

Seattle University
Tenure and Promotion File Preparation Guidelines
Updated April 2022

PURPOSE OF THE RANK AND TENURE FILE GUIDELINES:

Tenure candidates and departmental and school/college-level review committees are to use these guidelines to assist them in preparing a file that will give the Seattle University Rank and Tenure Committee (URTC) the information it needs to conduct a full and fair review of the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. These guidelines indicate only the materials required by the URTC. Departmental and school or college personnel committees may require other materials. Therefore, candidates should consult with their relevant units to determine whether additional materials are required at these levels of review.

Note on Mid-Probationary Reviews: Tenure-track assistant professor faculty members preparing files for mid-probationary review should consult with their respective dean's offices for appropriate submission guidelines and deadlines.

MANAGEMENT OF RANK AND TENURE FILES:

The file for tenure and/or promotion is an application submitted by the candidate with recommendations added by evaluators at the department and school/college level as indicated in this document. The candidate's file is submitted to the Provost by the candidate's respective Dean's Office by December 15th. The candidate will supply materials for Sections I, III, IV, and V as outlined in this document and will have access to these sections upon request. All confidential materials, including those outlined in Section II of this document, will not be available to the candidate and will be managed consistent with the confidentiality provisions in Section VII of the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook*.

As of AY2013 candidate file materials are submitted in electronic format. Detailed information for creating this type of file is contained in a separate document – 'Electronic File Submission Guidelines.' This document can be accessed at:

The URTC reminds department chairs, deans, and department and school/college personnel rank and tenure committees that their recommendations should not merely advocate for the candidate, but rather should include a thorough analysis of the applicant's professional performance along with a detailed discussion of the basis for the recommendation. These reviews are significant information for the URTC in making its recommendations.

CONTENT OF TENURE FILES

(Content for Promotion to Professor Files follows this section)

Section I: Introductory Statement and Vita

A. The introductory statement summarizes and highlights the candidate's academic/professional activities as well as their accomplishments and philosophy with regard to teaching, scholarship, and service. This statement is an overview only and should provide a brief overall self-assessment that speaks directly to how the faculty member's work reflects and supports their field as well as the character and mission of the University as expressed in the University's mission statement. Faculty involved in graduate level education should address how their scholarship meets the greater expectation of scholarly and professional activity discussed in the *Faculty Handbook* Section III.B.

B. A comprehensive vita, including a full teaching, scholarship, and service history, follows the introductory statement. Candidates should bear in mind that members of the University Rank and Tenure Committee represent diverse disciplines and that specific information about accomplishments helps them to understand and interpret these accomplishments. Candidates are encouraged to use section headings to distinguish between professional and service-oriented presentations, and to provide context for various types of published scholarship and/or creative works in their curriculum vitae.

Section II: Department and School/College Actions and Recommendations

Section II.A: Departmental Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations (applies only to schools having a departmental review structure):

In schools/colleges having a departmental review structure, action must be taken by a formal Department Personnel Committee, which may be a special committee in larger departments or a committee of the whole serving as a personnel committee. Departmental action and recommendations must be presented in writing by the chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee.

The recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee must be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's activities in the three key areas of performance—teaching, scholarship, and service, as these areas are documented in the file. The recommendation must include an analysis of all three areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the committee's recommendation. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

Given that disciplines vary in their assessment of what constitutes appropriate professional work and productivity, URTC encourages the Department Personnel Committee to provide a

context and/or description of the types, levels/quality of publication venues, and measures of professional work and output appropriate to the candidate's discipline and/or specialty. In addition to materials included in the file, the Department Personnel Committee is encouraged to review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and other activities relevant to teaching.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (e.g., "7 recommend tenure; 1 recommends against"), date of action, a description of the committee (e.g., "8 members consisting of tenured faculty"), and the signatures of all committee members. The votes of specific committee members should not be disclosed.,

Members of the Department Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report. In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.B: Department Chairperson's Recommendation (applies only to schools/colleges that have a departmental structure):

Whether or not the department chairperson is a member of the department personnel committee, they will submit their own recommendation on the candidate's petition. The department chairperson is often informed of the candidate's performance in ways that department personnel committees are not and can offer additional contextual information that is helpful to URTC. This recommendation should be based on the chairperson's independent analysis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation must include an analysis of all three areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the recommendation, taking into account the candidate's particular field and/or specialty. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the department, school/college, and/or university.

