

**PROMOTION AND TENURE INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY
(REVISED – April 1, 2018)**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Promotion and Tenure Calendar Deadlines.....	1
Promotion and Tenure Criteria.....	1
Promotion and Tenure Review Procedures.....	2
Promotion and Tenure Levels with Associated Committees	3
Department Level – Independent Faculty	3
Faculty Letters	3
Department Recommendation.....	3
College / School / Area Level – Local Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	3
Dean Level – College / School Dean	4
University Level – Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure.....	5
Provost Level – University Provost	5
President Level – University President	5
Dossier Preparation	6
Presentation Format of Materials for Dossier.....	6
Dossier Table of Contents	8
Instructions for Completing the Dossier.....	9
1.0 Introductory Information	9
1.1 Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form	9
1.2 Checklist / Table of Contents.....	9
1.3 Curriculum Vitae	9
1.4 Department and/or College Criteria	10
2.0 Teaching Data.....	10
2.1 Candidate’s Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	10
2.2 Course List Table.....	10
2.3 Graduate Student Committee History Table	11
2.4 Mentoring Table.....	11
2.5 Student Letters	11
2.6 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching.....	13
2.7 Peer Review Evaluations	13
2.8 Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors	13
2.9 Teaching Evaluation Summary Statement.....	13
3.0 Scholarship Data	13
3.1 Candidate’s Scholarship Philosophy Statement	13
3.2 List of Publications and Creative Work	13
3.3 Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count	14
3.4 List of Presentations	15
3.5 Scholarly Awards and Honors.....	15
3.6 Scholarly Grants	15
3.7 External Reviewer Letters	15
3.8 Scholarly Publications	18
3.9 Scholarship Evaluation Summary Statement	19

4.0	Service Data	19
4.1	Candidate’s Service Philosophy Statement	19
4.2	List of Service Activities	19
4.3	Service Evaluation Summary Statement	19
5.0	Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations	19
5.1	Faculty Letters	19
5.2	Third-year and Annual Reviews.....	20
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation.....	20
5.4	Local (Area/College) Committee Evaluation with Recommendation	20
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation	20
6.0	Candidate Addendum	20
6.1	Addendum Materials	20
	Appendix A – Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form	21
	Appendix B – Regular Faculty – Checklist / Table of Contents Form	22

**PROMOTION AND TENURE INFORMATION INCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS
TO PREPARE A DOSSIER FOR REGULAR FACULTY
(REVISED – April 1, 2018)**

Introduction

This document provides information about the promotion and tenure process and is intended for **regular** 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, university, Provost, and President.

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-and-tenure committees, Deans, Department Chairs, dossier preparers, and candidates. They are not intended to alter the substantive criteria for promotion and/or tenure, 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 and Tenure Calendar Deadlines

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

Promotion and Tenure Criteria

University criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure 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 or Dean. College and 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 and tenure 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 and Tenure Review Procedures

In terms of helping faculty know where they stand relative to promotion and/or tenure:

- All untenured assistant professors on the tenure track must receive annual reviews as well as a comprehensive review at or near the end of the third year assessing progress toward promotion to associate professor. A copy of the [third-year review](#) evaluation and recommendation is to be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the Dean within 30 days of completion.
- Associate professors with tenure must receive regular feedback, every 2-3 years if not annually, regarding their progress toward promotion to professor.

Assistant professors are time bound after their sixth year at Marquette. As such, they must go up for promotion and tenure at that time. Faculty members who are not approved for tenure in their time bound year will receive timely notice that the upcoming year is a terminal year.

Assistant professors may apply for promotion to associate professor with tenure prior to the time bound year if the criteria as set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#) as well as those articulated within their college or department have been unambiguously met. Candidates should not, however, apply for promotion and tenure prior to the 3rd year review, the results of which should help guide future decision making. Exceptions may apply in cases where a faculty member spent time in a tenure track position at another institution or in a commensurate position within an organization outside the academy. Assistant professors whose case for early promotion to associate professor is turned down may reapply in subsequent years.

There is no time bound year established for tenured associate professors. Associate professors may apply for promotion to the rank of professor when the criteria as set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#) as well as those articulated within their college or department have been met.

