1. INTRODUCTION

This document describes the procedures by which tenure-line and tenured faculty members in the School for New Learning (SNL) are reviewed for retention, tenure and promotion, as well as the standards to which such faculty should be held. The DePaul Faculty Handbook sets out University-wide criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion. These guidelines provide SNL-specific articulations of the University-wide criteria and describe SNL procedures and processes. In the absence of SNL-specific criteria and procedures, or in the event of a conflict between SNL-specific criteria and procedures, University-wide criteria and procedures govern.

2. AMENDMENT

SNL’s Promotion & Tenure Standards and Procedures may be amended by the vote of a two-thirds majority of tenured and tenure-line faculty of SNL. All such amendments must originate as proposals approved by a vote of the majority of tenured and tenure-line faculty. All changes to such a document require the approval of the Dean of the School for New Learning.

A change in SNL’s Promotion & Tenure Standards and Procedures cannot be voted on at the same meeting at which the change in question is first presented, with the exception of friendly amendments to changes proposed at a faculty meeting one month prior.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

SNL’s tenured faculty serve as the School’s Personnel Committee that is charged with the responsibility for carefully reviewing the materials assembled in the candidate’s tenure and promotion portfolio during the review process, and for deliberating and voting on the question of whether the candidate should be granted tenure and/or promotion. It is assisted by SNL’s Personnel Sub-Committee that is in charge of mentoring faculty for purposes related to tenure and/or promotion, and of coordinating all processes involved in preparing materials for tenure progress and tenure and/or promotion reviews. The members of the Personnel Sub-Committee must be tenured and are elected by SNL’s tenured and tenure-line faculty. The Personnel Sub-Committee must have at least three members and more members may be added depending on the number of candidates up for review in a given year. Personnel Sub-Committee terms may extend up to 3 years. The Personnel Sub-Committee elects its own chair and should hold a new election for Chair each year. The Chair of the Personnel Sub-Committee is also the chair of the Personnel Committee (which, as noted above, consists of all tenured faculty).

PART I: CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

INTRODUCTION
SNL follows DePaul’s Faculty Handbook by dividing its review criteria into three major categories. However, in order to include mentoring — a key faculty responsibility given the individualized, student-centered nature of most SNL programs -- the category ‘Teaching’ is replaced by ‘Teaching-Mentoring.’

A. TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

I. TEACHING-MENTORING

The term ‘teaching-mentoring’ encompasses SNL faculty’s separate yet mutually beneficial roles as instructors, mentors, and experts in a particular subject area. SNL offers a variety of learner-centered, work-life responsive, liberal and professional studies programs on the undergraduate and graduate level, on campus and online, interdisciplinary or intersectional. All programs are dedicated to serving adult students who bring rich experience to their desire to advance, enhance, or change their careers and personal lives. SNL faculty are therefore expected to engage in teaching, mentoring, and assessment activities that contribute to the realization of students’ intellectual, personal and professional potential as independent lifelong learners.

I.1. TEACHING

The School recognizes that individual pedagogical styles vary greatly, and that a variety of pedagogical approaches can be equally effective. Based on the multiplicity of disciplines and fields of expertise represented by its faculty, SNL also acknowledges that instructional practices may differ greatly according to a faculty member’s particular discipline or field of expertise. At the same time, it expects its faculty to employ teaching and mentoring strategies that effectively address adult learners, make different knowledges intelligible and actionable across academic disciplines, and be mindful that students have varied backgrounds and potentially different learning needs.

In accordance with the DePaul Faculty Handbook and mindful of SNL’s unique features, the School will evaluate faculty teaching according to the following criteria.

An SNL teacher

-- Designs and teaches courses / directs learning activities that are competence- or outcomes-driven, and which challenge and support students to grow both intellectually and as members of society.
-- Shows command of material and depth of knowledge in a subject area(s).
-- Encourages students to integrate new with prior learning, including learning gained from experience.
-- Organizes, presents and communicates material effectively in the pertinent setting (i.e., on-ground and/or online, in and/or outside a traditional classroom).
-- Applies methods of assessment in line with stated learning outcomes and general SNL standards.
-- Provides substantive feedback in a timely manner.
--Develops courses, onsite or online, that are responsive to the School’s goals and changing needs, and that engage, where appropriate, new technological resources and developments.
--Reflects thoughtfully on teaching activities, experiences, and approaches, and implements changes and/or makes innovations in teaching and/or course design as appropriate.

1.2. MENTORING

Mentoring is an essential role of tenured and tenure-line faculty in most of the School’s different programs. It fosters a collaborative, learning-centered partnership between students and mentors in both face-to-face and online environments from the time students enter an SNL program until graduation. While it relies on a variety of different processes and procedures, it promotes coherence and integration of student learning activities and outcomes.

Faculty mentors offer intellectual challenge and support, model intellectual curiosity and inquiry by way of their own professional development and lifelong learning journey, and contribute to broadening and deepening student learning. They are mindful that students have varied backgrounds and potentially different learning needs.

While providing an inviting space for students to express their concerns and learning needs, faculty mentors keep the relationship within the boundaries of confidentiality and equity.

Faculty mentors guide students’ individual learning and research projects according to the academic standards of the program, School, and University. They also consult and collaborate with administrators and staff to help ensure that students are aware of available options, and that administrative problems get solved.

The School will evaluate faculty mentoring according to the following criteria:

An SNL Faculty Mentor

--Assists students in understanding the curriculum framework of the program they entered, and how it relates to their particular interest and goals.
--Is accessible and responsive to student inquiries or requests.
--Encourages students’ understanding of themselves as learners and the use or purpose of different learning modes and strategies.
--Facilitates students’ exploration and assessment of their prior learning.
--Encourages students’ consideration of college-level opportunities to engage in independent new learning pursuits.
--Carefully supervises students’ individual learning and research activities.
--Offers timely and constructive feedback on students’ academic work.
--Engages in appropriate methods of assessment.
--Collaborates with professional/project advisors who are members of the student’s academic committee, and with other assessors of students’ learning approved by faculty and program directors.
--Stays current with structural/administrative changes and developments.
--Participates in professional development opportunities regarding best mentoring practices.
--Reflects thoughtfully on mentoring activities, experiences, and approaches, and implements changes in light of sound mentoring practices and principles.

II. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The School for New Learning welcomes scholars from all disciplines and affirms as one of its goals the fostering of disciplinary and interdisciplinary inquiry among both students and faculty. This commitment requires a broad definition of scholarship that recognizes the valences of diverse modes and styles of scholarly activity. That definition includes, but is not limited to, work pursued within established paradigms and according to normative modes of scholarship. At the same time, the School also provides a climate that welcomes faculty engagement in scholarly activities that involve building knowledge, exchanging perspectives, and creating a more comprehensive understanding of an issue by spanning multiple disciplines.

Faculty may also deliberately focus on the interplay of their particular discipline(s) and related pedagogical concerns regarding instructional approaches, methods, and materials relevant to their area of teaching and scholarship. In addition, as a school that assumes pedagogical leadership in the education of adult students, the School also values related practice-based scholarship, and the sharing and dissemination of corresponding scholarly products.