Section II.C: School/College Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations:

School/college action must be taken by a formal School/College Personnel Committee, which must be constituted in a manner appropriate to its structure and consistent with its bylaws or procedural rules governing the committee.

The School/College Personnel Committee recommendation must be presented in writing. The recommendation must be based on a full review and analysis of all file materials and must include discussion of the basis for recommendation, including all three areas of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service). As appropriate, the school/college assessment of the

candidate's performance should clearly reflect any published guidelines the school/college has regarding productivity and quality in teaching, scholarship, and service. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

If the school/college does not have a departmental structure, the School/College Personnel Committee must review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and other relevant teaching activities.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (e.g., "7 recommend tenure; 1 recommends against"), date of action, a description of the committee (e.g., "8 members consisting of tenured faculty"), and the signatures of all committee members. The votes of specific committee members should not be disclosed.,

Members of the School/College Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report. In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.D: Dean's Recommendation:

The Dean must present in writing a fully justified recommendation that includes an analysis of all three areas of performance and that is based on a review of all file materials and of preceding recommendations. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university.

Section II.E.: External Letters

At least three evaluations from peers outside the university who can speak to the quality and significance of the candidate's professional work are required. External evaluators will be chosen according to the guidelines of the individual school or college, solicited by a representative of the dean's office and made available in the electronic file for reviewers. CVs for external reviewers do not need to be placed in the electronic file but should be available upon request. The role of external evaluators should be to assess the significance of the candidate's scholarship within the standards of the discipline. As context for the evaluation, external evaluators should be provided with materials outlining Seattle University and the applicable school/college policies and expectations for scholarship. While they are not expected to explicitly assess candidates according to these standards, external evaluators should be instructed that this is the SU context for evaluation and encouraged to review the file in accordingly. Evaluators should be encouraged to indicate

faculty contributions specific to the field and discouraged from making generic comparisons. In tenure evaluations, external reviews typically focus on scholarship, but reviewers may comment on aspects of teaching and service as part of an integrated assessment. External evaluators should be instructed to clearly state their relationship to the faculty member. In recruiting external evaluators, school or college representatives should take care to avoid inviting peer assessors with whom there is a clear conflict of interest.

Section III A&B: Prior Reviews

In the cases of applications for tenure, copies of all previous reviews (annual and formal) must be included in the materials for URTC. Typically, this includes Annual Performance Reviews and Mid-Probationary Reviews. If a faculty member petitioning for tenure has been granted time toward tenure and has not undergone a mid-probationary review, the circumstances should be clearly described in the dean's letter (and also the department chair, where relevant) and supporting documentation (in the form of a hiring agreement and/or notification from the provost's office) should be included in this section.

Section IV: Supporting Documents

The file should include supporting documentation for teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate. Each of the teaching, scholarship, and service sections of the file must include analytical reflection statements, written by the candidate, that discuss the contents of the respective sections and provide information that will help the committee interpret these contents. In these statements, candidates should explicitly address how their teaching, scholarship, and service contribute to the educational mission of the university. Candidates should also explicitly discuss the contexts for their performance in each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) as well as address areas of apparent weakness in the file and how those weaknesses are being or have been addressed. These reflections are especially important to the URTC's understanding of how to assess the candidate, including how possible weaknesses fit within the overall contributions of the candidate as well as the possibility for improvement.

Section IV.A: Teaching

1. Statement on Teaching: This statement acquaints the URTC to the candidate's philosophy of education, their discipline, and the courses taught. It presents the candidate's achievements in the area of teaching and how their teaching contributes to the overall educational mission of the university. The statement should present evidence demonstrating the candidate's effectiveness as an educator and the promotion of student learning. It is

recommended that the candidate address peer evaluations, student evaluations (including quantitative and qualitative analysis), and grading patterns. A list of courses taught with brief course descriptions is encouraged.