Candidates turned down for promotion to the rank of professor may reapply, however 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 to the rank of professor.

Faculty members may be nominated or may self-nominate for review for promotion and/or tenure. 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 and/or tenure.
- 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 University Committee.
- The University Committee 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 and/or tenure.

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

Promotion and Tenure Levels with Associated Committees

The proceedings of the promotion and tenure 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

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 and/or tenure.

Normally associate professors and professors vote on promotion to the rank of associate professor, but only professors vote on promotion to the rank of 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 and/or tenure, those attempts, deficiencies, and remedies must be noted in the *Department Evaluation with Recommendation* section of the dossier (Section 5.3).

Faculty Letters - All departmental faculty, including the Department Chair, who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 5.1) 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. Voting faculty are expected to perform a thorough assessment of a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service 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 omission 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 and tenure process. If unusual circumstances warrant the inclusion of a letter from a retired or emeritus faculty member, justification must be provided in the dossier.

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 across teaching, scholarship, and service. 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 teaching, scholarship, and service.

College / School / Area Level - Local Promotion and Tenure Committee

After the department vote has been completed, the local committee reviews the dossiers of all candidates and renders the official 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 tenure and/or promotion. Local promotion and tenure committees must provide an impartial and thorough analysis of each case. Issues raised by internal or external evaluators, 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 and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier (Section 5.1) 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 teaching, scholarship, and service 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 by the Department Chair.* Only current faculty vote and write letters. Retired and emeriti faculty do not participate.

Normally associate professors and professors vote on promotion to the rank of associate professor, but only professors vote on promotion to the rank of 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 teaching, scholarship, and service (Section 5.4). 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 candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service.

When a local committee votes not to support a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, 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 the decision to reply to the Committee's critique in a special addendum (Section 6.0) at the end of the dossier or withdrawal of 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/or tenure and writes a letter (Section 5.5) addressing the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service. In doing, the Dean should specifically address any 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 provide 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, should not be shared with the candidate. At the same time, the Dean must communicate his or her own recommendation. A candidate may include an addendum in the dossier (Section 6.0) if the Dean does not recommend promotion and/or tenure, regardless of the vote at the local committee. Note, however, that the addendum must be included in the dossier before reaching the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure.

University Level - Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure

The University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure is chaired by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and is comprised of the chairs of each local committee. Because the University Committee regularly makes recommendations concerning promotion to the rank of professor, committee members must hold the rank of professor themselves. University Committee members may not be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure while serving on this Committee. For a more detailed description of this committee, refer to Article 4 - Section 2.01 of the University Academic Statutes as articulated in the [Faculty Handbook](#). The narrative below explains University Committee procedures when it gathers to consider faculty candidates for promotion and/or tenure (normally in December of each year).

Candidates are grouped and reviewed by college and by department. The local committee member from the candidate's college or school introduces the case to the committee by providing an impartial summary of dossier contents, highlighting candidate strengths and weaknesses along with the recommendations of prior level votes. Members of the University Committee discuss each case, addressing all issues and questions brought forth by committee members. After the case has been discussed, the college Dean and Department Chair of the candidate are asked to join the University Committee to answer questions. The Dean is the sole representative for units without departments. When these discussions conclude, the Dean and Department Chair are excused, and the University Committee considers all information before voting.

Voting is anonymous and facilitated by providing a ballot to each member on the University Committee. All members vote, with the exception of the Committee Chair. All votes are collected and the tally is announced to committee members before moving to the next candidate. Voting results are provided to the Provost, but otherwise kept strictly confidential.

Following the meeting, the University Committee Chair prepares a synopsis of the main points of the discussion and the Committee's vote on each candidate for the Provost.

Provost Level - University Provost

The Provost reviews the dossier, along with notes provided from the University Committee, and makes an independent judgment on the case. The Provost may seek clarification from the University Committee, 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 and to award tenure or not award tenure. There may be occasions when the Provost or President decides not to follow the recommendation of the University Committee. In such cases, the Provost will meet with the University Committee to explain the decision. The University Committee will also be apprised of final decisions made by the President prior to public announcement.

