April 25, 2013

Committee on Personnel (COP) Guidelines

for the Preparation of Cases

This document is a consolidation of what used to be several separate documents sent out annually to department chairs and candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.

Please see Appendix D for a helpful “Checklist for submitting cases of reappointment, tenure and promotion.”
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**1. Due Dates**

First, be aware of the deadline dates. COP will begin its consideration of personnel cases with review of tenured faculty, and proceed through reappointments, tenure, then promotions to full professor.

You must adhere to these deadlines. Plan the preparation of the cases such that the deadlines can be met. Given the time delays and difficulties that can be encountered in the solicitation and receipt of outside letters, Departments should start this process early, beginning with solicitation of outside letters during the summer. Do not assume that a personnel case submitted after the deadline will be accepted for review by COP.

**Third Monday in Sept REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FROM USE OF**

(September 16, 2013) **EXTERNAL LETTERS FOR REAPPOINTMENT**

See page 2 under Reappointment for more on this.

**First Monday in Oct PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

(October 7, 2013) COP will review tenured faculty who have not been reviewed by COP for at least seven years, and Lectureships (including

Professors of Practice) that have not been reviewed by COP for

six years.

**Last Monday in Oct DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL GUIDELINES**

(October 28, 2013) If your department is putting forward a personnel case of any

kind, you need to review your department guidelines to make sure that they comply with the Faculty Handbook and are current with any changes made in the Handbook since COP last

reviewed your guidelines. Please indicate in a cover letter what changes have been made since COP last approved the guidelines.

Please provide a copy of your department guidelines to faculty members undergoing personnel reviews in the coming year.

**Third Monday in Jan REAPPOINTMENTS, TENURE, PROMOTION**

(January 20, 2014)

**Third Friday in March PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR AND** (March 21, 2014) **FULL PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE**

**2. How Many Copies to Submit**

All cases for reappointment, promotion and tenure must be assembled using the notebooks and tabs provided by the administration (for review of tenured faculty and review of lectureship positions, please use whatever format best suits your case):

Please number the pages in the case statement (all of Tab 1)! And please use 12 point type on all printed materials.

**Please submit SEVEN + the original = EIGHT total notebooks** directly to Deb Brenner in the Provost’s Office. *NOTE that* *only 7 copies total are needed if your department includes a current member of COP, as COP members do not take part in deliberations on members from their home department.*

The “original” case must contain original documents, if there are any, such as paper letters from reviewers. If student letters are submitted, the original case must include the original student letters, even if copies of the case contain student letters that have been re-typed.

There are two exceptions to the 8 (or 7) copy rule:

1. The original University Wide Teaching Evaluations (UWTE) filled out by the students do not need to be copied. The original UWTEs need to be submitted separately from, and at the same time as, the 7 or 8 case notebooks;
2. the CVs of external reviewers should be included in the original case notebook ONLY. We need only that one set. Do not insert reviewer CVs into the other notebooks.

PLEASE double-side copy allcase materials. This will save in paper and shredding costs, cut in half the size of these case notebooks and help in the greening of Clark.

Note that the entire case, including reviewer CVs, needs to be submitted electronically to Deb Brenner, for the COP fileshare. This should happen at about the same time that the paper notebooks are submitted.

**3. General Guidelines for Submission**

COP, in agreement with the administration, has reaffirmed the usefulness of specific guidelines in relation to its deliberations on personnel cases.

Personnel cases will be reviewed according to the standards and procedures specified in the Faculty Handbook. Departments must maintain written departmental personnel guidelines that are consistent with the Faculty Handbook and that have been reviewed and approved by COP. Cases must be prepared in accordance with departmental guidelines.

3.1 Reappointment.

A reappointment review must include a comprehensive review of teaching and of professional and scholarly activity. The review of professional and scholarly activities should include the solicitation of outside letters on behalf of the candidate unless exemption is granted by COP.

Recognizing the difficulty of repeated requests for both departments and reviewers, COP will entertain recommendations for reappointment that do not include outside letters. If the department and the candidate agree not to solicit letters, they must request an exemption from COP by completing and returning a "Request for Exemption from Use of External Letters of Recommendation” form, attached (Appendix A). COP reserves the right to require outside letters in individual cases, after it has conducted a preliminary review of the personnel case.