2. Student Evaluations:

Covid-19 Faculty Accommodations to Rank and Tenure File Preparation Guidelines (2015)

Optional inclusion of Student Evaluations for Spring 2020-Spring 2021

Faculty preparing files for tenure and promotion for Fall 2021 have the option to NOT include Student Evaluation scores from courses taught during Spring 2020-Spring 2021 in their summary chart and in their quantitative analysis. This accommodation was recommended by the ad hoc Faculty Accommodations Task Force and adopted by Academic Assembly and has been approved by the Provost. The University Rank and Tenure Committee recognizes that teaching during the pandemic has required unprecedented adjustments from faculty. We also recognize that the current teaching evaluation instruments have not been designed with these adjustments in mind. Accordingly, we do not expect faculty to submit student teaching evaluations for this period. If faculty would like to include evaluations for this period, they may do so. We encourage all faculty, regardless of whether or not they include student teaching evaluations for this period, to offer a narrative summary of their experience of teaching during the pandemic. This narrative is intended as contextual information and is an opportunity for faculty to describe the ways in which they have responded to the challenges of teaching during a pandemic.

All student evaluations should be done using the standard student evaluation form for the applicant's college/school.

In the case of an application for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, candidates must provide a summary chart of student ratings for all courses taught with comparison information on department and/or college/school student rating averages. The chart should be clearly identified by the following: year and quarter taught, course title and course number, and mean of scores for major evaluation categories on the school/college approved forms.

In the case of evaluation using computer-scored forms, the file must contain the individual computer-generated summaries for each course along with student comments in the Supporting Documents Teaching folder. In the case of courses not evaluated with computer-scored forms, a summary of the results along with the copy of the evaluation instrument is to be submitted. It is important that the candidate's appraisal of individual teaching evaluations relate to the overall quality of the candidate's teaching.

The context of student evaluations, especially quantitative scores, are not self-evident. Given that such evaluations provide just one way of assessing the quality of teaching, chairpersons

and/or departmental personnel committees, as well as the candidate, are strongly encouraged to include an interpretation of these evaluations. Deans should interpret candidates' student evaluations in light of the norms or standards for their schools/colleges while also taking into consideration the specific teaching context of the candidate.

(1) Quantitative analysis of student evaluations: The candidate should include some form of quantitative analysis or summary of the student evaluation data, such as data summaries and trends in the data over time. Such summaries must include the mean (average) of scores. Analysis of quantitative evaluations must also include information relating to the quarter or semester taught, course number, enrollment, whether the course is a requirement or an elective, and whether the course is a new preparation.

(2) Qualitative analysis of student evaluations: The candidate should thoughtfully comment on and interpret the student evaluations. For example, if a course was taught on an experimental basis, the success (or lack thereof) of this course should be discussed. The URTC encourages discussion that will help it understand the causes of and responses to negative patterns in the evaluation data.

3. Peer Evaluations: The URTC encourages annual peer reviews of all tenure-track faculty and requires that applications for tenure or promotion include at least three peer evaluations from the past two years. The peer evaluator should normally be a tenured faculty member. The selection of peer evaluators is normally made by the department chairperson (or dean in schools without departments) in consultation with the candidate.

The peer review process must be carried out in accordance with school/college and departmental policy, but must, at a minimum, include classroom visitations (or videotaping, visitation of student teaching, or clinical training, as appropriate) and a review of course syllabi and materials, sample written assignments, examinations, and grading patterns (the materials themselves should not be included).

The peer evaluation must include a description of the review process, a detailed report of the observations of the evaluator or evaluators and any recommendations that seem appropriate.

4. Grading Patterns: Information on grading patterns with comparison information on department and/or college/school grading patterns should be included. The faculty candidate should request information on grading patterns from her/his dean's office. Grading patterns included in the file should be for the past five years or the candidate's time at Seattle University, whichever is less.