Dossier Preparation

Review for promotion and/or tenure of regular faculty requires preparation of a comprehensive dossier providing evidence that the candidate has met published criteria. The burden of proof in matters of tenure and/or 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 note any leaves of absence (or other delays to the time-bound year) granted to a particular candidate, excluding research/scholarly (normally in Section 5.3). The candidate is not expected to produce evidence of progress in teaching, scholarship, or service during the time of an approved leave of absence.

Each dossier must contain a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. Some evaluative letters, such as those from faculty and the Dean, must address all three areas. Other evaluative letters may focus more narrowly on one of these areas (e.g., letters from students should focus on teaching, while letters from external reviewers should focus on scholarship). The local and university committees evaluate all three areas rigorously in accordance with local and university criteria. The dossier is to be carefully compared with the Dossier Checklist (see p.8) for compliance before submission to the next level. Any missing data should be added and evaluated before advancing the dossier.

Presentation Format of Materials for Dossier

One original hard copy dossier for each candidate containing original letters and signatures on the [Promotion / Tenure 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.

- Responsibility for preparation of the dossier belongs to the Dean, but it may be delegated to the Department Chair, a senior faculty member in the department, or other faculty member as deemed appropriate.
- A new dossier must be prepared in the event the candidate is making a successive attempt at promotion and/or tenure. In such cases, the new dossier may include relevant material from the previous dossier(s), as well as new material that evidences how teaching, scholarship and/or service have changed since the prior review and now meet criteria. With regard to external reviewer letters, either all letters from the previous dossier should be used or all new letters should be solicited from different reviewers. If the successive attempt is three or more years after previous attempt, new letters should be obtained. Previous dossier(s), in full, will be made available to the University Committee, 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 to discuss this 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 and/or tenure.
- Confidential letters and evaluations must remain confidential. Letters inviting student reviews as well as external reviews 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

Item		R/A
1.0	<i>Introductory Information</i>	
1.1	Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form (Appendix A)	R
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)	R
1.3	Curriculum Vitae	R
1.4	Department and/or College Criteria	R
2.0	<i>Teaching Data</i>	
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement	R
2.2	Course List Table	R
2.3	Graduate Student Committee History Table	A
2.4	Mentoring Table	A
2.5	Student Letters	R
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching	R
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations	R
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors	A
2.9	Teaching Evaluation (Summary Statement)	R
3.0	<i>Scholarship Data</i>	
3.1	Candidate's Scholarship Philosophy Statement	R
3.2	List of Publications and Creative Work	R
3.3	Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count	R
3.4	List of Presentations	R
3.5	Scholarly Awards and Honors	A
3.6	Scholarly Grants (applied for and received)	R
3.7	External Reviewer Letters	R
3.8	Scholarly Publications (Electronic Dossier Only)	R
3.9	Scholarship Evaluation (Summary Statement)	R
4.0	<i>Service Data</i>	
4.1	Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement	R
4.2	List of Service Activities	R
4.3	Service Evaluation (Summary Statement)	R
5.0	<i>Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations</i>	
5.1	Faculty Letters	R
5.2	Third-year and Annual Reviews	R
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation	R
5.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation	R
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation	R
6.0	<i>Candidate Addendum</i>	
6.1	Addendum Materials	A

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 be submitted to the Office of the Provost. The University Committee will work from the electronic dossier, located on the SharePoint site that the Office of the Provost will provide.

1.0 *Introductory Information*

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

1.1 Promotion / Tenure 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 Curriculum Vitae (Required)

A current copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae (CV) must be included. Candidates may use the Faculty Activities Database to create the CV or use an alternative style if desired. In either case, particular attention should be paid to the following points:

- For each listing of items, begin with the most current and work back toward the earliest works.
- Distinguish between scholarly work completed prior to arriving at Marquette and scholarly work completed at Marquette. Candidates seeking promotion to (full) professor must clearly indicate which publications, grants, awards and so forth occurred after promotion to associate professor.
- Clearly distinguish between scholarship that is peer reviewed and that which is not peer reviewed by using separate headings.
- Manuscripts in press may be noted under publications and clearly identified as such.
- Work in progress should be listed separately after the listing of published and in-press works.
- Delineate the “level” of presentations: local, regional, national, or international; invited vs. refereed, as appropriate.
- Place refereed and non-refereed conference *publications* into separate categories.
- Place refereed and non-refereed conference *presentations* into separate categories.
- Include all authors in published order and provide inclusive page numbers of all publications.