The School views collaborative and independent research as being on equal footing and it also understands that in some fields collaboration and co-authorship or teamwork are the norm. In its tenure review process SNL seeks to distinguish and assess a faculty member’s specific, original, creative contribution to joint work.

II.1 DEFINITION AND RANGE OF SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:

SNL defines scholarship to include the following:

--Intellectual activity that contributes to or pushes at the boundaries of a field of inquiry and that introduces new concepts, theories, or insights.

--Scholarly activities and products that integrate or synthesize different modes of research and/or interpretation.

--The creation of artistic products.

--Public performances of creative work.

--Investigations related to pedagogical issues.

--The involvement of students, communities, or the larger public in various types of socially engaged or practice-based scholarship.

II.2 EXPECTATIONS IN TERMS OF QUALITY

Due to the wide range of scholars, disciplines, and areas of research represented by SNL faculty, the School evaluates the significance of scholarly and creative work of individual faculty on a case by
case basis. Overall, faculty should be able to demonstrate that individual pieces of scholarship can be seen as parts of a clear, coherent and evolving body of work.

The following list of categories serves as the School’s general guide for evaluating a candidate’s scholarly and creative products. Depending on the type of scholarship under review, the number or combination of categories applied to each candidate’s work may vary.

**In general, the School will evaluate scholarly and/or creative products in light of the following:**

-- Originality
-- Contribution to knowledge
-- Conceptual or artistic sophistication
-- Intellectual rigor or artistic skills
-- Effective application of knowledge to address human problems or needs
-- Effective communication of knowledge to audiences beyond the classroom

**Counting Earlier Work**

See the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.4.2.2.

**II.3 RANKING OF SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS**

**Individual Scholarly Products**

SNL acknowledges that scholarly contributions that are peer-reviewed generally carry more weight than those that are not peer-reviewed; exhibitions of creative art in refereed exhibits carry more weight than does curating an exhibit; production of original audio, film, digital cinema or multi-media artifacts carries more weight than community-based and/or discipline-related websites and blogs; invited talks carry more weight than contributed talks; external grants carry more weight than internal grants; and acting as an editor for a professional journal carries more weight than reviewing individual articles. SNL also seeks to assess the extent and intensity of different review processes leading to publication and/or dissemination, and the significance and acceptance rate of each journal or press under consideration.

**Co-Authored Scholarly Products**

Regarding works which are co-authored: Co-authored works are weighed and evaluated on the basis of written statements from the candidate and co-author(s) articulating the specific contribution of the candidate to the project. Co-authors are encouraged to submit written statements in terms of percentage if the scholarly research/product was generated in discrete sections or roles. In the instance of a collaborative project where contributions are shared, and contributors are unable to demarcate discrete sections or roles in generation of work, the determination of equal collaboration must be explicitly stated within written documentation.

**Scholarly Products in Relation to Larger Context**

Just as the number of publications, presentations, and grants is not sufficient for judging scholarly merit when taken alone, any application of differential weighting is inseparable from looking at the entire context of the faculty member’s active research agenda. Time, effort and work involved in
specific scholarly/creative activities are therefore taken into account, as are availability of resources, and, where appropriate, a faculty member’s engagement in major programmatic responsibilities above and beyond the ordinary.

The following list provides instances of scholarly products divided into five subcategories, A-D. Each subcategory, A-D, begins with the most highly valued product (based on relative importance and relevance) and, where appropriate, concludes with less-weighted forms of scholarship.

A. Publication and Dissemination of Scholarship:
   a. Original scholarly work such as books, monographs, book chapters, and articles in scholarly journals (digital or print), which have been assessed by peers in the appropriate field as a condition of their publication;
   b. Collections on which the faculty member serves as editor, where the faculty member’s original scholarship constitutes a significant portion of the overall work, such as a lengthy introduction providing theoretical grounding, historical analysis, comparative framing, etc.; this includes peer-reviewed textbooks that contain an original text by the author.
   c. Review essays where scholarly works are considered at length and within an articulated theoretical framework;
   d. Invited book chapter(s) for a non-peer reviewed publication;
   e. Collections of the work of others (such as textbooks with an anthology format), popular press books, edited or co-edited works;
   f. Publication of conference presentations in Proceedings;
   g. Book, film, video, or art review(s);
   h. Brief book reviews and/or articles in reference works, encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other comparable collections;
   i. Scholarly presentations, workshops, panels, poster sessions, showing of creative work, and/or performance at local, regional, national, or international academic conferences;
   j. Serving as a reviewer for scholarly journals;
   k. Creation of online scholarly information exchanges such as blogs, op-eds, etc.;
   l. Unpublished research or policy reports that are publicly disseminated for institutional and/or policy issues;
   m. Awards and grants;
   n. Curriculum development and/or the preparation of instructional materials having impact beyond the individual classroom, and/or the development of software that provides new or improved methods or tools for facilitating research and/or teaching; and
   o. Research-based expert testimony and/or lectures to community groups and organizations that are directly linked to the faculty member’s scholarship.

B. Publication of Creative Literary Works
a. Publication of original poems, plays, short stories, novels (and works from other literary genres) in refereed settings.

C Creation and Exhibition of Visual Art
a. Making of paintings, drawings, prints, sculpture, photographs and other works of art that are created partially or primarily for aesthetic, expressive, or critical purposes and which are reviewed by peers;
b. Exhibitions of visual and creative art in refereed exhibits;
c. Curating an exhibit of visual and creative art.

Note: Candidates are expected to engage in proper preparation before the activity in order to be able to solicit peer reviews of their work.

D. Public Performance of Creative Works
a. Public performances of the candidate's creative work (i.e., musical or theatrical compositions, including audio, film, digital cinema or multi-media productions) which are reviewed by peers;
b. Community-based and/or discipline-related websites and blogs which are reviewed by peers.

Note: A public performance of a candidate's creative work is evaluated on the basis of its engagement with communities and publics outside the classroom, as well as scholarly reviews and/or grants and/or awards relating to the work.

II.4 EXPECTATIONS IN TERMS OF QUANTITY

Although SNL recognizes that publication or presentation of scholarship, research and/or creative activity can take on many different forms and is subject to established ranking systems, it expects its faculty to have at least submitted a scholarly or creative product for publication. By the time a faculty member goes up for tenure, she/he should have published at minimum either:
- Two or more scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals or anthologies; or
- a scholarly book or monograph; or
- the artistic equivalent of same.

This minimum assumes an acceptable level of quality in the scholarship, research and/or creative activity under review. See 11.2 above.

III. SERVICE

In general, service consists of activities that benefit SNL, the larger University, professional associations, and the community. Such activities should be consonant with the mission of the University and the Mission Statement and Essential Commitments of SNL. They should also require the expertise of the faculty member – either the specialized expertise of the faculty member’s field or the general skills possessed by all members of the faculty. In service roles, faculty members are
expected to maintain high standards of professional conduct as specified in official university
documents.

As a School for adult students whose programs take into account individual students' as well as
larger social changes and developments, SNL places particular importance on faculty contribution
to programmatic maintenance and development. Moreover, as a School with a large multi-
disciplinary faculty, service at SNL includes informal faculty leadership or initiatives that contribute
to an environment of shared responsibility, mutual respect, and recognition.