COP recommends that candidates and departments considering the possibility of requesting exemption from use of external letters discuss this option with the Provost.

3.2 Tenure and Promotion.

3.2.1 Standards for promotion and tenure are described in the Faculty Handbook.

3.2.2 Note that the Faculty Handbook cautions against personnel recommendations

solely on the basis of promise without demonstrated achievements.

3.2.3 Tenure-on-appointment cases will be considered by COP as specified in the

document “Guidelines for Granting Tenure on Appointment,” in section 7.

3.2.4 Concerning promotion to the rank of Professor, COP wishes to make note of the

following with respect to the possible promotion of associate professors who

have been in rank for a long period. In some instances, a combination of

continued excellence in teaching and contributions significantly beyond the

normal expectations to the essential work of the University may be used to

complement a record of scholarship which otherwise might be insufficient for

promotion to full professor.

3.2.5 When a promotion case to the rank of Professor is not approved, submission of a new

case will normally occur no sooner than two years after the previous submission.

3.3 Review of Tenured Faculty.

The “Procedures for Periodic Review of Faculty” is found in section 8.

**4. Process**

4.1 Cases must include the steps called for in (1) the department’s own policies, (2) this document, “COP Guidelines for the Preparation of Cases,” (3) the Faculty Handbook.

4.2 In general, it is the sense of COP that the candidate should have access to all details

of a recommendation as long as their disclosure does not violate confidentiality.

4.3 In some cases departmental guidelines require the solicitation of individual student letters as an additional source of information on teaching effectiveness. Where individual student letters are required, a robust effort must be made to obtain such input, and the process used to obtain the letters must be described in the case. If individual student letters are solicited, they should be solicited from (i) students or former students nominated by the candidate and (ii) students or former students randomly selected by the Office of Student Records. These students should be apprised that their letters will be regarded as confidential to the extent that the law allows. Letters that the department receives from students should be included in the case binder under Tabs 4 and 5 as appropriate. (See 5.4 and 5.5 below)

4.4 One question that has arisen on rare occasions pertains to a nominal honorarium to external reviewers. The general assumption throughout the academic community is that we provide evaluations of each other’s work as a matter of professional service, and departments at Clark University, therefore, do not normally offer to compensate external reviewers. If there is an occasion, however, where a department feels such payment must be offered to the reviewers in a particular field or case, permission must be sought from the Provost, and the letters to the external reviewers and the case write-up must mention the arrangement.

4.5 After the department has prepared a draft of the case statement and voted on the case, and before the case is forwarded to the Provost, the candidate should be allowed to view a version of the report that has been redacted to preserve confidentiality of all persons providing input into the case. This aspect of the process should be described in the case. The purpose of this is so that the candidate may correct errors and be apprised of the status of the case. The candidate may provide written comment on the case, and the candidate’s comments should be included with the case. A department may, but is under no obligation to, revise the draft based upon the candidate’s comments.

4.6 In the event of a negative vote at the departmental level, the Provost must be kept

informed at each stage of the process. Whenever the candidate is informed of action

taken by the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Provost should also be informed.

4.7 There must be an opportunity for a candidate to appeal a negative recommendation at

the departmental level before the case is forwarded to the Provost and COP. The

candidate’s written appeal should be included in the case submitted to COP.

4.8 COP does not require that a candidate be allowed to appeal a weak positive

recommendation, although a department may allow the practice.

**5. Case Structure**

The Tab numbers below refer to the 8 tabs in case notebooks. For reappointment, tenure and promotion cases, notebooks must be used. For review of tenured faculty and review of Lectureship positions, do not use case notebooks. Please use whatever format best suits your case.

Note that individual department personnel guidelines may require additional materials beyond those specified in these guidelines.

5.1 **Tab 1: Department Recommendation and Report**

**Materials under Tab 1 must be paginated, and must include the following:**

5.1.1 A specific recommendation.

The materials submitted should result in a formal departmental recommendation for action. The report should indicate the actual vote of the department personnel committee. There should be an opportunity for minority reports. The candidate must be informed of the recommendation before it is transmitted to the Administration and COP and *the case should indicate that this has occurred.*

5.1.2 The name of the person with overall responsibility for preparation of the case*.*

5.1.3 A description of the process through which the recommendation was reached.

Please describe the process in sufficient detail that COP can confirm that the process followed is consistent with the Faculty Handbook and with departmental personnel guidelines.