1.4 Department and/or College Criteria (Required)

Please include the criteria used to evaluate the dossier. Note that some areas use department criteria exclusively; others rely on both departmental and college criteria; finally, some use only college 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 (including external reviewers) used this set of criteria. In accordance with the *Policy on the Applicability of Revised Promotion and Tenure Standards in Academic Units*, please check to ensure the correct set of departmental or college standards have been applied to the faculty member in question.

2.0 Teaching Data

Teaching is an integral part of the Marquette faculty experience and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. 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.

2.1 Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement (Required)

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 3rd year reviews) along with a description of the innovative methods employed to enhance student learning and keep teaching fresh.

2.2 Course List Table (Required)

Please use course evaluation information reports in the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) created by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. The table below includes a sample entry. For candidates seeking the rank of 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 to associate professor). For candidates seeking the rank of associate professor, the table must include data for the entire probationary period. An explanation is to be provided if course evaluations were not administered in any classes.

**[Guidelines on accessing MOCES in FAD.](#)

Term	Class ¹	Total Enroll	Total Respond	Response Rate	Core Items Median ²	Department Comparison ³ (same course level)			College Comparison ³ (same course level)		
						20 th - 50 th - 80 th Percentiles	Total Classes	Class Decile ⁴	20 th - 50 th - 80 th Percentiles	Total Classes	Class Decile ⁴
Fall 2017	ENGL 1002 105	18	15	83.3%	5.6	4.5 - 5.1 - 5.5	450	8	4.3 - 5.0 - 5.5	1,755	8
Fall 2017	ENGL 1001 104	20	18	90.0%	4.7	4.5 - 5.1 - 5.5	450	3	4.3 - 5.0 - 5.5	1,755	3
Spring 2017	ENGL 3210 102	15	10	66.6%	4.6	5.0 - 5.5 - 5.7	436	0	4.5 - 5.2 - 5.7	1,731	2
Fall 2016	ARSC 1900 101	8	8	100.0%	5.9	4.4 - 5.2 - 5.7	48	9	4.3 - 4.9 - 5.5	1,743	9
Fall 2016	ENGL 1001 110	20	10	50.0%	4.2	4.4 - 5.2 - 5.7	438	1	4.3 - 4.9 - 5.5	1,743	1

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.

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	2017 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Mary Williams	2015 - present	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Sue Jones (UWM)	2013 - 2017	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
John Smith	2012 - 2014	<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	2016	McNair Mentor
Kevin Gordon	2015	Directed Master's Capstone Project
Xavier Gonzalez	2013	Directed Independent Study

2.5 Student Letters (Required)

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. 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. A statement must be included describing how student letters were solicited, the number solicited, and the number received.

Sample Student Solicitation Letter

Date

Student Name

Dear *Student Name*:

Dr. *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 Dr. *Candidate's Name* dossier and will submit this file of information to various committees at the University. An essential part of the dossier is the inclusion of student evaluation letters. You have been identified as a former student of Dr. *Candidate's Name* and have been randomly selected to provide an assessment.

Your candid commentary on Dr. *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 *Dr. CANDIDATE'S NAME* behalf.

Sincerely,

Name, Title

Contact Information

Sample Student Reply Guide

Date

Dear University Committee on Faculty Promotions & Tenure

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 *Dr. CANDIDATE'S NAME* as an instructor.

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

Your signature (if responding by letter)

2.6 Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching (Required)

Please include the department or college peer review policy and guidelines used to review teaching. Peer review affords evaluation by a senior 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). 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 (Required)

Comprehensive peer reviews of teaching are required in dossiers for all candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor, annually for non-tenured regular faculty and periodically for tenured faculty. Dossiers for regular faculty seeking promotion to professor must contain at least three peer reviews conducted since promotion to associate professor 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 Evaluation Summary Statement (Required)

Provide a statement that summarizes the evidence indicating the extent to which the candidate has met the teaching criteria as articulated in local and university standards.