Service can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. Depending on the rank of the faculty member,
service may directly contribute to the University or to SNL. See the Faculty Handbook chapter 3,
section 3.4.2.3.

'Service' covers three main subcategories – University service, professional service, and community
service. In accordance with differing service requirements at SNL (the academic home unit) and
DePaul, 'University service' is further divided into 'Service to SNL' and 'Service to DePaul.' Below is
a non-exhaustive list of the types of service for which SNL faculty may receive credit.

### III.1. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

#### Service to SNL

All tenured and tenure-line faculty are expected to participate in basic matters of school
governance (e.g., attending faculty meetings) as described in SNL's Governance Document. Beyond
such basic obligations, service includes

--- Serving on committees, task forces, councils and related entities within the School.
--- Serving as a champion of a specified area of SNL's curriculum.
--- Serving as the appointed liaison or representative of the School to an external institution
or as the liaison or representative of an external institution to SNL.

Please note that most of the roles noted above are listed, along with specific descriptions and/or
charges, in SNL's Governance Document.

#### Service to DePaul University

University Service includes service outside SNL to the University at large. Faculty members must, as
opportunity presents itself, be available for such service where significant counter-considerations
are absent. Service to the university at large includes

--- Serving on committees, task forces, boards, councils and related entities at the University
level.
--- Serving as the appointed liaison or representative of the university to an external
institution, or as the liaison or representative of an external institution to DePaul.

### III.2. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

In addition to serving the School and the larger University, each tenured and tenure-track faculty
member is expected to participate as a member of a professional community. Professional service
consists of contributions to the organizations and associations of a faculty member's discipline or the professoriate. Professional service may involve scholarly or creative activities. Examples of professional service include:

- Participating actively in a relevant professional association as a member and/or officer and/or committee or task force member.
- Organizing a professional meeting, conference, or symposium.
- Consulting for a professional or public agency.
- Editing a professional journal or newsletter.
- Serving as a peer reviewer for a professional journal.
- Employing skills and knowledge actively in a professional capacity outside the University.
- Undertaking specialized education as defined by one's professional community.

### III.3. COMMUNITY SERVICE

Community service consists of activities that require a faculty member's expertise (either specialized expertise in the faculty member's field or general skills possessed by all faculty) which contribute to the public welfare of the larger community outside the University. Community service is significant for SNL and DePaul, but depends upon opportunity and the other professional demands upon one's time and energy. Examples of community service include:

- Consulting with public and/or private organizations (providing that such consulting not be fully remunerated).
- Providing services to the public through a university clinic or center (providing that that such consulting not be fully remunerated).
- Giving presentations, clinical services, workshops, media interviews, performances, etc. for the public (provided that such activities not be fully remunerated).
- Communicating in popular and non-academic publications.
- Speaking to civic organizations on issues related to the faculty member's area of expertise.
- Testifying as an expert witness before a municipal, state or federal government body.
- Serving on boards of non-profit organizations

**The following criteria will be applied when evaluating the quality of a faculty member's service:** these criteria shall be applied holistically as a set. Not all criteria need to be met for an activity to be evaluated as high quality service. Service activities shall thus be considered in relation to:

- Level and extent of participation (attendance, activity).
- Importance and quality of individual contribution.
- Demonstrated leadership qualities.
- Impact or significance of the service on the infrastructure, reputation, and mission of the School and the University.
- Time on task.
Contributions that enhance the intellectual community.

C. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

In addition to the requirements for associate professor, candidates must give evidence of continued scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities – the quality of which is recognized by their peers, inside and outside the university. Candidates for this rank must also show a record of notable service contributions at the university level. Effective teaching remains mandatory for this rank. This rank is reserved for those with recognized academic achievements.

Tenured faculty with the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor vote on a candidate for promotion to Full Professor.

I. TEACHING-MENTORING

A candidate for full professor should demonstrate continued commitment to teaching and mentoring. Not only should there be a consistent record of good to excellent teaching and mentoring, but also evidence that the candidate has progressed as a teacher and mentor of students.

In particular, the candidate may demonstrate excellent performance by providing evidence in the areas of course development, and successful course innovation and revamping of existing courses; of development and successful application of pedagogical methods and tools to enhance student learning; of development and successful application of innovative approaches to interdisciplinary teaching; of engaging in teaching advocacy and consultation beyond the School; securing instructional grants; and successful implementation of changes in mentoring activities and approaches based on careful reflection of sound mentoring practices and principles.

II. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Since tenure the candidate should have made additional substantial contributions that have had a significant impact in his or her disciplinary or interdisciplinary field. The post-tenure body of work should be examined alongside the pre-tenure body of work to understand the candidate’s trajectory, and demonstrate that he or she will continue to produce research at a rate and of a quality commensurate with leaders in the field.

The work of the candidate should have achieved recognition at a national or international level as an expert in his or her field. In some disciplines, leadership in application of research to societal needs may be an important part of the evidence presented.

Evidence of successful grant pursuit, particularly from sources beyond the University, can strongly enhance the candidate’s records at this level.

III. SERVICE

Tenured faculty have special responsibilities for mentoring tenure-line faculty, and for leadership in service and governance on the School and University level. A substantial service record beyond the home academic unit is therefore required for promotion to full professor.
Examples of SNL and University service include, but are not limited to, serving as an associate dean; director of undergraduate or graduate studies; director or coordinator of programs or centers; faculty chair; extraordinary contributions to the work of committees, boards, working groups; active membership of Faculty Council and its committees; serving as the appointed liaison or representative of the university to an external institution; mentoring tenure-line faculty.

Examples of professional service include, but are not limited to, serving as an elected officer of a national or regional professional association; editing a professional journal or newsletter; serving as a liaison between School or University and a professional organization; serving as a peer reviewer for a professional journal; organizing professional conferences; organizing exhibits of artistic-creative work.

Examples of community service include, but are not limited to, consulting with private, public and religious organizations, provided that such consulting is not fully remunerated; giving public presentations and performances provided that the activities are not fully compensated; promoting civic engagement, e.g., providing individual expertise or classroom-guided experiential learning for community organizations; serving on the boards of non-profit organizations and grass-roots groups; speaking to civic organizations on a matter pertinent to the faculty member's expertise; testifying as an expert witness before a committee of the United States, Illinois, City or similar governmental bodies.

PART II: PROCEDURES

A. PROBATIONARY TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Tenure-line faculty members serve in a probationary capacity before attaining eligibility for tenure. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, the probationary period is six years in length with credit for prior service (if applicable) negotiated at the time of hire.

During that probationary period, a faculty member shall undergo on an annual basis a probationary review that is both summative and formative in nature. Those reviews are conducted by faculty peers and conveyed to the Dean.

The purpose of a probationary review is to

- assess a tenure-line faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching-mentoring, scholarship, and service, by measuring her or his accomplishments against the School's and University's standards and expectations for retention in rank;
- provide an unambiguous interpretation and valuation of the faculty member's accomplishments to date, as judged against the School's and University's performance standards and expectations for tenure and promotion;
- provide clear, candid, and consistent guidance to the faculty member by establishing specific benchmark performance goals that the School expects her or him to meet before the next personnel reviews;
• produce a recommendation as to whether or not the tenure-line faculty member's contract should be renewed.

