

The candidate's statement should articulate core beliefs about teaching and how the candidate has enacted them. Candidates must indicate the ways in which their teaching efforts have developed over time, addressing improvements made (e.g., as a result of shortcomings noted in annual or periodic reviews) along with a description of the innovative methods employed to enhance student learning and keep teaching fresh. Candidates may include information in the teaching statement related to the way(s) in which their teaching was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **2.2 Course List Table (As Applicable)**

For traditional courses, please use course evaluation information reports in Faculty Success created by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. The table below includes a sample entry. For candidates seeking the rank of either professor or associate professor, the table must include data from at least the twelve most recent semesters (or less as applicable if the candidate is seeking promotion in fewer than twelve semesters since being promoted last). For candidates seeking the rank of assistant professor, the table must include data for the entire period to date. An explanation is to be provided if course evaluations were not administered in any classes. This table may be modified as needed to accommodate other types of student evaluation data associated with alternative courses (e.g., practicum supervision).

Instructor Profile - Marquette Online Course Evaluation System (MOCES)  
Click [here](#) for more information on interpreting your results

Term	Class <sup>1</sup>	Mode <sup>2</sup>	Total Enroll	Total Respond	Response Rate	Core Items Median <sup>3</sup>	Department Comparison <sup>4,5</sup> (same course level)		College Comparison <sup>4,5</sup> (same course level)	
							20 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> -80 <sup>th</sup> Percentiles	Total Classes	20 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> -80 <sup>th</sup> Percentiles	Total Classes
Fall 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 1001</a>	IP	17	15	88.2%	5.3	5.1 - 5.6 - 5.9	50	5.0 - 5.5 - 5.9	75
Fall 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 1001</a>	IP	12	10	83.3%	5.5	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.8	46	4.1 - 5.3 - 5.4	137
Spring 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 2101</a>	IP	20	12	60.0%	4.9	4.5 - 5.4 - 5.7	42	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.7	624
Spring 2022	<a href="#">PSYC 3210</a>	IP	6	6	100.0%	5.1	4.5 - 5.4 - 5.7	42	4.3 - 5.4 - 5.7	624

- <sup>1</sup> Click the link for each class to access the course profile for the class. Course profiles are uploaded into the Scheduled Teaching section of the Faculty Activities Database at the end of teach term. You must be logged into to your FAD account to access these reports.
- <sup>2</sup> Mode describes which instrument was used to evaluate the class IP = In-Person; DS = Distance; BL = Blended.
- <sup>3</sup> Core item median combines the responses to the four core items. These are: How was this class as a whole? How was the content of this class? How was the instructor's contribution to this class? How effective was the instructor in this class?
- <sup>4</sup> The comparisons are based on classes evaluated within the last two academic years in the same department/college & course level. Comparison data are not available for all classes. Please see <https://www.marquette.edu/institutional-research-analysis/moces/profile-interpretation.php> for more information.
- <sup>5</sup> Course evaluations did not occur in the Spring 2020 semester therefore are not included in any comparison data. Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 evaluation results may not be consistent with previous or subsequent results because of the substantial changes to class schedules and modalities due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- <sup>6</sup> In spring 2023, as a result of a technical issue with the vendor's software, some students were unable to complete evaluations on the final day they were open. The overall response rate was about 3 percentages points lower than the previous four semesters, so course scores may be based on fewer students than in past semesters.

### 2.3 Graduate Student Committee History Table (As Applicable)

Provide a history of service on theses and dissertations committees noting role as director where applicable. The table may be expanded to accommodate other *significant* service activities.

Student Name and Institution if other than Marquette	Years on Committee	Master's Thesis Committee: Served as Director	Doctoral Dissertation Committee: Served as Director
Bob Johnson	2020 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Mary Williams	2019 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sue Jones (UWM)	2016 - 2019	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
John Smith	2015 - 2016	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### 2.4 Mentoring Table (As Applicable)

Include items such as post doc, graduate, and undergraduate scholarship support (including work in a lab), professional projects, independent studies, McNair advising, etc. Do not repeat graduate student committee work noted in Section 2.3 (above).