3.0 *Scholarship Data*

Scholarship is an integral part of the Marquette faculty experience and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The dossier is to provide a full evaluation of scholarship applying the criteria articulated in departmental, local and university standards.

3.1 Candidate's Scholarship Philosophy Statement (Required)

The candidate's statement on scholarship describes the philosophy as well as scholarly efforts and plans for future scholarship. Work with postdoctoral associates, undergraduate and graduate students and proposed funding agencies should be articulated as appropriate. Note any scholarly works of particular significance.

3.2 List of Publications and Creative Work (Required)

A full list of scholarly publications and creative work must be provided. For easy reference in Section 3.3 (below), please number all publications. 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 tenure and/or 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. When listing publications please adhere to the following set of guidelines:

- For books, indicate what stage the book is in using these definitions:
 - *Published*, if electronic give DOI
 - *In Production* (page proofs being prepared from copy submitted by the author, copy editing, or in press)
 - *Accepted* (positive editorial decision)
- For journal articles, distinguish those that are forthcoming/in press from those already published. Manuscripts under review and works in progress may be listed under a separate heading.
- Distinguish between scholarly work completed prior to arriving at Marquette and work completed at Marquette.
- For faculty being considered for promotion to (full) professor, clearly identify those scholarly works completed after promotion to associate professor.
- Distinguish between scholarship that went through a peer review process and scholarship that did not.
- Distinguish between refereed and non-refereed conference proceedings.
- Indicate works that were specifically invited (as applicable).
- Include all authors in published order and provide inclusive page numbers for all publications. Provide some indication of context with regard to local norms around authorship, co-authorship, and author order on publications.

3.3 Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count (Required)

Note that the burden of proof for demonstrating the quality of the candidate’s scholarship is with the candidate and dossier preparer. In addition to providing information in the table below, external reviewers may serve as good sources for evidencing the quality of publication outlets. Adjustments may be made to the table as necessary (e.g., to account for two sources of citation or impact factor).

Publication # (from list in Table 3.2)	Type of Publication (book, journal, etc.)	Department Ranking (if applicable)	Citation Count & Source	Impact Factor & Source	Journal Acceptance Rate	Candidate’s Percent Contribution	Nature of Contribution
Publication #1	Journal article	AB	23 – Google Scholar	2.378 – Journal Citation Reports	15%	50%	Collaborator
Publication #2	Book	N / A	145 / Google Scholar	N / A	N / A	100%	N / A
Publication #3	Journal article	B	75 – Google Scholar	1.015 – Journal Citation Reports	22%	10%	Data Analysis
Publication #4	Journal article	A	43 – Google Scholar	3.961 – Journal Citation Reports	10%	100%	N/A

3.4 List of Presentations (Required)

A full list of scholarly presentations must be provided. Presentations include but are not limited to those delivered at: disciplinary conferences, invited meetings, universities, and community settings. Clearly distinguish between refereed and non-refereed conference presentations as well as invited and non-invited. Finally, indicate the presentation “level” such as local, regional, national or international.

3.5 Scholarly Awards and Honors (As Applicable)

List all awards and other honors associated with scholarship.

3.6 Scholarly Grants (Required)

With regard to grant applications, distinguish grants received from grants applied for but not received, as well as those that were internal to Marquette versus those that were external. In addition, the candidate’s role on each grant must be indicated (e.g., PI, Co-PI, or collaborator) as well as the amount, duration, funding source and type of grant. The nature of collaborative contributions and/or responsibilities with respect to co-authored grants must also be noted. Examples are provided below:

- “Alcohol actions on NMDA receptor gating domains,” National Institutes of Health (R-01 program), P.I., \$1,289,771, 7/1/2011 to 6/30/2016.
- “Testing the Model for Accelerated Diffusion,” William T. Grant Foundation, Co-PI, \$900,000, 5/1/2015 to 4/30/2018.
- “The Political Aesthetics of British Romantic Poetry, 1789-1830,” NEH, P.I., \$54,500, 9/1/2017 to 5/31/2018.