### A.1. SCHEDULE OF TENURE PROGRESS REVIEWS

Consistent with University policy, the School shall conduct formal and informal tenure progress reviews according to the schedule outlined in the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.8.

The Personnel Sub-Committee may call for a formal review following a previous formal review in any year if circumstances warrant.

Except for the second year at DePaul, the candidate receives written notification in the fall quarter from the Personnel Sub-Committee to prepare for the informal or formal review. The review is then conducted in the winter quarter to determine whether a candidate’s contract should be renewed for the year following the review.

During the second year at DePaul the candidate receives two reviews, one in the fall (for Year 3 contract renewal), and one in the spring (for Year 4 contract renewal). The candidate will therefore receive written notification in the spring in preparation for the fall review, and in the winter in preparation for the spring review.

Regardless of schedule or nature of the review, the candidate consults with the Personnel Sub-Committee in preparation of the material.

All reviews must be completed and documented in written form and sent to the dean before she/he sends her/his recommendations for contract renewal to the provost.

### A.2. LEAVES AND THE TENURE/REVIEW CLOCK

See Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.2.2.

If a faculty member accepts postponing tenure review because of a leave, this may also change the scheduling of that faculty member’s informal tenure progress reviews. Nevertheless, the School expects all faculty members on leave to arrange with the Personnel Sub-Committee ahead of time an alternate review schedule upon her or his return from the leave. Although the timing of this review may not coincide with the timing of the dean’s decision regarding contract renewal, the Personnel Sub-Committee will still issue a summative and formative evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure.

### A.3. CONDUCTING REVIEWS

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review will be conducted, the Personnel Sub-Committee shall notify the candidate in writing that the review is underway. The notification should also provide a deadline for submission of review materials and set forth a schedule for the conduct of the reviews.

#### Informal Tenure Progress Review

Before the deadline given by the Personnel Sub-Committee, the candidate shall prepare and submit to the Sub-Committee the following materials:
- an updated *curriculum vitae*;
- a separate summary of current year and planned activities in the categories of student learning, scholarship, and service in relation to tenure and promotion criteria; this can be the official Faculty Accomplishment and Faculty Planning Reports prepared for the yearly merit review (conducted by the dean);
- any other material the candidate wishes the Personnel Sub-Committee to review.

The Personnel Sub-Committee meets with the candidate, assesses the evidence, and makes a written report to the Dean with a copy to the candidate. The report includes a recommendation concerning the renewal of the candidate’s contract. The candidate may request a meeting with the Sub-committee to discuss any questions or concerns she/he may have about the report.

Any written material used by the Personnel Sub-Committee in conducting informal reviews will be made available to the faculty member being reviewed.

### Formal Tenure Progress Reviews

Before the deadline provided by the Personnel Sub-Committee, the candidate shall prepare and submit to the Sub-Committee the following materials:

- An updated *curriculum vitae*;
- A separate summary of current year and planned activities in the categories of teaching-mentoring, scholarship, and service in relation to tenure and promotion criteria; this can be the official Faculty Accomplishment and Faculty Planning Reports prepared for the yearly merit review (conducted by the dean);
- A personal statement that reflects the candidate’s evaluation of her or his development in light of the School's and the University's criteria for promotion and tenure;
- Student evaluations of teaching done since the last formal review;
- Peer evaluations of teaching done since the last formal review;
- Evaluations of mentoring solicited by the School and done since the last formal review;
- Scholarly or creative materials produced since the last formal review.
- Other material the candidate deems relevant.

The Personnel Sub-Committee meets with the candidate, reviews the completeness and adequacy of all presented material, makes the material available to the Personnel Committee (all tenured faculty), and organizes a special meeting with the Personnel Committee as well as the candidate. The Personnel Committee meets with the candidate, then excuses the candidate from the meeting and discusses her/his progress in all areas of evaluation based on available evidence. Part of this evidence can be written input by other full-time untenured faculty. At the end of the meeting, the Personnel Committee votes according to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.3.1.1.

The Personnel Sub-Committee summarizes the assessment of the Personnel Committee both in terms of adequate progress towards tenure as well as recommendation towards reappointment, and makes a written report to the Dean with a copy to the candidate.

The candidate may request a meeting with the Personnel Sub-Committee to discuss any questions or concerns he/she may have about the report.
Any written material used by the Personnel Committee in conducting formal reviews will be made available to the faculty member being reviewed.

B. REVIEW FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

INTRODUCTION

Review for tenure and/or promotion is a multistage process that involves faculty peers and administrators at the School and University level.

The School has a key responsibility for evaluating the evidence contained in a candidate’s tenure or promotion portfolio in

Before granting tenure, the university should have no reasonable doubt about the faculty member’s demonstrated qualifications and continued capacity to contribute to DePaul’s distinctive goals and academic mission.

B.1 SCHEDULE AND PROCESS STEPS

See Appendix A.

B.2 RESPONSIBILITIES

The Personnel Sub-Committee is charged with coordinating and managing all processes involved in preparing materials for tenure progress as well as tenure/promotion review, and for preparing a formal report to the Dean based on the discussion of all tenured faculty (Personnel Committee).

The Personnel Committee (tenured faculty) is charged with the responsibility for carefully reviewing the materials assembled in the candidate’s tenure and promotion portfolio during the review process, and for deliberating and voting on the question of whether the candidate should be granted tenure and/or promotion.

Personnel Sub-Committee Responsibilities

In particular, the Personnel Sub-Committee is charged with

- coaching and mentoring the candidate;
- coordinating and providing oversight of a candidate’s review;
- guiding the completion of the Primary Portfolio, and monitoring any additional submissions after the tenured faculty vote until the candidate’s file goes to the dean, the next level of review;
- selecting and guiding a Student Representative Committee;
- selecting external reviewers of scholarship;
- soliciting input from SNL faculty (tenured and tenure-line) and staff to be included in the Primary Portfolio;
- meeting with the candidate;
- making the candidate’s material available to tenured faculty;
- conducting the tenured faculty meeting for deliberation and vote;
- writing the final report based on the deliberation and vote of all tenured faculty and any other reports necessary for the process.

The Candidate’s Responsibilities

The candidate is responsible for following the guidelines, process steps, and schedule provided by the School and the University. In particular, the candidate is responsible for

- providing the Personnel Sub-Committee with a list of possible external reviewers:
  The candidate may seek advice from representatives of the particular disciplines in question. For instance, core members from appropriate departments at DePaul could give the candidate suggestions of possible external reviewers, though the candidate may, if she/he prefers, tap into other resources. The Personnel Sub-Committee makes a decision regarding which external reviewers to invite to assess the candidate’s scholarship see (see B.4, External Evaluations of Research).
- soliciting written statements from co-authors:
  In case of co-authored or collaborative scholarship or creative work presented for review, the candidate should request written statements from the co-author(s) articulating the specific contribution of the candidate to the project. The co-authors may specify the percentage if the scholarly/creative research/product was generated in discrete sections or roles, for example data collection vs. data analysis. In the instance of a collaborative project where contributions are shared, and contributors are unable to demarcate discrete sections or roles in the generation of the work, the determination of equal collaboration must be explicitly stated within written documentation.
- soliciting comments assessing the candidate’s performance from DePaul University colleagues, members of the candidate’s professional community and, where appropriate, from members in the non-academic community;
- preparing parts of the Primary Portfolio that are the candidate’s responsibility (see B.3);
- compiling Supplementary Material.