5.1.4 A description of the process used in selection of blind and non-blind reviewers.

This is particularly significant. Please see Section 6, "Guidelines for Solicitation of Letters,” for important details.

Departments are strongly encouraged to solicit more than the minimum number of letters so as to assure that the minimum number required are obtained.

5.1.5 A statement on the organizational context of the recommendation, providing a description and evaluation of the role of the candidate in relation to the objectives of the department and the University.

It is important to comment on the role of the candidate in terms of field of interest, within the department and the University, including expected contributions to interdisciplinary programs.

5.1.6 Evaluation by the department of the scholarly or creative activities enumerated in the CV.

Note that this evaluation applies to the activities of the entire professional career of the candidate. It is important to comment on the quality and standing of journals and publishers, including whether journals are refereed, and the nature and scope of contributions of candidates to co-authored works. Evaluation of creative works by the department is also essential.

Since the significance of different types of publications varies across fields (e.g. conference proceedings), please be sure to indicate in the case the importance of each category of publication included on the candidate’s CV.

Departments should be sure to include in the case an evaluation of scholarship relative to the standards for scholarship and creative achievement contained in the Faculty Handbook (Section II, A3). The evaluation should make clear how such standards are manifest in the particular field of study and should draw on the outside letters and curriculum vita in making the evaluation.

Where publications involve co-authors, COP asks that the department clarify the contribution of the candidate for each publication (lead author, etc.).

5.1.7 A statement describing the credentials of the outside reviewers and their

relationships to the candidate, if any.

5.1.8 A listing of the scholarly materials submitted to the outside reviewers for their

consideration.

5.1.9 An analysis of the letters submitted by the outside reviewers.

In the past, there have been situations in which the contents of the letters have

been interpreted differently by COP and the department. It should not be

assumed that the materials contained in the letters are self-evident. Please be sure to address in the case the content of the letters of the outside reviewers.

Be sure to indicate “B” for blind or “NB” for non-blind after every quote from a reviewer within the narrative case.

5.1.10 An analysis of the role of the candidate in the overall (undergraduate and

graduate) teaching and advising needs of the department.

Evaluation by the department should include an examination of the teaching of the candidate as it relates to the teaching needs of the department, size of classes taught, level of classes and students, lecture, seminar or laboratory format. An analysis of enrollment data is expected. If the candidate has a reduced teaching load because of his or her heavy involvement in individual instruction (thesis supervision, etc.), the department should provide COP with evidence regarding the quality and quantity of such instruction.

5.1.11 An analysis of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate.

Each copy of the case should include (under Tab 6) the computer generated summary sheets from the UWTEs for all courses taught by the candidate since

the previous reappointment or appointment, up to a maximum of three years for

reappointment and tenure cases, and at least six years for promotion to professor cases.

The original UWTEs should be submitted separately from the notebooks. Copies are not needed in the notebooks.

Chairs are encouraged to visit classes of the candidate as well as to review materials developed and used in classes. Review of teaching portfolios is also recommended as part of case preparation because portfolios may provide significant insight into the candidate’s view of teaching progress and plans for improvement of teaching. However, portfolios should not be submitted to COP as COP will not review them.

It is important that departments complement a review of UWTEs with a discussion of course syllabi, exams, and other assignments, the observation of the candidate’s classes, and teaching statements written by the candidate. Letters from students, notes from interviews and other materials should also be included.

Please describe the process by which information on teaching effectiveness was gathered.

In analyzing teaching effectiveness, departments should draw on all of the primary materials referenced above, including both the quantitative and written comments contained in the UWTE.

In discussing the UWTEs, the department should include a table (under Tab 6) summarizing the candidate’s evaluations in relation to those of the department and of the University as a whole. Also include data on the percentage of students in each class completing evaluations. Please use the form (or an equivalent ) provided in Appendix C.