Section IV.B: Scholarship

Statement on Scholarship: To assist the URTC with the evaluation of scholarship from different disciplines, candidates should present an overview of the focus of their scholarship, their achievements, and their goals or plans for future work. A brief description of selected professional projects should be included. Candidates should emphasize the relevance of the projects to their own professional development trajectory as well as indicate specific contributions to their field. Candidates are reminded that reviewers are not necessarily familiar with their field. Accordingly, a compelling statement is one that provides a context for the scholarly work and helps reviewers to assess its significance. This should include discussion of why particular venues for disseminating scholarly work were chosen and the significance to the field (for example, fields of practice which encourage podium presentations, specific scholarly journals or edited volumes intended to reach particular audiences or peers, venues for presenting creative works, etc.).

This section must include materials documenting the candidate's scholarship. In this context "scholarship" is to be understood as creative production, typically including books, peer-reviewed or equivalent articles, artistic productions, and other major works. Representative copies of manuscripts, conference presentations, reviews, creative artistic productions, software and websites developed, symposia or panel comments, and curricular or grant proposals may also be included. This section should contain only the two or three submissions that the candidate considers wishes to highlight. Hardcopies of books and other materials do not need to be included with the file, however all materials listed on the CV should be available to share with reviewers on request.

Section IV.C: Service

Statement on Service: The candidate's service contributions play an important role in the rank and tenure review process. The candidate's statement should address the record of service activities and also describe ways in which service activities are integrated into their overall faculty development and contributions in teaching and scholarship. Candidates are encouraged to highlight activities that may not be immediately evident, but which reflect their expertise and commitment to furthering the mission of Seattle University; to their field, and to related communities of practice. The record of service should be reflected in the candidate's vita and introductory statement. Additionally, departmental and school reviews must include an evaluation of the candidate's service.

Section V: Supplemental Supporting Materials:

This section contains materials not included elsewhere in the file that offer direct evidence of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and/or service. For example, monographs pertaining to community engagement, or notification of major grants and awards. Candidates should be judicious in their inclusion of these materials and should not include conference

programs, letters from students, etc. unless this material is specifically referenced elsewhere in the file (e.g. the candidate's teaching or scholarship statement) and has specific bearing on the case.

CONTENT OF PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR FILES

Section I: Holistic Faculty Development Statement and Curriculum Vita

Section I.A: Holistic Faculty Development Statement (HFDS).

In June 2021 the university approved revisions to the promotion guidelines that include an integrated statement on holistic faculty development. See Section VI.A of the *Faculty Handbook*. A faculty member petitioning for promotion to Professor will demonstrate a record of achievement that indicates systematic, programmatic, and/or sustained intentional development in one or more of the areas of faculty work as articulated in their adopted HFDP; The dossier will include an integrated statement that communicates and provides evidence of the outcomes of their HFDP.

The Holistic Faculty Development Statement is a reflective statement describing and documenting a record of sustained accomplishment and high competence demonstrating career-long integration with post-tenure evidence in one or more areas of faculty work. Areas of faculty work to which a faculty member may apply their expertise include:

- curriculum/program development;
- contributions to university leadership and institution building;
- research/scholarly/creative practice;
- applied and public scholarship;
- community-engaged scholarship, teaching, or other community engagement.

The statement should include:

- A detailed description of the areas in which the candidate has chosen to apply their expertise.
- A detailed description of their own professional development in these areas indicating sustained, intentional systematic or programmatic development.
- A detailed description of the communities of practice for which these activities are relevant. Relevant communities include, but are not limited to academic discipline, non-academic or public communities, and creative communities.
- A detailed description of activities, products, projects and/or related outcomes that arise from the faculty work described above.
- A description of and evidence for the impact or contributions of these activities, products, and/or projects.

Candidates are encouraged to keep in mind that reviewers may not be familiar with these areas and should therefore provide context for their work, explain its relevance within their chosen communities of practice, and describe the contributions or impact to communities of practice. Statements should be reflective and emphasize integrated trajectories of development and accomplishment.

Section I.B: Curriculum Vita

The file should include a comprehensive vita that has been designed to align with the Holistic Faculty Development Statement.