Student Name	Year(s) Mentored	Type of Mentoring Provided
Megan O'Conner	2020	McNair Mentor
Kevin Gordon	2019	Directed Master's Capstone Project
Xavier Gonzalez	2017	Directed Independent Study

## 2.5 Student Letters (As Applicable)

Students asked to write letters must be randomly selected by the department or college and must have received a grade of “C” or higher in the course. Dossier preparers should request the “Promotion Student Report” from the Office of the Registrar. This report includes a list of all qualified students who were enrolled in the faculty’s courses, along with their email address information, if available. The sampling of students approached for teaching assessment should be representative of the candidate’s teaching career and typically include both undergraduate and graduate students familiar with the candidate’s teaching. Normally 10 to 15 letters from undergraduate students and 5 to 10 letters from graduate students is sufficient. Since 20 percent or fewer of solicited students typically respond, a large number of students will need to be contacted to obtain the desired number of letters. Students for whom the candidate has directed a thesis, dissertation, or other major work, whose names appear in Tables 2.3 and 2.4 may also be asked to submit a letter. A statement must be included describing how student letters were solicited, the number solicited, and the number received.

Templates have been provided for both solicitation and reply letters. It is recommended that these be used as presented.

### Student Solicitation Letter Template

*Date*

*Student Name*

Dear *Student Name*:

*Candidate Name*, rank in the *Department Name* at Marquette University, is currently being considered for promotion to *Proposed Rank*. As part of the review process, the department is preparing *Candidate’s Name* dossier and an essential part is the inclusion of student evaluation letters. You have been identified as a former student of *Candidate’s Name* and have been randomly selected to provide an assessment.

Your candid commentary on *Candidate Name’s* attributes, skills, style, effectiveness, and so forth as **an instructor** would be greatly appreciated and vitally important to the review process. Specific examples to illustrate key points are especially valued. Your comments (preferably in letter form but an e-mail response is acceptable) will be held in confidence unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure.

Please submit your comments to me no later than *SPECIFY DEADLINE*. A sample guide for your reply is provided below for your consideration.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this very important matter on *CANDIDATE’S NAME* behalf.

Sincerely,

*Name, Title*

*Contact Information*

## **Student Reply Guide Template**

*Date*

Dear Concerned:

Indicate your status (current student or alumnus) as well as your undergraduate major or graduate degree, etc. Note the specific course(s) in which you had *CANDIDATE'S NAME* as an instructor.

Provide comments and specific examples concerning the attributes, skills, style, effectiveness, and so forth of *CANDIDATE'S NAME* as an instructor.

Your signature (if responding by letter)

### **2.6 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching (As Applicable)**

Please include the department or college peer review policy and guidelines used to review teaching. Peer review affords evaluation by an experienced faculty member with recognized proficiency in teaching and as such the reviewer must not simply provide a summary of activities but rather critically assess the instructor and provide suggestions for improvement. Peer reviews must include a classroom visitation, unless the course is online in which case alternative plans should be made in lieu of an in-person visit (e.g., full course description and pertinent aspects of online teaching). Useful information may be available from student surveys, course materials (syllabi, tests, assignments, teaching rubrics, etc.), and faculty development projects.

### **2.7 Peer Review Evaluations (As Applicable)**

Comprehensive peer reviews of teaching are required in dossiers for all candidates seeking promotion. Dossiers must contain at least three peer reviews with at least one completed in the two years leading up to the candidacy.

### **2.8 Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors (As Applicable)**

List all grants, awards (internal and external) and other honors associated with teaching.

### **2.9 Teaching Summary Statement (As Applicable)**

The dossier preparer should provide a written statement that summarizes the evidence related to teaching and provides context and integration to help the reader understand the teaching evidence presented in Sections 2.1 - 2.8. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the candidate's teaching.