If additional primary information on teaching effectiveness is obtained by the department (e.g. student letters), this information should be evaluated in the case. The department should look for evidence of teaching effectiveness, and evaluate the teaching in the light of the department’s and candidate’s teaching goals.

Sample letters to students, both graduate and undergraduate, and the letters themselves are to be inserted under Tabs 4 and 5.

5.1.12 An analysis by the department of activities other than teaching and scholarly research, relating to service to the department, the University and the community.

The Faculty Handbook states that the following are the general criteria for such activities: "Significant contribution to the essential educational work of the University outside the classroom, including development of departmental

programs, and participation in University planning or shaping of educational policy, in conspicuously important student advisory functions and committee work, and in academically relevant civic and community services."

5.1.13 An evaluation of the candidate’s contributions to interdisciplinary and/or cross-

program activities.

Departments should be careful to solicit the appropriate letters.

5.1.14 For reappointment cases, a copy of the first year teaching review.

5.1.15 For tenure cases, a copy of any COP “flag” from the candidate’s reappointment letter.

5.1.16 The case should also include details about any special arrangements with the Provost, e.g. someone hired with a shortened time to tenure.

5.2 **Tab 2: Candidate’s CV, Research and Teaching Statements**

**Materials under Tab 2 must include the following:**

5.2.1 Curriculum vita provided by the faculty member.

The curriculum vita should be current as of the date the case was considered

by the department and cover the period that COP will review. The chair should review the submitted CV to make sure that it is in the proper form. Publications should be broken down into appropriate sub-categories (e.g. peer reviewed

versus non-peer reviewed articles). Details on professional activity, such as presentations at professional conferences, should be included. Full details of publications must be provided (page numbers, grant amounts, a full listing of

co-authors, and so on).

5.2.2 A short reflective teaching statement that discusses aspects of their teaching.

Candidates for reappointment *must* include a teaching statement. Candidates for

tenure and/or promotion are encouraged, but not required, to provide such a

statement. In neither case should the statement exceed three pages.

5.2.3 A short summary overview of the candidate’s scholarly interests.

Candidates for reappointment, tenure or promotion are encouraged, but not

required, to write a short summary overview, again not to exceed three pages.

5.3 **Tab 3: Sample Letter to External Reviewers and External Reviewer Letters. (external reviewer CVs in original case only)**

**Materials under Tab 3 must include the following:**

5.3.1 Sample letter to external reviewers.

5.3.2 External reviewers letters.

These must be signed by the reviewer in some fashion: either a paper letter sent through the mail; an emailed scan of a signed letter sent by the reviewer; or an email sent by the reviewer with an electronic signature. If a paper letter is received, the original letter itself should be placed in the original case notebook.

Letters should be ordered this way: all Blind letters first, in alphabetical order by last name; a blank sheet of colored paper; all non-Blind letters, in alphabetical order by last name.

5.3.3 Reviewers’ CVs. These are submitted onlyin the original case notebook.

5.4 **Tab 4: Sample Letter to Undergraduates and their Responses**

**Materials under Tab 4 must include the following:**

Undergraduate student support information, including any letter sent out to solicit this

information.

If student letters are submitted, the original case must include the original student letters, even if copies of the case contain student letters that have been re-typed.

5.5 **Tab 5: Sample Letter sent to Graduate Students, their Responses,**

**Graduate Student Report (all if applicable)**

**Materials under Tab 5 must include the following:**

If applicable, graduate student support information, including any letter sent out

soliciting this information.

If student letters are submitted, the original case must include the original student letters, even if copies of the case contain student letters that have been re-typed.

5.6 **Tab 6: Course Evaluation Summary Sheets, Fall xxxx to Spring xxxx**

**Materials under Tab 6 must include the following:**

5.6.1 A summary table listing all courses taught by the candidate during the review period, with enrollments. Use the table provided in Appendix C.

5.6.2 Course evaluation data summary sheets for all courses taught during the review

period.

Please indicate the span of years on the tab itself.

5.6.3 For reappointment cases only, a copy of the first year teaching review.

5.7 **Tab 7: Service Letters**

**Materials under Tab 7 must include the following:**

Letters referring to the candidate’s service within and outside the university.