For additional guidance in preparing the HFDS and CV, see:

https://www.seattleu.edu/media/advance/documents/February-2022-Writing-Workshop-for-Faculty-Applying-for-Promotion_Slides.pdf

Section II: Department and School/College Actions and Recommendations

Section II.A: Departmental Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations (applies only to schools having a departmental review structure):

In schools/colleges having a departmental review structure, action must be taken by a formal Department Personnel Committee, which may be a special committee in larger departments or a committee of the whole serving as a personnel committee. Departmental action and recommendations must be presented in writing by the chairperson of the Department Personnel Committee.

The recommendation of the Department Personnel Committee must be based on a thorough assessment of the candidate's activities through the lens of the candidate's Holistic Faculty Development Plan. The recommendation must include an analysis of all the areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the committee's recommendation. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's contributions reflect systematic faculty development and contribution to the educational mission of Seattle University and the faculty member's own HFDP.

Given that disciplines vary in their assessment of what constitutes appropriate professional work and productivity, URTC encourages the Department Personnel Committee to provide a context and/or description of the types, levels/quality of publication venues, and measures of professional work and output appropriate to the candidate's discipline and/or specialty. In addition to materials included in the file, the Department Personnel Committee is encouraged to review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and other activities relevant to teaching.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (e.g., "7 recommend tenure; 1 recommends against"), date of action, a description of the committee (e.g., "8 members consisting of tenured faculty"), and the signatures of all committee members. The votes of specific committee members should not be disclosed.,

Members of the Department Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report.

In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.B: Department Chairperson's Recommendation (applies only to schools/colleges that have a departmental structure):

Whether or not the department chairperson is a member of the department personnel committee, they will submit their own recommendation on the candidate's petition. The department chairperson is often informed of the candidate's performance in ways that department personnel committees are not and can offer additional contextual information that is helpful to URTC. This recommendation should be based on the chairperson's independent analysis of the candidate's file. The recommendation must include an analysis of all the areas of performance and discussion of the basis for the committee's recommendation. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's contributions reflect systematic faculty development and contribution to the educational mission of Seattle University and the faculty member's own HFDP.

Section II.C: School/College Personnel Committee Actions and Recommendations:

School/college action must be taken by a formal School/College Personnel Committee, which must be constituted in a manner appropriate to its structure and consistent with its bylaws or procedural rules governing the committee.

The School/College Personnel Committee recommendation must be presented in writing. The recommendation must be based on a full review and analysis of all file materials and must include discussion of the basis for recommendation. As appropriate, the school/college assessment of the candidate's performance should clearly reflect any published guidelines the school/college has regarding faculty performance and evaluation at this level. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate's contributions reflect systematic faculty development and contribution to the educational mission of Seattle University and the faculty member's own HFDP.

If the school/college does not have a departmental structure, the School/College Personnel Committee must review and comment on course syllabi and materials, sample assignments and examinations, and other relevant teaching activities.

The written recommendation must include a report on the vote rendered by the committee (e.g., “7 recommend tenure; 1 recommends against”), date of action, a description of the committee (e.g., “8 members consisting of tenured faculty”), and the signatures of all committee members. The votes of specific committee members should not be disclosed.,

Members of the School/College Personnel Committee have the option of submitting a minority report. Minority reports must be submitted within the same document as the majority report. In cases where both a majority and minority report are submitted, the document must indicate the numbers of committee members represented by each report and should make clear the issues upon which the members of the committee disagree.

Section II.D: Dean’s Recommendation:

The dean must present in writing a fully justified recommendation that includes an analysis of the HFDP. Particular attention should be paid to how the candidate’s contributions reflect systematic faculty development and contribution to the educational mission of Seattle University and the faculty member’s own HFDP.