3.7 External Reviewer Letters (Required)

Letters are to be obtained from external reviewers who are asked to evaluate both the quality and quantity of a candidate’s scholarly publications in relation to department or college criteria. If the candidate’s publication has already been evaluated at one level (i.e., for promotion to associate professor), then that publication must not be evaluated again (i.e., for promotion to professor). All reviewers are to be asked to provide their evaluation of the overall quality of the candidate’s scholarship, with particular attention paid to whether the scholarship meets the relevant criteria at Marquette. As such, departmental and/or college criteria must be made available to reviewers.

Include a statement describing the process by which external reviewers were solicited and ultimately selected. Please include the solicitation letter along with a brief paragraph describing each reviewer’s professional accomplishments (do not include reviewer CVs). Reviewers should be tenured faculty and recognized authorities in their fields of study. Further, reviewers are to be chosen from programs that, as compared to Marquette’s program, are ranked equivalently or higher. Reviewers must hold the rank of (full) professor to review a faculty member being considered for promotion to professor. It is also expected that reviewers hold the rank of professor to review a faculty member being considered for promotion to associate professor, however, if special circumstances dictate, a reviewer may be solicited that holds the rank of associate professor. Emeritus faculty should not serve as reviewers. Any deviations, however, must be explained in the dossier.

Although it is reasonable and expected for a candidate to be acquainted with the experts in his or her field, external reviewers must not have ties to the candidate that would create an undue risk of bias or constitute a conflict of interest (where the candidate's promotion would benefit the reviewer in some way). For example, it is not appropriate to solicit letters from the candidate's dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor, or from current or past collaborators or co-authors. Nor is it appropriate to solicit letters from colleagues in a department where the candidate previously worked. If personal or professional ties do exist, those must be explained. The candidate may suggest up to five reviewers, the department or local committee must independently suggest others, and the department or local committee is responsible for the final selection of reviewers. Because a negative conflict of interest may exist for the candidate, either for personal or professional reasons, candidates must be allowed, a priori, to identify up to two potential reviewers to exclude from consideration. No more than two of the eventual external reviewers are to come from candidate recommendations.

Reviewers suggested by the candidate must be clearly distinguished from those selected by the department or local committee. Whenever possible, letters from five external reviewers are to be obtained. Reviewers who provided letters for a candidate's promotion to associate professor generally should not be asked to provide an evaluation for that candidate's promotion to professor. Any deviation must be thoroughly explained.

Note: The University Committee believes that care must be taken to use some economy when selecting external reviewers. Since Marquette University does not offer a stipend to accompany the external reviews, some reviewers are reluctant to undertake such work. This may affect future candidates. Thus, in the usual case, there is no need for more than five external reviewers.

The candidate's scholarly works are to be included as follows. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor, all works published during the probationary period at Marquette University are to be made available to reviewers. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of professor, all works published since promotion to associate professor are to be made available to reviewers. Scholarly works must be scanned and uploaded to the electronic dossier; hard copies of scholarly works are NOT to be included in the paper dossier. Books or other scholarly evidence that cannot be scanned must be submitted to the reserve desk at Raynor Memorial Libraries by November 1 of any given year. These materials must also be made available to external reviewers.

Sample Description of External Reviewer Selection Process

The candidate identified eight potential reviewers all of whom were familiar with the candidate's work. The candidate also identified, a priori, one individual who was perceived to have a conflict and thus asked that this individual be excluded from consideration. The Department Chair (who prepared the dossier) along with senior faculty in the department, identified eight additional potential reviewers whose names were not shared with the candidate. Ten of the sixteen potential reviewers were asked to provide evaluations, four were chosen from those suggested by the candidate and six were chosen from those suggested by the department.

All reviewers were contacted by the Department Chair to determine if they were willing to conduct the evaluation. Five agreed to do so, four from those identified by the department and one from those identified by the candidate. After agreement, departmental criteria, candidate publications, and the candidates curriculum vitae were made available to reviewers electronically. All five reviewers submitted reviews by the due date. Biographical information for the five reviewers is provided below.