### **3.0 Data on Additional Activities as Required by Appointment**

While most, but not all, participating faculty teach, many often engage in additional activities as required by their appointment (see for example, table in Section 1.3). Data associated with those responsibilities are provided in this section.

### **3.1 List of Publications, Creative Work and Presentations (As Applicable)**

List scholarly publications and presentations, as well as creative work, entrepreneurial activities, and so forth. Clearly distinguish between work that is published, has been accepted for publication, that is under review, or in preparation. Also, be sure to clearly distinguish between works that were peer-reviewed and those that were not peer reviewed.

Some creative works may fall outside the boundaries of traditional outlets, such as scholarly journals and books. In these instances, provide a thorough and comprehensive review together with supporting evidence. Work is not necessarily creative or original simply because it is non-traditional. When presented as grounds for promotion, creative work must be subject to rigorous peer review by professionals. Furthermore, since this peer review is not standard, the process itself must be clearly explained.

Publications include but are not limited to: books, book chapters, monographs, journal articles, and conference proceedings.

Scholarly presentations include, but are not limited to, those delivered at: disciplinary conferences, invited meetings, universities, and community settings.

The department or college promotion committee can determine if external reviewers are needed in cases where scholarship/research activities constitute a significant portion of the candidate's required duties. The department or college committee should determine the threshold that constitutes a significant portion of required duties

### **3.2 List of Clinic and/or Administrative Activities (As Applicable)**

Provide a list of activities related to clinic responsibilities as well as other administrative responsibilities. Next to each item, provide a brief description of the responsibility.

### **3.3 List of Service Activities (As Applicable)**

Include service activities within the candidate's department (where departments exist), college and university. Also include professional/disciplinary activities which might include reviewing manuscripts and/or grants, organizing and participating in professional meetings at national or international levels, and membership on editorial or professional boards. Finally, also include service to the larger community, including community and corporate engagement (as applicable). In doing so, identify the nature of the work along with the extent to which students or other university constituents were involved.

### **3.4 List of Other Activities (As Applicable)**

Include other activities not captured in Sections 3.1 through 3.3 above. Next to each item, provide a brief description of the responsibility.

### **3.5 Relevant Grants, Awards, and Honors (As Applicable)**

List relevant grants, awards (internal and external), and honors associated with candidate responsibilities.

### **3.6 Summary Statement of Additional Activities as Required by Appointment (As Applicable)**

The dossier preparer should provide a written statement that summarizes the evidence related to additional activities, other than teaching, (as required by the appointment) and provides context and integration to help the reader understand the evidence presented in Sections 3.1 - 3.5. Be sure to include a thorough discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the candidate's additional activities.

### **4.0 Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations**

Include faculty letters, the candidate's reviews (annual and/or periodic reviews) and evaluations with recommendations from the department, local committee and Dean.

#### **4.1 Periodic and/or Annual Reviews (Required)**

Include all reviews in chronological order (most recent review last) conducted since appointment to current position.

#### **4.2 Faculty Letters (As Applicable)**

Include letters from faculty members as dictated by local procedures.

#### **4.3 Department Evaluation with Recommendation (Required except for units without departments)**

The Department letter is written on behalf of the department. The letter must include the vote and articulate the extent to which the candidate meets stated departmental criteria across responsibilities as articulated in the table located in Section 1.3. Include a discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the case. Where the vote was not unanimous, minority view(s) must be explained. In cases where a significant minority exists, a more thorough and detailed explanation is expected.

#### **4.4 Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation (Required)**

The chair of the local committee writes a letter on behalf of the committee which notes committee membership and presents the vote of the committee and its evaluation of all relevant responsibilities. Include a discussion of both positive and negative aspects of the case. Where the vote was not unanimous, minority view(s) must be explained. Any committee member with a dissenting view may write a separate letter explaining her or his minority view.



## **4.5 Dean Evaluation with Recommendation (Required)**

The Dean's letter must indicate whether or not the Dean supports the candidate along with specific reasons for the recommendation based on the extent to which the candidate meets the requisite criteria. In addition, the Dean must address both strengths and weaknesses raised in the dossier.