5.8 **Tab 8: Department Personnel Procedures**

**Materials under Tab 8 must include the following:**

A copy of the department’s personnel procedures.

If these have changed since COP last reviewed them, they must be approved by COP prior to submission of this case. Please be sure the candidate has received a copy.

**6. Guidelines for the Solicitation of External Review Letters.**

6.1 Required Letters from External Reviewers.

Outside letters of reference are to be solicited on initial tenure-track appointments, reappointments, tenure, and promotion cases. The letters are to be solicited from experts in the candidate’s field of study. Typically “experts” will be of senior rank (Full Professor) or of other equivalent standing. The recommendation made in a case (positive or negative) is strengthened by letters from faculty of high standing in the appropriate field of scholarship. **Care must be taken in documenting in the personnel case the specific process used to obtain external reviews**.

Individual reviewers should be able to provide independent assessments of a candidate’s work. Thus, multiple blind reviewers typically should not be solicited from within the same department.

*Exemption from use of external letters*. Recognizing the difficulty of repeated requests for both departments and reviewers, COP will entertain recommendations for

**reappointment** that do not include outside letters. To exercise this option, the department and the candidate must request an exemption from COP for the solicitation and inclusion of external letters. COP reserves the right to request outside letters in individual cases, after it has conducted a preliminary review of the personnel case. If a department and candidate wish to forgo the solicitation of outside letters, they must complete a "Request for Exemption from use of External Letters of Recommendation" form (Appendix A). It is recommended that candidates and departments who are considering the possibility of requesting exemption from use of external letters discuss this option with the Provost.

*Resolicitation of reviewers*. In some instances a reviewer who has previously written (to Clark University) on behalf of a candidate will be asked to serve again as a reviewer. In such a situation the reviewer should be encouraged to report on changes in the candidate's work from the previous review. If the department wishes that more than one evaluator be resolicited, COP must be consulted. Departments should be careful to justify their use of non-academic reviewers.

6.2 Number of Letters to be Solicited.

6.2.1 For reappointment, a minimum of four letters is required, of which at least two

must be from “blind” reviewers who are disinterested in the outcome of the

personnel case.

6.2.2 For tenure and promotion, there should be a minimum of five letters, of which at

least three must be from "blind” reviewers who are disinterested in the outcome

of the personnel case.

6.2.3 Departments are **strongly encouraged** to solicit more than the minimum number of required letters to ensure that the requisite number of letters is included in the case. This is especially important for ‘blind’ letters. It is not uncommon for COP to conclude that a letter originally solicited as ‘blind’ is in fact a non-blind letter.

6.3 Confidentiality.

The candidate should not know the identity of any of the reviewers.

6.4 Non-blind reviewers

Non-blind reviewers are reviewers who may have had significant contact with the candidate or who may have an interest in the outcome of the case. They typically include collaborators, former mentors, persons who have had significant interaction with the candidate or the Clark department of the candidate. It is expected that “non-blind” reviewers should still be objective.

A candidate will be invited to provide an annotated list of not less than five “non-blind” reviewers from which a department may select some. The list provided by the candidate should be long enough to protect the anonymity of the reviewers. If a reviewer’s name is on the candidate’s list of non-blind reviewers, COP will normally take the position that the reviewer is non-blind.

This annotated list should state briefly what the candidate’s relationship is to each of the reviewers. This should help prevent overlap between the candidate’s list of non-blind reviewers and the list of blind reviewers drawn up by the department. Candidates should be cautioned not to nominate as non-blind reviewers scholars who might legitimately be selected as blind reviewers by the department. The last should not be included in the case.

A department may select additional non-blind reviewers. In some cases, a reviewer solicited as a “blind” reviewer may turn out to have an interest in the case or have had significant contact with the candidate, in which case the reviewer should be reclassified as “non-blind.”

6.5 Blind Reviewers.

Blind reviewers are those who satisfy the following criteria:

a. they are experts in their field;

b. they are disinterested in the outcome of the personnel case.

The second criterion requires elaboration. Disinterested parties have no personal links to the candidate. People who are not disinterested parties would include a dissertation supervisor, a post-doctoral mentor, or a research collaborator. It is permissible for a disinterested party to be acquainted with the candidate or the candidate's work. Researchers who know the candidate and his or her work through publications, presentations at conferences or workshops could qualify as disinterested parties. The critical issue is that the reviewer has no personal interest in the outcome of the reviewing process.