Sample Paragraph of Reviewer's Professional Accomplishments

Dr. Reviewer Name

University Name

Dr. Reviewer Name has been a professor at *University Name* for 32 years. She has published more than 90 refereed journal articles as well as two textbooks used extensively throughout the discipline. *Dr. Reviewer Name* has received more than \$5 million in federal grants over the past 3 years and over \$120 million across her career having received funding from organizations including the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. *Dr. Reviewer Name* was named National Academy of Sciences fellow in 2015. *Dr. Reviewer Name* knows *Dr. Candidate Name* from disciplinary meetings but has never collaborated with him.

Sample External Reviewer Solicitation Letter

Dr. Reviewer Name

Department and Institution Name

Address

Dear *Dr. Reviewer Name*:

Dr. 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 *Dr. Candidate's Name* dossier and will submit this file of information to various committees at the University. An essential part of the dossier is the inclusion of evaluation letters from experts outside the University. You have been identified as a person who is qualified to provide an assessment of *Dr. Candidate's Name* scholarly accomplishments. If you agree, please keep in mind that we are interested in your assessment of the extent to which *Dr. Candidate's Name* has met the scholarly expectations at Marquette University.

To assist you in making your evaluation, I have enclosed our departmental criteria for promotion and tenure at the *Proposed Rank* as well as *Dr. Candidate's Name* curriculum vitae. If you are able to review, I will make *Dr. Candidate's Name* publications available as well. The due date for the review is *Date*.

Please note that *Dr. Candidate's Name* will not have access to your letter unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure. In addition, if you are able to review, but believe a conflict of interest may exist, please note the nature of the conflict in your response along with your willingness to assist, so that a determination can be made one way or another.

I understand the commitment of valuable time required to accommodate this request and would be sincerely appreciative of your positive response. If, however, you are not able to participate in this vital process, please notify me as soon as possible and perhaps recommend a colleague who might be willing and available.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Name, Title

Contact Information

Sample Letter to External Reviewer after Agreement

Date

Dr. Reviewer Name

Department and Institution

Address

Dear Dr. *Reviewer Name*:

Thank you for agreeing to write a letter of review for Dr. *Candidate's Name* dossier for promotion to *proposed rank*. I have attached three files, one containing Dr. *Candidate's Name* curriculum vitae, one containing departmental criteria for promotion (please see *pages X-X* for details of scholarly expectations), and one containing Dr. *Candidate's Name's* scholarly publications. If you need any additional information, please let me know.

In preparing your response to this request, note that we are primarily interested in your evaluation of Dr. *Candidate's Name* scholarly profile and quality of work. Please consider the following suggestions related to format and content:

- Typed on letterhead, 2-3 pages in length.
- With the salutation, "To the Marquette University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure".
- Please include identifying information such as (e.g. title, academic rank, degrees).
- Provide an evaluation pertaining to the nature of Dr. *Candidate's Name* scholarship, its quality, quantity and contributions to the field, and the extent to which Marquette's criteria for scholarship have (or have not) been met. Please note, we are NOT requesting a specific recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion.
- Either mail your letter in the return envelope provided, or print, sign, scan, and email your letter as an attachment to: *e-mail address*.
- Please complete and return your review by *Date*.

Note Dr. *Candidate's Name* will not have access to your letter unless a judicial or adjudicatory body orders disclosure.

Thank you again for your time and energy. I am very grateful.

Sincerely,
Requester

3.8 Scholarly Publications (Required Only in the Electronic Dossier)

This section is only for the electronic dossier and should NOT be included in the hard copy binder submitted to the Provost. Upload electronic copies of all scholarly works *published since appointment to current position*. In some cases, for example when a candidate comes to Marquette having served in rank elsewhere, works published prior to coming to Marquette University may be included as well. These scholarly works will be sent to external reviewers as well. Scholarly works (such as books) that cannot be uploaded electronically must be placed on reserve at the Raynor Library as well as mailed to external reviewers.