B.3 DOCUMENTATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The Primary Portfolio

The office of the dean, the candidate, and the Personnel Sub-Committee shall work together to compile the Primary Portfolio of materials to be evaluated by reviewers at every level during the tenure and promotion review process. An itemized list based on the description of the Dossier in the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.6.1 (as well as SNL-specifics) is included in Appendix B.
Adding Material to the Primary Portfolio

See Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.1.3.

Supplementary Material

The candidate should provide any additional material that supplements, in substantive ways, the material provided in the Primary Portfolio, and is organized in relation to the main categories of scholarship, student leaning, or service. Such supplementary material may give concrete examples of pedagogical products or processes, of scholarly presentations, work-in-progress, or material produced as part of specific service activities. It is important that the candidate include all information she/he deems necessary for the review, as the candidate may not make any additions to the dossier after the final vote of the UBPT. See the Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.1.

B.4 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Due to the fact that faculty at the School for New Learning represent many different academic disciplines, the process of selecting external reviewers requires the Personnel Sub-Committee to take particular steps for generating evaluations of tenure and promotion candidates’ research, scholarship, or creative activities.

Regarding external reviewers and the letters they write, see the Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.2.1.

Candidates generally supply the Personnel Sub-Committee with an extensive list of possible external reviewers who are recognized experts in the particular disciplinary or interdisciplinary field in question. The Personnel Sub-Committee inquires about the nature of the candidates’ relation with these possible external reviewers so as to ensure that such reviewers can provide an impartial assessment of the candidate’s work. In doing so, the Sub-Committee seeks external reviewers who either a) have not had contact with the candidate; or b) have had contact with the candidate but will not be unduly influenced by that contact. (E.g., a reviewer should not have anything to gain by her/his review.)

The Personnel Sub-Committee carefully selects a large enough pool of potential external reviewers so as to obtain the sufficient numbers required for the candidate’s particular application. In this regard, the School requires at least two external reviews for promotion to associate professor and at least three for promotion to full professor. Given this, the final list of potential external reviewers generated by the Personnel Sub-Committee must consist of a minimum of four for associate and five for full (in the hope of receiving back at least the minimum of two for associate and three for full).

In order to develop an appropriate pool of external reviewers, the Personnel Sub-Committee may seek external reviewers beyond the list provided by the candidate.

For university policy on external reviewers and review letters see the Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.2.3. It is the responsibility of the Personnel Sub-Committee to explicitly state in the letter of solicitation to potential reviewers that their identity will be kept confidential. The Faculty Handbook provides a sample of a letter to potential reviewers in chapter 3, section 3.6.2.4.
Any copies of the external review letters that are given to the candidate will have any information that would identify the reviewer redacted. Any citations from the external review letters in reports from the unit or the Dean will be similarly redacted so that the reviewers will not be identified to the candidate. Unredacted copies of the complete versions of the external review letters will be available to the Personnel Sub-Committee, the Personnel Committee, and the Dean. They will also be included in the candidate’s dossier when it is forwarded by the Dean to the University level (i.e., after the point at which the candidate no longer has access to the dossier and therefore would not be able to discover the identities of the external reviewers.)

### B.5 REVIEW BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEE

See the Faculty Handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.3 for information relevant to this process.

#### Selection of Student Review Committee

The Personnel Sub-Committee will select a Student Review Committee comprised of at least two and no more than three students from the SNL program level(s) at which the candidate has taught and or mentored. Depending on the candidate’s particular involvement, the committee can therefore be comprised of only undergraduate students, only graduate students, or a mix of students from both program levels. If there is more than one P&T candidate in a given year, a separate Student Review Committee is convened for each.

Students can only become members of this committee if they have never worked with the candidate as either a student in her/his class or as one of her/his mentees. Undergraduate student representatives should have completed Research Seminar. Graduate student representatives should have completed at least 26 credit hours of graduate work. All student representatives should possess good organization and project management skills, good quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills, and strong writing and presentation skills.

#### Responsibilities of Student Review and Personnel Sub-Committee

The Student Review Committee will be gathered for their initial meeting by a designated member of the Personnel Sub-Committee, who will in turn give the Student Review Committee an orientation to the P&T review process and to their roles and responsibilities within it.

The designated member of the Personnel Sub-Committee, together with the P&T administrative assistant, will guide and monitor the data collection process and make the following material available to the Student Review Committee:

- The candidate’s Personal Statement;
- The candidate’s *curriculum vitae*;
- Course syllabi;
- The aggregate data for the candidate’s course evaluations;
- Data from the survey of current and graduated mentees;
- Letters of evaluation from mentees and students, (if any); and
- Any other teaching/mentoring materials the candidate wishes to provide.
The Student Review Committee reviews and assesses the information that has been provided to it. The student committee creates a written report for the Personnel Sub-Committee. The Personnel Sub-Committee may ask a representative of the Student Review Committee to meet with it to discuss their report if the Sub-Committee has questions. This report and the data on which it is based are also provided to the candidate and included in the candidate’s dossier.

**Student Input Instrument: The Mentee Survey**

Due to the major role of mentoring in SNL faculty member’s work with students, the student input instrument for P&T review is a survey sent to current and recently graduated mentees of the candidate.

A Student Input Instrument Committee of at least two students (preferably including both undergraduate and graduate students) and at least two tenured faculty members will create the mentee survey, the process for gathering data and a template for reporting results. The Personnel Sub-Committee must approve the mentee survey, process and report template and any subsequent modifications. Once the survey, the data collection process and the data reporting template have been created by a Student Input Instrument Committee, they can be re-used in subsequent years. A new committee would only need to be convened in subsequent years if substantive changes in this instrument or process are proposed.

The mentee survey will be sent to all current, active mentees of the candidate. Note that “current, active mentees” is defined as those mentees who are currently listed as the candidate’s mentees and who have registered for credit hours at DPU within the prior two years. It will also be sent to all the candidate’s mentees that have graduated in the past two years (i.e., back to and including the June graduates two years prior to the review.) The candidate will be given a list of these mentees and the mentees who graduated in the past two years. The candidate will have an opportunity to assure the accuracy of this list before the survey is sent.

There will be different versions of the survey sent to undergraduate and graduate level mentees.

The survey data remains anonymous. I.e., no information that identifies the respondents will be given to the Student Review Committee or to the candidate. Identifying information will only be used by the Personnel Sub-committee to verify that the respondents are all intended recipients of the survey.

**Mentee/Student Letters**

The mentee survey process is designed to solicit anonymous input on the candidate. Most of the data from the mentee survey will be in quantitative form. But some students may want to identify themselves with their input and may want to provide feedback in a much more qualitative form. Letters from mentees, graduates and/or other students, therefore, can be helpful complement to the mentee survey in assessing the candidate’s work. So data is solicited from students in two forms for the P&T process: mostly quantitative data that is anonymous via the mentee survey and qualitative data that is not anonymous through letters.