6.6 Possible Means of Selecting Blind Reviewers.

6.6.1 The department chair and/or the departmental personnel committee may select reviewers known to be knowledgeable and respected in the candidate's field.

6.6.2 The chair and/or committee may select reviewers whose work is frequently cited in the candidate's own publications.

6.6.3 Editors of leading journals or other leading figures in the candidate's field may be asked for names of possible blind reviewers.

6.6.4 If 6.6.1 through 6.6.3 are unsuccessful in identifying a complete list of blind reviewers, it is permissible to ask the candidate for a long list including at least 15 names of potential blind reviewers. From this list the department may, but is not obligated to, select reviewers. In no case shall all names on the final list be selected from the candidate’s list.

6.6.5 The department chair may contact people on the candidate’s long list of potential blind reviewers, see 6.6.4, to ask them for the names of other potential blind reviewers.

6.6.6 COP recommends that ‘non-blind’ reviewers not be used to identify possible blind reviewers.

6.6.7 It should be emphasized that 6.6.4 and 6.6.5 are less preferred options for the selection of reviewers, and that COP may request additional reviews if it judges that the process has been flawed.

6.6.8 Note that in no case is the candidate to know the identity of blind reviewers. It may be desirable in some cases, where there is possible controversy over the candidate or the field, to allow the candidate to recommend deletion of names from a lengthy potential list.

6.7 The Letter to Potential Referees.

It is appropriate to ask potential reviewers if they are willing to do the review before sending materials. In order to give the potential reviewers an adequate understanding of the task at hand, they should be informed what quantity of materials will be sent to them if they agree to serve. They should also be told when the review must be in the hands of the department (in order for it to complete its review).

The wording of the department's letter to outside reviewers is particularly important. A model letter is attached. (Appendix B).

The letter must not contain anything that may be read as advocacy for or against the candidate. The committee suggests that the following points be included in the initial letter to reviewers. (Some chairs will do their initial contact by telephone. In this case, the following points should be covered in the call and/or in a follow-up letter.)

6.7.1 Begin the letter by describing the particular personnel decision and the role of

outside reviewers in the process.

6.7.2 The reviewer should be asked to evaluate the candidate's work by establishing

the quality and impact of the research or creative activity. In some instances it

may be appropriate to concentrate on a portion or subset of the candidate's

accomplishments.

6.7.3 The letter to the reviewer should briefly describe the candidate's areas of research, and should not discuss either teaching or service. It may be appropriate

to mention any research teams of which the candidate is a member, in order to

describe the type of research being done by the candidate.

6.7.4 There should be a standard paragraph describing the personnel process at Clark

for the decision being made on the particular candidate. This section should make clear that the role of the evaluator is to assess the research of the candidate. It can be said that it is not the role of the evaluator to make a recommendation on

promotion, tenure or reappointment. This description should point out the role of

the department and COP.

6.7.5 The reviewer should be asked to indicate whether and how the candidate is

known by her/him.

6.7.6 COP requests that the following paragraph be used in letters to outside reviewers:

Under current policies and practices at Clark University, the identities of outside reviewers are, within limitations imposed by law, regarded as confidential. Following a suggestion of the American Association of University Professors, candidates will have access to outside letters in a form redacted solely to delete any reference that would compromise the anonymity of the outside reviewer. You may wish to alert us to any special features of your letter that might need to be deleted or modified to protect your anonymity. The unredacted letters are for limited use within the University. However, various governmental agencies may have a legal right to such evaluations, and it is possible that future federal or state law may afford the person being evaluated full access to the evaluations.

6.7.7 A current CV of the reviewer must be obtained.

6.7.8 Proof of signature on all reviewers’ letters is needed.

**7. Guidelines for the Granting of Tenure on Appointment.**

7.1 Tenure on appointment shall be possible only for new faculty who are offered a position at the Associate Professor or Full Professor level and who have:

7.1.1 completed at least five years of full-time teaching at peer institutions;

7.1.2 undergone a careful tenure review at one of those institutions including, at a minimum, departmental review and the solicitation of blind external scholarly reviews; and

7.1.3 been granted tenure as a result of that review.