3.9 Scholarship Evaluation Summary Statement (Required)

The scholarship evaluation summary is to provide an overall assessment of scholarship performance since hire or tenure. This must include reference to the criteria and include evidence that substantiates whether or not the candidate has met these standards. A thorough explanation must be provided in cases where the candidate has experienced a late surge in scholarship.

4.0 Service Data

Service is very important in the life of a Marquette faculty member and as such a thorough evaluation is expected for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The dossier must provide a full evaluation of service including several pieces of evidence that are more fully articulated below.

4.1 Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement (Required)

The candidate's service philosophy statement must reflect the candidate's approach to service in the candidate's department, college, university, community and profession. This may include, but need not be limited to, the ways in which service is connected to the candidate's teaching and scholarship.

4.2 List of Service Activities (Required)

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.

4.3 Service Evaluation Summary Statement (Required)

Provide a statement that summarizes the evidence indicating the extent to which the candidate has met service expectations.

5.0 Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations

Include faculty letters, the candidate's reviews (annual and third-year reviews for tenure, or regular periodic reviews for promotion to professor), and evaluations with recommendations from the department, local committee and Dean.

5.1 Faculty Letters (Required)

All departmental faculty who cast a ballot regarding the promotion and/or tenure of a particular candidate must write a letter for inclusion in the dossier, 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 teaching, scholarship,

and service 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 exclusion must be clearly explained in the dossier by the dossier preparer.*

5.2 Third-year and Annual Reviews (Required)

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

5.3 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 teaching, scholarship, and service. Be sure to 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.

5.4 Local (Area/College) 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 teaching, scholarship, and service. Be sure to 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.

5.5 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 criteria around scholarship, teaching, and service. In addition, the Dean must address any weaknesses raised in the dossier.

6.0 Candidate Addendum

6.1 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 and/or tenure. The addendum must be included in the dossier before reaching the University Committee on Faculty Promotions and Tenure. A detailed explanation of why the material was added is to be provided by the candidate at the beginning of this section. Candidates are to discuss the desire to create a "Candidate Addendum" with the individual charged with preparing the dossier before doing so.

APPENDIX A

Promotion / Tenure 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 tenure track faculty member prior to coming to Marquette University _____
- 7a. Present Rank: Assistant Professor Associate Professor 7b. Start Date of Present Rank _____
- 8a. Proposed Rank: Associate Professor Professor 8b. Is candidate seeking tenure? Yes No
- 9a. Is candidate time-bound? Yes No 9b. If No, indicate time-bound year _____
- 10a. Has candidate taken any leaves of absences? Yes No 10b. If Yes, total number of years? _____

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

Candidate Name _____

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

Key:	R = Required	A = As Applicable	R/A	Uploaded to Electronic Dossier (✓)
Item				
1.0	Introductory Information			
1.1	Promotion / Tenure Proposal Form (Appendix A)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Checklist / Table of Contents (Appendix B)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	Curriculum Vitae		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4	Department and/or College Criteria		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.0	Teaching Data			
2.1	Candidate's Teaching Philosophy Statement		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2	Course List Table		R	<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		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.6	Department Policy on Peer Review of Teaching		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.7	Peer Review Evaluations		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.8	Teaching Grants, Awards, and Honors		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.9	Teaching Evaluation (Summary Statement)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.0	Scholarship Data			
3.1	Candidate's Scholarship Philosophy Statement		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2	List of Publications and Creative Work		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	Publication Outlet Evaluation and Citation Count		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.4	List of Presentations		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.5	Scholarly Awards and Honors		A	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6	Scholarly Grants (applied for and received)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.7	External Reviewer Letters		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.8	Scholarly Publications (Electronic Dossier Only)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.9	Scholarship Evaluation (Summary Statement)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.0	Service Data			
4.1	Candidate's Service Philosophy Statement		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	List of Service Activities		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3	Service Evaluation (Summary Statement)		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.0	Additional Letters, Reviews, and Recommendations			
5.1	Faculty Letters		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.2	Third-year and Annual Reviews		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.3	Department Evaluation with Recommendation		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.4	Local Committee Evaluation with Recommendation		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.5	Dean Evaluation with Recommendation		R	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.0	Candidate Addendum			
6.1	Addendum Materials		A	<input type="checkbox"/>

 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.