Section II.E.: External Letters

At least three evaluations from peers outside the university who can speak to the quality and significance of the candidate’s professional work are required. The external reviewers will be proposed by the faculty member in discussion with the designated representative of the dean’s office (including department chairs, where relevant) and will be selected based on the reviewers’ areas of expertise and ability to evaluate the quality of work identified by the faculty member in their HFDP. External reviewers of a faculty member’s dossier will be experts in their given areas, and at least two will be associated with an institution of higher education. As indicated by the HFDP and where appropriate, additional reviewers need not be associated with an institution of higher education and may be drawn from other sectors.

External evaluations will be solicited by a representative of the dean’s office and made available in the electronic file for reviewers. CVs for external reviewers do not need to be placed in the electronic file but should be available upon request. The role of external evaluators is to assess the significance of the candidate’s contributions within the context of holistic faculty development as described in Section VI.A of the *Faculty Handbook*. As context for the evaluation, external evaluators should be provided with materials describing holistic faculty development as well as the applicable school/college policies and expectations for promotion. While they are not expected to explicitly assess candidates according to these standards, external evaluators should be instructed that this is the SU context for evaluation and encouraged to review the file accordingly. Evaluators should be encouraged to indicate

faculty contributions specific to activities described in the HFDS, and discouraged from making generic comparisons. In selecting external evaluators, school or college representatives should take care to avoid inviting peer assessors with whom there is a clear conflict of interest.

Section III A&B: Prior Reviews

In the case of applications for promotion to professor, all annual reviews since the last formal review of the candidate by the URTC must be included. However, if the time between the last formal review and the new petition is greater than four years (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section VI), the candidate need only include the past five annual reviews (e.g., if ten years have passed between the formal review that led to tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, then the candidate need only include the past five annual reviews). Additional annual reviews may be included if they are needed to give an accurate context for the achievements of the candidate. Please explain the justification for the additional reviews in Holistic Faculty Development Statement.

Section IV: Supporting Documents

The file should include supporting documentation in TWO Sections. One for teaching and one for the areas of professional development and contribution as described in the Holistic Faculty Development Statement.

Section IV.A: Teaching

1. **Statement on Teaching:** This statement acquaints the URTC to the candidate's philosophy of education, their discipline, and the courses taught. It presents the candidate's achievements in the area of teaching and how their teaching contributes to the overall educational mission of the university. For promotion, candidates should emphasize development and contributions since tenure, including reflections on how their teaching is integrated with other faculty activities. The statement should present evidence demonstrating the candidate's effectiveness as an educator and the promotion of student learning. It is recommended that the candidate address peer evaluations, student evaluations (including quantitative and qualitative analysis), and grading patterns. A list of courses taught with brief course descriptions is encouraged.

Note for Faculty Administrators who have not taught courses in recent years. Faculty administrators petitioning from promotion who have not been teaching should provide a brief statement describing their contributions to teaching in their administrative roles, including curriculum planning, faculty and student mentoring, and related activities that indicate commitment to the Seattle University educational mission.

2. Student Evaluations:

Covid-19 Faculty Accommodations to Rank and Tenure File Preparation Guidelines (2015)

Optional inclusion of Student Evaluations for Spring 2020-Spring 2021

Faculty preparing files for tenure and promotion for Fall 2021 have the option to NOT include Student Evaluation scores from courses taught during Spring 2020-Spring 2021 in their summary chart and in their quantitative analysis. This accommodation was recommended by the ad hoc Faculty Accommodations Task Force and adopted by Academic Assembly and has been approved by the Provost. The University Rank and Tenure Committee recognizes that teaching during the pandemic has required unprecedented adjustments from faculty. We also recognize that the current teaching evaluation instruments have not been designed with these adjustments in mind. Accordingly, we do not expect faculty to submit student teaching evaluations for this period. If faculty would like to include evaluations for this period, they may do so. We encourage all faculty, regardless of whether or not they include student teaching evaluations for this period, to offer a narrative summary of their experience of teaching during the pandemic. This narrative is intended as contextual information and is an opportunity for faculty to describe the ways in which they have responded to the challenges of teaching during a pandemic.

All student evaluations should be done using the standard student evaluation form for the applicant's college/school.

For candidates seeking promotion to professor, a summary chart for all courses, minimally four years prior to the candidates' application should be included. All courses should be clearly identified by the following: year and quarter taught, course title and course number, and means for major evaluation categories on the school or colleges approved forms.