7.1.4 No exception may be made to these eligibility criteria for consideration for tenure upon appointment at Clark.

7.2 Tenure on appointment can be recommended to the President only after careful review by, and on the positive recommendation of, all three of the following bodies at Clark: the home department, the Provost, and the Committee on Personnel.

7.3 A decision on tenure at appointment will be made only after the decision has been made to offer a tenure-track position to a candidate and after the home department has recommended that tenure be granted. The Provost may make an offer of appointment to the candidate prior to the decision on tenure. The candidate will be informed that a separate decision on tenure on appointment will be made after COP review of the department’s recommendation and all supporting materials.

7.4 The department will forward its recommendation on tenure to the Provost, who must concur with the recommendation before sending it on to COP. The department recommendation must explain fully why it considers an offer of tenure appropriate and provide the necessary supporting evidence. It is expected that the department will have anticipated this need and obtained the supporting material as part of its normal search process, well in advance of submitting the request. COP will consider the request as expeditiously as possible in light of the need to review carefully the evidence of scholarly accomplishment and teaching effectiveness commensurate with Clark’s standards for tenure. COP will expect, at a minimum, a full CV, outside letters of recommendation that provide a thorough assessment of the candidate’s scholarly or creative accomplishment, and any available data on teaching effectiveness at other institutions that the recommending department has obtained. If necessary, COP may request additional information to assist in its deliberations.

7.5 COP will then vote on a motion to recommend to the President that an offer of tenure be extended upon appointment. The usual rules and procedures for such motions will be followed, with the exceptions that (a) there will be only one vote rather than the customary two and (b) the candidate shall have no right of appeal.

**8. Procedures for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty and Faculty holding Lectureship Positions.**

8.1 In 1995, the Faculty Assembly approved a regular review of tenured faculty by COP, and the first set of periodic reviews was carried out in the 1995-96 academic year. In 1999, the Faculty Handbook was modified to include the post-tenure review. In 2012 the Faculty Handbook was further modified to include periodic review of Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Professors of Practice and Associate Professors of Practice.

COP and the academic administration concur that the objective is to set up a system of periodic review that is constructive and beneficial, both to the individual undergoing review and to the relevant department or program. The review process is designed to address, as appropriate, all three areas specified in the Faculty Handbook relevant to advancement at the University: scholarship/creative work (not relevant for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, Professors of Practice and Associate Professors of Practice), teaching,

and service. The review is intended to provide an opportunity for the faculty member to consciously address the direction, balance, and quality of work in these areas. With the

amendment of our sabbatical policy, the timing of post-tenure reviews is no longer linked to sabbatical plans.

Faculty reviews will be conducted for tenured faculty who have not been reviewed by COP in the past seven years and for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Professors of Practice and Associate Professors of Practice on a six-year cycle. The Provost prepares a list of candidates for faculty review and sends this to departments by the beginning of the academic year.

To prevent the review process from becoming unduly burdensome, COP has adopted some guidelines, which are given below. The intention of COP and the administration is that the time and effort involved in preparing the review should be modest, particularly where departments have already developed effective annual review processes. The review is not intended to supplant or diminish the annual review of all faculty. The emphasis of the post-tenure review should be on the long-run, and should be complementary to the short-term focus of the annual reviews. The review is intended to yield significant benefits, including the following:

8.1.1 improving dialogue between individual faculty and their chairs;

8.1.2 revealing areas of faculty activity that require attention or improvement, and an understanding of the reasons for poor progress in these areas;

8.1.3 revealing inappropriate imbalances in the allocation of effort in the three critical areas, thus providing an opportunity for the faculty member to reevaluate goals and re-prioritize his or her academic duties to facilitate long-term career goals, including, for example, promotion to full professor;

8.1.4 developing strategies for more effective use of sabbatical leaves, and helping identify conditions that could promote successful sabbatical activity;

8.1.5 informing the department of an individual faculty member's contributions to the long-term operation of the department in the areas of teaching and service;

8.1.6 realigning departmental duties to better and more fairly utilize the abilities of all faculty;

8.1.7 optimizing the fit between a faculty member's strengths and departmental plans, enabling departments/programs to function more efficiently.