In order to give all the candidate’s current and recently graduated advisees an opportunity to submit a letter, but also to target students who might be particularly able to provide insight into the candidate’s mentoring, letters will be solicited in two ways:
First, the mentee survey that is sent to all current, active mentees and recently graduated mentees will conclude with information on how the respondent can submit a letter describing and assessing their experience with the candidate if they would like to do so. Therefore, everyone who is sent a survey has the opportunity to also submit a letter. They will be instructed to address their letters to the Student Review Committee. Should mentees choose to submit such a letter, that letter would not be anonymous. In this regard, these letters differ from the anonymous input the respondent can provide on the mentee survey. These letters will be given to the Student Review Committee and the candidate and included in the candidate’s dossier.

In addition, the candidate may provide the Student Review Committee a list of up to thirty names (and contact information) of mentees, former mentees and/or other students to provide input. These students will be sent an invitation to submit a letter describing and assessing their experience of the candidate’s mentoring work. They will be instructed to address their letters to the Student Review Committee. Should these mentees/students choose to submit such a letter, that letter would not be anonymous. In this regard, these letters differ from the anonymous input the respondent can provide on the mentee survey. These letters will be given to the Student Review Committee and the candidate and included in the candidate’s dossier.

B.6 SCHOOL DELIBERATION AND VOTE

Main Purpose of Personnel Committee Meeting and Deliberation

The meeting of the Personnel Committee (which consists of all tenured faculty) has three main purposes:

1. To help the candidate articulate what may be unclear in her/his documents.
2. To use the meeting as a general forum for discussing the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.
3. To vote by secret ballot on the candidate’s suitability for receiving promotion and/or tenure.

Preparing for and Attending the Meeting

The dean will not be present at the review meeting of the Personnel Committee for candidates and will not vote.

All tenured faculty are expected to come to the meeting after having carefully read the candidate’s material in light of SNL’s promotion & Tenure Standards, and with any corresponding questions or concerns, exempting those faculty who may be unable to participate due to an approved leave of absence.

Faculty in absentia may vote only if they use technology that permits simultaneous participation in the review meeting and conveyance of their secret ballot at the time of the vote. Moreover, faculty who vote in absentia are required to have reviewed a candidate’s materials before the academic unit’s official vote. Only those faculty having a valid excuse may attend and vote using technology.

SNL defines such a valid excuse as inability to attend the meeting due to an out of town professional commitment (e.g., presenting at a professional conference or teaching off-campus), the sudden onset of a severe illness or a family emergency. Faculty who are on leave are exempt from attending the meeting.
**Process**

At the beginning of the meeting (10 – 15 minutes) the Personnel Sub-Committee briefly emphasizes the purpose and structure of the meeting and asks for clarifying questions or comments. Based on its work with the candidate, the committee then gives a summary assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, and asks faculty in attendance to consider this assessment as an integral part of the ensuing discussions. A member of the Personnel Sub-Committee will chair the rest of the entire meeting.

Faculty then meet with the candidate for about 45 – 60 minutes. The candidate has the option of opening the meeting with a brief statement about key aspects of her/his application. Faculty use the time with the candidate primarily to ask clarifying questions concerning her/his material, to help the candidate see the strengths of her/his material, or to voice concerns regarding the adequacy or accuracy of her/his presentation of various accomplishments. Faculty may make corresponding suggestions for revising aspects of the Personal Statement or CV. Faculty may also offer a realistic assessment of any of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses that may very well influence the decision to grant or not grant tenure and/or promotion which is made at the final level of review (UBPT). The candidate then leaves the meeting.

The next portion of the meeting will be spent discussing the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in light of SNL’s promotion and tenure criteria. This discussion will draw on the candidate's material as well as her/his written and verbal statements, considering and comparing these in relation to what each faculty member has heard or read. During these discussions faculty mutually enlighten each other on the candidate’s material. Faculty who want to offer any additional information on the candidate’s performance can do so as long as it directly relates to SNL’s Standards, Procedures and Evaluation Guidelines for Retention, Tenure & Promotion of Faculty and is supported by documentable evidence. Unsupported comments or opinions regarding the candidate that are attributed to individuals not present at the discussion shall not be admissible in the discussion.

Regarding the ensuing faculty report, see the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.5.2). The faculty report will cite the numbers of Yes and No votes. In order for the report to explain any possible No votes, it is important that faculty members be open with criticism (should they have any) during the meeting.

**Attendance and Voting**

At the end of the meeting all faculty will vote by a secret ballot. See the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, section 3.5.2.

Once the votes are tallied, a member of the Personnel Sub-Committee will inform the candidate of the result of the voting, adding that a complete faculty report giving the grounds for the votes will be coming soon.

**B.7 REPORT ON DELIBERATION AND VOTE**
The Personnel Sub-Committee is responsible for taking notes during the meeting on all issues that address the candidate’s performance in relation to SNL’s Standards, Procedures, and Evaluation Guidelines for Retention, Tenure & Promotion of Faculty. Based on these notes it will prepare a first draft of the report and send it to all tenured faculty for revisions until a final version is agreed upon.

The P&T administrative assistant will collect all the signatures on one or (if applicable) two forms. One form states the faculty member agrees that the report accurately represents the discussion of tenured faculty, the other that the report does not accurately reflect the discussion, or that the School did not follow proper procedural guidelines.

### Signing Statement or Minority Report

See the Faculty Handbook chapter 3, sections 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.2.

In the event a faculty member refuses or is unable to sign one or the other of the two forms (Signing Statement or Minority Report), the report will go forward with an explanation from the Personnel Sub-Committee. Reasons for not being able to sign the form stating lack of agreement may be: unavoidable physical absence (such as being out of the country) or illness.

In a case where a faculty member claims that the School violated its guidelines, criteria, or processes, or those of the university, the faculty member needs to provide a written minority report. This report is, however, restricted to describing how the academic unit violated these guidelines or procedures and must not offer any opinions on the candidate that have not already been expressed during the general tenured faculty deliberation.

The Personnel Sub-Committee will review such a written minority report to check whether it conforms to the criteria stated in the preceding paragraph and then bring it to the PC.

The signed written statement or the minority report goes to all tenured faculty as well as to the P&T administrative assistant who will include it in the Primary Portfolio and make it available to the candidate.

If by the specified date (see Appendix A) no minority report or signing statement has been submitted, the P&T administrative assistant will inform the Personnel Sub-Committee who will supply the explanation as to why the written statement explaining lack of agreement with the faculty report or due process is missing. This explanation will be added to the Primary Portfolio.

By the date specified in Appendix A, the candidate submits either a response to the signing statement of minority report, or a written verification that she/he will not respond to the Personnel Sub-Committee and the P&T administrative assistant, who will include either statement in the Primary Portfolio.

### B.8 CANDIDATE’S REBUTTAL

The candidate also has the option of responding to the faculty report with a rebuttal. The time span for submitting the rebuttal is listed in Appendix A.

