

## **CDES PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION + TENURE DOSSIER SUBMISSIONS**

The procedures described in this document provide implementation information for College of Design consistent with the University of Minnesota "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (dated October 15, 2007).

### **COMMON TERMINOLOGY**

- "Full Dossier"** - content determined by the Departments' 7.12, copy of 7.12 included
- "Summary Dossier"** - content determined by the University (Appendix I)

### **CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES**

- External Reviewers** - review Full Dossier
- Department Faculty + Head** - review Full Dossier
- CDes P+T Committee + Dean** - review Summary Dossier with access to Full Dossier as required
- University** - review Summary Dossier with access to Full Dossier as required

### **PROCESS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**

*Prior to each step, the candidate will be notified and given the opportunity to respond to any new material.*

#### **Step 1. *Submission to the External Reviewers*** (Appendix II)

- Full Dossier (1 pdf or paper copy for each External Reviewer - minimum 4)
- Letter from the Head - The same letter will be sent to all External Reviewers for any given candidate, but the letter may vary between candidates.

#### **Step 2. *Submission to the Department***

- Full Dossier (minimum 1 paper copy, actual number TBD by Head) including:
  - a list of External Reviewers with their qualifications and relationship to the candidate
  - a description of the process for selecting the External Reviewers
  - a sample of the letter sent by the Head to the External Reviewers
  - all letters of evaluation from the External Reviewers
  - copy of all Appraisal of Probationary Faculty reports for each of the probationary years (for probationary faculty)
  - where required, a copy of the Memorandum of Agreement indicating which 7.12 statement the faculty member selected

#### **Step 3. *Submission to the College***

- Full Dossier (1 paper copy - same as Department copy) including items added in Step 2 and:
  - evaluation report from the Department Faculty
  - evaluation letter from the Department Head

*The Full Dossier remains in the CDes Dean's office for reference.*
- Summary Dossier (5 paper copies, at least two of which should be submitted in a three-ring notebook) including items added in Step 2 and:
  - evaluation report from the Department Faculty,
  - evaluation letter from the Department Head
  - any separate statements by members of the tenured faculty
  - any statement by the candidate

#### **Step 4. *Submission to the University***

- Full Dossier (1 paper copy - same as Department/College copy) including items added in Step 3 and:

- evaluation letter from the CDes P+T Committee
- evaluation letter from the Dean

*The Full Dossier remains in the CDes Dean's office for reference.*

- Summary Dossier (CD and paper copy) including items added in Step 3 and:

- evaluation letter from the CDes P+T Committee
- evaluation letter from the Dean
- any other information added to the summary dossier at the request of the dean, any communication that has been received concerning the candidate and memoranda summarizing conversations he/she has had concerning the candidate that have been taken into consideration in any way
- any statement by the candidate

*The electronic Summary Dossier cannot be sent by e-mail.*

#### **APPENDIX I. CONTENT OF THE COMPLETE SUMMARY DOCUMENT**

*paraphrased list of pdfs (below) and quote taken from a memo from Arlene Carney*

The Summary Dossier should be organized in one electronic folder with the following folder title: "*College Last name Decision*" (i.e. CLA Smith Associate with Tenure.") Inside the folder, there should be seven pdfs with the following titles and content:

1. "*last name* Table of Contents"

a table of contents for the other pdfs in the folder

2. "*last name* CV"

candidate's CV

3. "*last name* Teaching"

teaching information about the candidate: statement, description of courses taught, advising, summaries of teaching evaluations, etc.

4. "*last name* Research"

research information about the candidate: statement, any type of summary used by the College to describe research - description of publication/creative work venues, description of External Reviewers and their qualifications, sample letter sent to reviewers, background on the process, letters from External Reviewers, etc.

5. "*last name* Service"

service information about the candidate

6. "*last name* Department Review"

all Department review information from the initial evaluation: initial Department report, majority and minority, evaluation letter from the Head

7. "*last name* College Review"

all College review information: College P+T Committee's and Dean's evaluation letters

"This is not meant to replace the format of the collegiate dossier that has been used previously. Colleges can certainly make some variation in the format above as long as it is clear from the file names what they contain. Please label each of these pdfs with a content label (e.g. 'Smith CV,' or 'Jones teaching,' and not just a number. That is, there should be sufficient information to find materials in the dossier. When additional material is to be added to the file, please continue to send both a hard copy and an electronic file. We ask that the electronic file be given to us on a CD along with one hard copy of the file. Please do not send the electronic file via e-mail."

*Note: It is the CDes P+T Committee's understanding that items 3-5 above should be abstracted from the Full Dossier,*

#### **APPENDIX II. SELECTION OF EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

*from "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty" (dated October 15, 2007).*

"The unit should seek appraisals both from persons suggested by the candidate and from other recognized scholars in the field. Units may determine a minimum number of external appraisals that they require, but at least half, and no fewer than four, of the external reviews must be obtained from individuals with no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate's career (for example, they should not be former advisors, mentors, co-authors, or co-investigators on previous work)."

April 10, 2009  
College of Design  
Promotion and Tenure Committee