## **5.0 Candidate Addendum**

### **5.1 Addendum Materials (As Applicable)**

While atypical, a candidate may include an addendum in the dossier if the Dean and/or the local committee does not recommend the candidate for promotion (for additional information, see "Dean Level" procedures on pages 6-7). Additional evidence relative to the case may be included; however, care should be exercised to ensure such evidence is substantive and relevant. Examples of such evidence may include, but are not limited to, notification of a publication, grant, or scholarly presentation. The addendum must be included in the dossier before Provost review.

A detailed explanation of why the material was added is to be provided by the candidate at the beginning of this section. Candidates are encouraged to discuss the desire to create a "Candidate Addendum" with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so.

Candidates wishing to include an addendum in response to the recommendation of the local committee or the dean, should do so by delivering a hard copy to the Office of the Provost by December 14, 2023. The addendum will be added by the Office of the Provost to both the hard copy dossier and the electronic copy dossier.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Participating Faculty Promotion Proposal Form**

1. Name (Last, First, Middle) \_\_\_\_\_ 2. College/School \_\_\_\_\_

3. Department (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Highest Degree Earned \_\_\_\_\_

5. Total years of relevant professional experience prior to MU (appropriate to the discipline) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Total years teaching as a faculty member prior to coming to Marquette University \_\_\_\_\_

7. Present Rank:     Instructor              Assistant Professor              Associate Professor

8. Start Date of Present Rank \_\_\_\_\_

9. Proposed Rank:     Assistant Professor              Associate Professor              Professor

10a. Has the candidate taken any leaves? Yes  No      10b. If Yes, total number of years? \_\_\_\_\_

-----

Recommendation of:	Recommendation	Votes if Applicable # Yes / # No	Date	Signature
Department	Yes     No <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Local Committee	Yes     No <input type="checkbox"/>	/		
Dean	Yes     No <input type="checkbox"/>			
Provost	Yes     No <input type="checkbox"/>			

*Print form for signatures, then scan and upload to dossier.  
Place the original, signed document in the paper copy binder for the Provost.*

**APPENDIX B**  
**Checklist / Table of Contents Form**

Candidate Name \_\_\_\_\_

Please name all electronic files exactly as listed below, including numbers.

When the dossier is complete, all boxes should be checked and sections uploaded.

Key:	R = Required	A = As Applicable	R/A	Uploaded to Electronic Dossier (✓)
<b>Item</b>				
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introductory Information</b>			
1.1	Promotion Proposal Form (Appendix A)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Explanation of Appointment		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	Curriculum Vitae		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5	Department and/or Local Criteria		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Teaching Data</b>			
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2	Course List Table		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3	Graduate Student Committee History Table		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.4	Mentoring Table		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.5	Student Letters		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.9	Teaching Summary Statement		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Data on Additional Activities as Required by Appointment</b>			
3.1	List of Publications, Creative Work, and Presentations		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2	List of Clinic and/or Administrative Activities		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	List of Service Activities		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4	List of Other Activities		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Relevant Grants, Awards, and Honors		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6	Summary Statement of Additional Activities as Required by Appointment		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations</b>			
4.1	Periodic and/or Annual Reviews		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Items 1.0 - 4.1 must be uploaded by October 30, 2024</i>				
4.2	Faculty Letters		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation (Required except for units without departments)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Items 4.2 &amp; 4.3 must be uploaded by November 5, 2024</i>				
4.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Item 4.4 must be uploaded by November 19, 2024</i>				
4.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Item 4.5 must be uploaded by December 10, 2024</i>				
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Candidate Addendum</b>			
5.1	Addendum Materials		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Addendum items must be provided to the Office of the Provost by December 12, 2024</i>				

Dossier preparer comments, if any (to explain any anomalies in the dossier):

Dossier Preparer Name (print) \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

*The above signature verifies that the guidelines have been followed with the understanding that non-compliance may result in the rejection of the dossier.*