### B.9 COMPLETION AND TRANSFER OF CANDIDATE’S PRIMARY PORTFOLIO
By the specified date (see Appendix A), all material, the faculty report, and any signing statement or minority report plus the candidate’s response will move on to the dean, as does all responsibility for the candidate’s application process, thus relieving the Personnel and the Personnel Sub-Committees from any further involvement.

### III. APPENDICES

#### APPENDIX A: SCHEDULE AND PROCESS STEPS

The following dates are subject to change. The Personnel-Subcommittee will therefore publish the most recent dates each year a candidate is up for tenure and/or promotion. Code:

- **PC** = Personnel Committee (i.e., the entire SNL tenured faculty)
- **PSubC** = Personnel Subcommittee (i.e., a subset of the SNL tenured faculty)
- **Chair** = Chairperson of the Personnel Committee and the Personnel Subcommittee.
- **Liaison** = Liaison between PC/PSub and the individual P&T candidate
- **AA** = Administrative Assistant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>PERSONNEL (SUB-) COMMITTEE</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSubC reviews the P&amp;T process and procedures to identify any revisions that may be necessary and then takes appropriate actions. E.g., reviews the student input process to see whether a new Student Input Instrument Committee needs to be convened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSubC meets with candidate to review P&amp;T process and procedures. It identifies a liaison for the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sets up a separate folder each candidate on the SNL public drive for review materials. Folder must have access restricted to the candidate, the PC (i.e., entire tenured faculty),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 1st</td>
<td>Responds to Provost Office’s notification of eligibility to apply for P&amp;T. Copies SNL Dean and Chair.</td>
<td>the Dean and the AA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 14th</td>
<td>Liaison works with candidate to edit CV and personal statement and to prepare list of potential external reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 14th</td>
<td>Provides PSubC list of at least 6 potential reviewers of scholarly/creative materials. The list includes names, titles, complete contact information and brief explanation of the nature of the candidate’s relationship with each potential reviewer. If necessary, the list also indicates which reviewers have appropriate expertise to review which areas of the candidate’s scholarly/creative materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 14th</td>
<td>Provides PSubC with drafts of his/her CV and personal statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 21st</td>
<td>PSubC meets with the candidate (if necessary) to review the candidate’s list of potential external reviewers. PSubC decides which external reviewers to use and prioritizes alternate external reviewers in case the need arises to use them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair begins to contact the external reviewers who have been selected. Deadline for securing their commitments is July 7th.</td>
<td>Chair requests that external reviewers send a digital copy of their CV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 21st</td>
<td>Provides candidate with feedback on draft CV and personal statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 21st</td>
<td>AA provides PSubC and candidate with list of candidate's current, active and recently graduated (i.e., past 2 years) mentees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 30th</td>
<td>Liaison works with candidate to draft the Table of Contents for the candidate's primary and secondary review materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 30th</td>
<td>Corrects errors or omissions in the mentee &amp; recent graduate list and gives revised list to Liaison and AA. Gives Liaison and AA a list up to 30 current or former mentees and/or other students to be contacted for a letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 30th</td>
<td>Provides Liaison with a checklist of all course evaluations that will need to be gathered. (Course evaluations are gathered by the PSubC and AA, not the candidate.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 30th</td>
<td>Following SNL’s procedures for the student input process, PSubC sets up and orients a Student Review Committee. (If there is more than one candidate, creates a separate Student Review Committee for each candidate.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 30th</td>
<td>PSubC determines the dates for candidate's review meetings with PSubC and PC (i.e. tenured faculty). (These meetings are in late October to early November. See below.) Chair informs candidate and PC of those dates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 7th</td>
<td>PSubC with assistance of AA requests candidate’s course evaluations and a summary report from the SNL Assessment Center. Due date is July 31st.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 7th</td>
<td>Chair has contacted all external reviewers and secured commitments from them. Has used alternate external reviewers approved by PSubC if any of the external reviewers decline or are unavailable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 7th</td>
<td>Provides PSubC with both digital and hard copies of scholarly/creative materials for submission to external reviewers. Provides PSubC with the CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Personal Statement that are to be sent to the external reviewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Following SNL’s procedures for the student input process, AA integrates any revisions suggested by the candidate into the list of students to be sent the mentee survey. Reviews list with Liaison.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By July 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AA discusses with Chair procedures for maintaining the confidentiality of the external reviews throughout the P&amp;T process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| By July 14<sup>th</sup> | Chair provides AA with external reviewers’ contact information and list of which materials each reviewer is to receive.  
Liaison provides AA with hard copies of the candidate’s scholarly/creative materials for the external reviewers.  
Liaison provides AA with the candidate’s CV and personal statement for external reviewers.  
Chair provides AA with hard copies of any supplementary materials that are to be sent to the external reviewers (e.g., SNL P&T criteria). |
<p>| By July 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; | Chair emails digital |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By July 21st</td>
<td>Provides pre-paid return envelope for their letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External review letters are due back by October 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(When external review letters are returned, AA gives original hardcopies to Chair as they arrive. Chair is responsible for holding these for later insertion into candidate's primary portfolio. The confidentiality of the external reviewers must be maintained.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 21st</td>
<td>Following SNL's procedures for the student input process, the Liaison and Student Review Committee work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of the cover letter, candidate's scholarly/creative materials, candidate's CV and personal statement, and SNL P&T criteria to each external reviewer. Requests external review letters back by October 1st.

Chair requests that external reviewers email back a digital copy of their review letter in MS Word so that it can be redacted for the candidate.
| **By July 21st** | Solicits letters detailing service activities from appropriate internal and external people. Letters should be addressed to the Chair and should be suitable for inclusion in the candidate’s review materials. (I.e., these should be on letterhead, not in email form.)

If appropriate, solicits letters from collaborators clarifying contributions to co-authored scholarly works.

These letters are all due by September 7th.

(Chair passes these on to candidate as they arrive. Candidate is responsible for submitting these with her/his review materials.) |
| **By July 31st** | Liaison has received candidate’s course evaluations and evaluation summary report from SNL assessment center.

Liaison confirms that the expected course evaluations are all present.