For faculty who have taught within ten years, but not the previous four years prior to petitioning for promotion, the most recently available courses should be included in this summary chart.

In the case of evaluation using computer-scored forms, the file must contain the individual computer-generated summaries for each course along with student comments in the Supporting Documents Teaching folder. In the case of courses not evaluated with computer-scored forms, a summary of the results along with the copy of the evaluation instrument is to be submitted. It is important that the candidate's appraisal of individual teaching evaluations relate to the overall quality of the candidate's teaching.

The context of student evaluations, especially quantitative scores, are not self-evident. Given that such evaluations provide just one way of assessing the quality of teaching, chairpersons and/or departmental personnel committees, as well as the candidate, are strongly encouraged

to include an interpretation of these evaluations. Deans should interpret candidates' student evaluations in light of the norms or standards for their schools/colleges while also taking into consideration the specific teaching context of the candidate.

(1) Quantitative analysis of student evaluations: The candidate should include some form of quantitative analysis or summary of the student evaluation data, such as data summaries and trends in the data over time. Such summaries must include the mean (average) of scores. Analysis of quantitative evaluations must also include information relating to the quarter or semester taught, course number, enrollment, whether the course is a requirement or an elective, and whether the course is a new preparation.

(2) Qualitative analysis of student evaluations: The candidate should thoughtfully comment on and interpret the student evaluations. For example, if a course was taught on an experimental basis, the success (or lack thereof) of this course should be discussed. The URTC encourages discussion that will help it understand the causes of and responses to negative patterns in the evaluation data.

3. Peer Evaluations: The URTC encourages annual peer reviews of all tenure-track faculty and requires that applications for tenure or promotion include at least three peer evaluations from the past two years. The peer evaluator should normally be a tenured faculty member. The selection of peer evaluators is normally made by the department chairperson (or dean in schools without departments) in consultation with the candidate.

The peer review process must be carried out in accordance with school/college and departmental policy, but must, at a minimum, include classroom visitations (or videotaping, visitation of student teaching, or clinical training, as appropriate) and a review of course syllabi and materials, sample written assignments, examinations, and grading patterns (the materials themselves should not be included).

The peer evaluation must include a description of the review process, a detailed report of the observations of the evaluator or evaluators and any recommendations that seem appropriate.

Section IV.B: Evidence of Holistic Faculty Development and Contribution

Inventory of Materials: To assist the URTC with the evaluation of evidence provided, the candidate should provide an inventory describing the various products, activities, and related materials being submitted in support of the promotion application. Candidates should emphasize the relevance of the projects to their own professional development trajectory as well as indicate specific contributions to designated communities of practice. Candidates are reminded that reviewers are not necessarily familiar with their field. Accordingly, a compelling statement is one that provides a context for products and activities and helps reviewers to assess their

significance. In the case of scholarly or creative work, this should include discussion of why particular venues for disseminating scholarly work were chosen and the significance to the field (for example, fields of practice which encourage podium presentations, specific scholarly journals or edited volumes intended to reach particular audiences or peers, venues for presenting creative works, etc.). In the case of institution building and community engagement, specific activities, with supporting documentation of evidence of impact should be highlighted.

Hardcopies of books, physical creative works, and related materials do not need to be included with the file, however all materials listed on the CV should be available to share with reviewers on request.

Section V: Supplemental Supporting Materials:

This section contains materials not included elsewhere in the file that offer direct evidence of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and/or service. For example, monographs pertaining to community engagement, or notification of major grants and awards. Candidates should be judicious in their inclusion of these materials and should not include conference programs, letters from students, etc. unless this material is specifically referenced elsewhere in the file (e.g., the candidate's teaching or scholarship statement) and has specific bearing on the case.

Submission of Documentation

For complete instructions on electronic submission of review documentation, refer to the Electronic Portfolio Guide for Faculty on the Policies and Procedures page of the Office of Academic Affairs. <http://www.seattleu.edu/academicaffairs/policies/>