8.2 PROCESS

Perhaps the most important component of the whole review is a comprehensive and constructive dialogue between the faculty member being reviewed and the department/ program chair. COP views its role primarily as a monitor of the intradepartmental review process. While the Chair will normally take the primary role in carrying out the review,

COP expects that the final document will be shared with the entire department and represent the majority opinion of the department*.* If appropriate, areas of disagreement

among departmental faculty should be noted. Where a Chair is being evaluated, a tenured faculty member shall be assigned to lead the review. COP recommends that each department insure that their personnel procedures document addresses these processes of faculty reviews. Where the faculty member has significant involvement in other departments or programs, the Chair should obtain input from the Chairs of such departments or programs, as appropriate.

Once the necessary information has been collected, the Chair and the candidate should discuss the materials in detail, including a discussion of the “retrospective and prospective” document prepared by the candidate. The Chair will then write a report to COP and share this with the department and then the candidate, redacting only those parts required to protect the identity of individuals.

Chairs should submit to the Provost, by the first Monday in October, the following. (Note that a notebook with tabs is not needed for submitting periodic reviews of tenured faculty or for lectureship reviews; please use whatever format best suits your case):

8.2.1 A description of the departmental process followed.

8.2.2 The candidate’s full and up-to-date vita.

8.2.3 A statement from the candidate presenting a retrospective and prospective view of his or her overall activity (scholarship and/or practice activity as appropriate, teaching and service), which would give an assessment of previous achievements and trends as well as discuss future directions/goals. This should  not exceed three pages.

8.2.4 A tablesummarizing all classes taught, with enrollments, for the last six years.

8.2.5 An evaluative summary of teaching performance at both graduate and undergraduate levels*.* This should summarize the university-wide teaching evaluations and any other pertinent data on teaching. The discussion should address performance including a discussion of areas of strength and weakness. It is helpful to compare the faculty member’s performance with norms for the

department and the university; this can often be conveniently done by way of a table, such as that provided in Appendix C. Departments should retain the original evaluations in case COP requests them, but should not include them in the case documentation. All forms of teaching and advising should be addressed, even if there are no formal evaluations for some of it.

8.2.6 A statement from the chair giving the department’s assessment of the scholarly and/or artistic performance of the candidate over the last six years.

8.2.7 An evaluation of the amount and quality of the candidate’s service over the last six years.

8.2.8 The faculty member under review *may* submit a confidential, supplementary statement directly to the Chair of COP if he or she chooses. This is not normally required.

8.3NOTES:

8.3.1 Evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service (items 8.2.5, 8.2.6, and 8.2.7) should be concise, yet complete. More in-depth discussions may be warranted if the department identifies areas of concern, or if COP requests additional information.

8.3.2 COP does not require or expect departments to solicit letters of evaluation addressing teaching, scholarship or practice. Departments should do this only after discussion with the Chair of COP.

8.3.3 COP may request additional information it considers necessary. Such material may include copies of the Chair’s annual (merit) evaluations for the last six years, original teaching evaluations, university-produced numerical summaries of teaching evaluations. The department should NOT include these materials unless asked for.

8.3.4 All documents submitted for COP review, from either the chair or the faculty

member, will be treated confidentially, and will become part of the candidate’s

personnel file.

8.4 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION:

COP will review the materials submitted by the department or program on behalf of a faculty member, and check that the materials submitted are complete and consistent with faculty legislation. In reviewing a faculty member's activity over the review period, COP will use the following criteria for evaluation:

8.4.1 Have his/her activities been consistent with the interests of the University?

8.4.2 Have his/her activities enhanced the department or program in areas of research, teaching and service?

8.4.3 Have his/her activities advanced his/her professional career objectives?

COP will prepare a brief written summary report for the candidate, the department, and the administration. In all cases, this will specifically answer the above questions; in some cases brief advisory comments may be added. Where it is appropriate, COP's report will be considered by the Administration in reviewing future sabbatical requests. At the conclusion of COP’s review of a case, the Chair of COP will also orally communicate the specifics of COP’s evaluation to the candidate and the department Chair.

####