Liaison submits these materials to the Student Review Committee and... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By July 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Assembles sample syllabi, course materials, assessment/feedback examples, and other student learning materials for review by the student committee. Gives these materials to the Liaison and the AA to be passed on to the student review committee.</td>
<td>the AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Chair invites all full-time and part-time faculty and staff to send the PSubC written input on the candidate suitable for inclusion in the candidate’s review materials (i.e., no email responses). (Chair does not send the personal statement or CV to these constituencies.) Due date is September 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;. Chair passes these on to the candidate as they arrive. The candidate is responsible for incorporating these into her/his review materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Candidate finalizes the Table of Contents for her/his primary and supplementary review materials and submits to Liaison and PSubC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Liaison/PSubC review candidate’s Table of Contents. If approved, passes ToC on to AA. If revisions are necessary, asks candidate to resubmit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 21\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>Liaison/PSubC clarifies with candidate and AA who is responsible for submitting and organizing which parts of the primary and secondary materials to make sure there is no confusion about who is doing what.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 21\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>AA uses approved Table of Contents to begin collaborating with the candidate on assembling the digital and hard copies of candidate's primary materials. (The candidate is solely responsible for assembling both the digital and hard copies of her/his supplementary materials.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 15\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Chair sends PC (i.e., tenured faculty) reminder about the policies and procedures for review process. Chair includes reference to 3.5.2.f of the Faculty Handbook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 21\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>AA sends reminders to the students and mentees who were contacted for input. Responses due by August 31\textsuperscript{st}.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 7\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>Letters about service and/or collaborative research are due. (Any of these that come to the Chair are passed by the Chair to the candidate. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Letters from full-time and part-time SNL faculty and staff are due. Chair passes these to the candidate. The candidate is responsible for including these in his/her materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Chair sends reminders to external reviewers who have not yet submitted their letters. Letters due by Oct. 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| By September 21<sup>st</sup> | Candidate has completed the digital and hard copy versions of his/her supplementary materials.  
Candidate has completed those parts of the digital and hard copy versions of the primary materials that he/she is responsible for. |
| By October 1<sup>st</sup> | Chair confirms that all external review letters have been returned and informs PSubC. PSubC is given unredacted copies of the external review letters. These letters must be kept confidential. |
| By October 7<sup>th</sup> | Chair/Liaison prepare copies of the external review letters that have any information that would identify the reviewer redacted.  
Chair/Liaison gives the redacted versions of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By October 31st</td>
<td>The written report from Student Review Committee is due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By October 7th</td>
<td>External review letters to the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By November 7th</td>
<td>The PSubC meets with the candidate to prepare the candidate for her/his review meeting with the PC (i.e., tenured faculty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By November 21st</td>
<td>Chair informs PC (i.e., tenured faculty) how they can access the candidate’s primary and supplementary materials. Digital copies of the redacted external review letters are made available to the PC. The original, unredacted versions are only available in hard copy form in the office of the AA, from the Chair, and at the PC meeting with the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 7th</td>
<td>PC meets with the candidate. PC discusses and then holds secret vote. PC members provide PSubC input for inclusion in the PC report on the review. Chair communicates the vote results to the candidate after the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December</td>
<td>Liaison drafts the PC report on the candidate and circulates the draft report to the PSubC and then the PC for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA has NetAdmin create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>A new folder on the SNL public drive with access restricted to the AA, the PSubC chair, the Dean and a representative Office of Academic Affairs. (The candidate does not have access to this folder because it will have the unredacted external review letters in it.) AA begins having the candidate's digital versions of the primary and supplementary materials copied into this new, restricted folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 14th</td>
<td>PSubC finalizes the PC report on the candidate. Chair sends final PC report to the PC and to the candidate. In consultation with the Dean, PSubC sets the date when the candidate's materials (including the PC report) will be submitted to the Dean. Chair informs tenured faculty of that date when the candidate's materials will be submitted to the Dean. (Any “signing statements” or minority reports are due 5 business days after the candidate's materials are submitted to the Dean. Any signing statements or minority reports are sent by the Chair to the PC and to the candidate. The PC has 5...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Action</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By December 14th</strong></td>
<td>AA has copied all of the digital versions of the candidate’s primary and supplementary materials into the new restricted folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By December 14th</strong></td>
<td>AA has inserted the original, unredacted external review letters into the candidate’s primary portfolio (both in the hard copy and in the digital version in the new restricted folder.) The candidate is no longer given access to his/her primary portfolio (either hard copy or digital copy) because they include the unredacted external review letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date TBD by PSubC in consultation with the Dean.</strong></td>
<td>The PSubC submits the candidate’s complete materials including the PC report to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By January, 31st</strong></td>
<td>AA arranges for candidate’s primary and secondary materials, complete with the Dean’s letter, to be submitted to the office of Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the date</strong></td>
<td>Candidate has received all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>when the candidate's dossier has been submitted to Academic Affairs.</strong></td>
<td>School-level reports generated in the review process to date. The candidate has until two business days before his/her meeting with the University Board on Promotion and Tenure to submit an optional response to the School-level reports. The response may address only the candidate’s issues or concerns with the School-level reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before candidate's meeting the UBPT</strong></td>
<td>Following the Faculty Handbook section 3.6.1.3, If necessary the candidate requests the Dean’s approval to submit additions to dossier. The Dean must respond within 5 business days. If the Dean approves the addition(s), the Dean is responsible for submitting the material or information to the University level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBD by Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td>Candidate meets with the University Board on Promotion and Tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By April 30th</strong></td>
<td>Candidate receives the UBPT report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By May 15th</strong></td>
<td>Candidate’s optional response to the UBPT report is due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By June 15th or soon after.</strong></td>
<td>Candidate receives the Provost's decision on P&amp;T.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following documents should be included in the candidate's dossier.

I. Items supplied by the candidate

1. The candidate's complete curriculum vitae, paginated with the candidate's name on each page.
2. The candidate's personal statement of up to 3,000 words in which the candidate emphasizes those achievements or qualifications to which evaluators should particularly attend.
3. Evidence of teaching effectiveness including, at a minimum, selected syllabi, course assignments, and exams.
4. Evidence of service, including, at a minimum, description of individual contributions and supporting documentation such as letters from committee chairs.
5. Other evidence he or she may wish to submit, e.g., awards and special recognition.
6. A single copy of articles, papers, published manuscripts, video and audio recordings, and other examples of scholarship and creative activities.

II. Items supplied by the School

1. The School's Standards, Procedures and Evaluation Guidelines for Retention, Tenure & Promotion of Faculty.
2. The written recommendations from the Personnel Committee and the Dean, including signature forms.
3. Signing statement and/or minority report, if any,
4. Candidate's responses (if any)
5. Student review committee's report (including narrative of methodology and sample of survey tools used)
6. For tenure, an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities by at least two external experts.
7. For promotion to full professor, an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, research, or and/or other creative activities, by a minimum of three external experts.
8. Complete list of courses taught during the probationary period or, if applying for full professor rank, courses taught while in current rank.
9. Sample(s) of evaluation tool(s), such as generic course evaluations used in different types of programs or program levels; all tools used during the time period must be represented.
10. Copies of all student evaluations (for tenure candidates all, including courses taught in other institutions; for candidates to promotion to full professor, all evaluations since tenure review).

APPENDIX C: THE PERSONAL STATEMENT

See the faculty handbook, chapter 3, section 3.6.1.1.
The Statement should explain the following: the candidate’s approaches to teaching and mentoring (including a teaching philosophy and, where appropriate, ideas about differences between teaching face-to-face and teaching online); her/his scholarship, research, and/or creative activities; and her/his service. Furthermore, the candidate’s accomplishments in the three areas should be summarized, and future work should be mapped out. Although the focus should be on the time the candidate spent at DePaul, previous work at other places can be mentioned in order to provide a narrative thread.

Overall, the candidate should explain the contribution of her/his body of work, and the trajectory of work done and planned. All faculty candidates for promotion or tenure who engage in collaborative research or creative work should include in their dossier (either in their Personal Statement, annotations to the CV or a personal “Statement of Collaboration”) an explanation of the importance and value of collaborative research, how it advances the scholarship in the candidate’s home disciplinary field or the interdisciplinary fields involved; the kinds of collaboration(s) s/he has undertaken; and an account of her/his own original and creative contribution to such collaboration(s).