

**Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures**  
**School of Continuing and Professional Studies**  
**DePaul University**

**1 GENERAL**

**1.1 APPROVAL HISTORY**

Approved, SCPS Tenured and Tenure Line Faculty, 6/25/15  
Amended and approved, SCPS Tenured and Tenure Line Faculty, 3/16/17  
Approved, SCPS Dean, 3/16/17  
Pending review and approval of Academic Affairs, UBPT, and Full Time Faculty 11/14/19

**1.1 PREAMBLE**

The DePaul Faculty Handbook sets forth University-wide criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion. The School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS) is a local academic unit that is also a college. SCPS's Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures (hereafter the School's "Standards"), as provided in the present document, sets forth unit-specific criteria and procedures for the review of tenure-line and tenured faculty members in SCPS for retention, promotion, and/or tenure. In the absence of unit-specific criteria and procedures, or in the event of a conflict between unit-specific criteria and procedures, University-wide criteria and procedures shall govern.

**1.2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The School of Continuing and Professional Studies's tenured and tenure-line faculty is charged with responsibility for voting on amendments to these Standards (see section 1.3 below) and voting in the elections of tenured faculty nominees for serving on the School's Faculty Review Process Committee. A quorum of a simple majority of tenured and tenure-line faculty must be present for votes to be called.

The School's tenured faculty is the body within the local academic unit charged with responsibility for evaluating and voting, by secret ballot, on candidates' cases presented for tenure progress, promotion, and/or tenure reviews.

A School Faculty Review Process Committee (FRPC) is comprised of at least three members of SCPS's tenured faculty of at least associate rank, elected by the tenured and tenure-line faculty, charged with coordinating the reviews and writing the tenured faculty reports on cases. Members of the FRPC serve for terms of three years. The chair of the FRPC is annually elected by the FRPC and also serves as the chair of the tenured faculty meetings in which cases are discussed and voted upon.

The Dean of the School of Continuing and Professional Studies is the college's academic officer charged with conducting an independent evaluation of cases, after the evaluation of the tenured faculty is completed, and with writing a separate report for inclusion in the candidate's dossier. The Dean does not attend the meetings held by the FRPC and tenured faculty.

**1.3 AMENDMENTS**

Amendments to these Standards may be proposed by the Dean or any tenured or tenure-line faculty member of the School. For an amendment to become effective, it must receive approval by vote of two-thirds of the School's tenured and tenure-line faculty and, following this, approval by the Dean of the School. Amendments are subject to the review and approval of the University Board on Promotion & Tenure (UBPT). Any amendment must be proposed in a meeting of the tenured and tenure-line faculty held prior to the meeting in which the vote to approve the amendment is called.

## 2 CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

### 2.1 TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

#### 2.1.1 TEACHING AND LEARNING

In accordance with the DePaul Faculty Handbook and the School of Continuing and Professional Studies's focus on adult learning, the School will evaluate faculty in the area of teaching and learning according to the criteria specified below in the areas of instruction and academic mentorship and/or advising.

##### 2.1.1.1 INSTRUCTION

The School will evaluate instruction according to these criteria: an effective SCPS instructor

- 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 the subject area(s) taught.
- Encourages students to integrate new learning with prior learning, including learning from experience.
- Organizes, presents and communicates material effectively.
- Applies methods of assessment in line with stated learning outcomes and School and University 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.

##### 2.1.1.2 MAJOR ADVISING AND MENTORING

Depending on the particular degree programs of the School, major advising and/or mentoring are essential responsibilities of tenured and tenure-line faculty and therefore constitute significant contributions in the area of teaching and learning to be evaluated in tenure progress, promotion, and tenure reviews.

The School will evaluate major advising and/or mentoring according these criteria: an effective major advisor or mentor

- Assists students in understanding the curriculum framework of the program they entered, and how it relates to their particular interests and goals.
- Is accessible and responsive to student inquiries or requests.
- Encourages students' understanding of themselves as learners and the utility of different learning styles and strategies.
- Facilitates students' exploration and assessment of their prior learning.
- Encourages students' consideration of college-level opportunities to engage in new independent 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.
- In programs in which student support is structured through academic committees, collaborates with professional/project advisors.
- Collaborates 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 advising and/or mentoring practices.
- Reflects thoughtfully on advising and/or mentoring activities, experiences, and approaches, and implements changes in light of sound practices and principles.

## 2.1.2 SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The School values scholarship, research and/or creative activities (hereafter also shorthanded as “scholarship”) within and across disciplinary boundaries, and it recognizes practiced-based scholarship and its corresponding disseminations.

The School places equal value on scholarship produced independently and collaboratively, and it understands that in some fields collaboration and co-authorship are the norm. In its tenure review process SCPS seeks to distinguish and assess a faculty member’s specific, original, creative contributions to joint work.

### 2.1.2.1 DEFINITION AND RANGE OF SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, SCPS views scholarship as a broad term encompassing the four separate but overlapping functions of a quality faculty member: discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

- Original discovery advances knowledge within the context of a disciplinary or multi-disciplinary field and practice, contributing significantly to knowledge and the intellectual life of the university. Research falls into the category of discovery.
- Integration develops knowledge through cross- and multi-disciplinary investigations, allowing new fields of inquiry to develop.
- The application of knowledge uses research findings in responsible ways to address contemporary societal problems through interaction with the larger community.
- The study of teaching experiences leads to the development of better pedagogical methods and tools.

Broadly, the School considers the following kinds of scholarship for promotion and tenure:

- Research products, using the disciplinary methodologies for investigation and production of new knowledge in the humanities, social and natural sciences, and mathematics, that are shared through presentations at professional meetings and academic publications.
- Creative products in the fine arts, such as the visual arts, the literary arts, and the performing arts, that are shared through presentations at professional meetings and academic publications.
- Public performances of creative works.
- Socially-engaged and/or practice-based scholarship that involve students, communities, or the larger public.

Across these broad categories, the School considers for promotion and tenure a range of works, bearing in mind that the relative importance of the works are governed by the professional norms of candidates’ disciplines and fields and, as such, shall be subject to the evaluations of the external peer reviewers. Eligible works include

- Publications in the form of books, book chapters, and articles in scholarly journals, which have been assessed by peers in the pertinent discipline or field as a condition of their publication.
- Collections edited by the candidate, where the candidate’s original scholarship constitutes a significant portion of the overall work, such as a substantive introduction providing theoretical grounding, historical analysis, and comparative framing.
- Invited publications in the form of books, book chapters, and articles in scholarly journals that are not peer reviewed as a condition of their publication.
- Textbooks or textbook sections authored by the candidate.
- Publication of conference presentations in proceedings.
- Published book, film, video, or art reviews.
- Articles in published reference works, such as encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other comparable compilations.
- Refereed and invited scholarly presentations, workshops, panels, and posters at academic conferences.
- Showings of creative works and performances at academic conferences.
- Online blogs, websites, and similar forums for scholarly exchange, created and edited by the candidate, the content for which draws upon the contributors’ scholarly expertise.
- Unpublished research or policy reports that are publicly disseminated for institutional and/or policymaking uses.

- Competitive grants, fellowships, and awards for research and/or creative activity.
- 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.
- Expert testimony and/or lectures to community groups and organizations that draw upon the candidate's scholarship.
- Publication of creative literary works, including original poems, plays, short stories, and novels, in refereed venues.
- The creation of visual works, including paintings, drawings, prints, photographs, sculptures, and architecture, created partially or primarily for aesthetic, expressive, or critical purposes and which are peer reviewed.
- The technical production of digital media, including website content, animations, graphic design, and computer programs, which are peer reviewed.
- Exhibition of artwork in refereed exhibits or permanent collections.
- Exhibits curated by the candidate that are peer reviewed.
- Public, peer reviewed performances, which engage communities outside of the classroom, of the candidate's creative work, including musical and theatrical compositions, and audio, film, digital and multimedia productions.
- Master classes delivered to external audiences.
- Publications in news and other popular media that draw upon the candidate's scholarship.

Any works of scholarship or creative activities that cannot be evaluated according to the criteria specified in the next Section (2.1.2.2) will not be considered for promotion and tenure.

#### 2.1.2.2 EXPECTATIONS IN TERMS OF QUALITY AND QUANTITY

In line with the Faculty Handbook, SCPS evaluates scholarship, research and/or creative activities in light of their:

- 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

To judge the quality of products and their relative importance in achieving these criteria, the School relies upon the evaluations of the tenured SCPS faculty and external peer reviewers with expertise in the area(s) of the candidate's scholarship (see Section 3.2.6 below).

The School expects candidates to demonstrate how individual objects of scholarship contribute to a clear, coherent and evolving body of work.

The School evaluates tenure-line faculty based on their total output of work. The School expects candidates for tenure to give evidence of notable scholarship, research, and/or creative activities produced during the pre-tenure probationary period. Similarly, the School also expects candidates for promotion to give evidence of notable scholarship, research, and/or creative activities produced during the period of rank held by the candidate at the time the candidate applies for promotion. The School expects a level of scholarly productivity during the probationary period and/or period of rank, commensurate with the usual expectations of the disciplinary or cross-disciplinary field(s) of the candidate, while also allowing for School-specific commitments, for example the demands of summer teaching and mentoring obligations that are typical of the School's twelve-month faculty contracts.

#### 2.1.2.3 DOCUMENTATION OF CANDIDATE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLABORATIVE WORK

Co-authored and/or collaborative works are weighed and evaluated on the basis of written statements from the candidate and the collaborator(s) that articulate the specific contributions of the candidate to the project. Statements of

collaboration should specify the percentage of the collaborative work produced by the candidate, if the work was generated in discrete sections or through discrete roles. In cases where contributions are jointly generated through equivalent effort by the contributors, and contributors are unable to demarcate discrete sections or roles, this should also be documented by the candidate and the collaborator(s).

### 2.1.3 SERVICE

In general, service consists of activities that benefit SCPS, the larger University, professional associations, and the community. Such activities should 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, SCPS’s programs are responsive to changing student demographics, external market dynamics, and trends in higher education. SCPS therefore counts as service faculty contributions to programmatic maintenance and development that go beyond regular, academic administrative responsibilities.

“Service” may be divided in three main subcategories – University service, professional service, and community service. In accordance with differing service requirements at SCPS (the academic home unit) and DePaul, “University service” may be subdivided as “Service to SCPS” and “Service to DePaul.” Below is a non-exhaustive list of the types of service by which SCPS faculty may demonstrate service expectations for promotion and tenure.

#### 2.1.3.1 UNIVERSITY SERVICE

##### 2.1.3.1.1 Service to SCPS

All tenured and tenure-line faculty are expected to participate in basic matters of school governance (e.g., attending faculty meetings) as described in SCPS’s Governance Agreement. Beyond such basic obligations, the School expects candidates to provide service by

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

Most of the roles noted above are listed, along with specific descriptions and/or charges, in SCPS’s Governance Agreement.

##### 2.1.3.1.2 Service to DePaul University

The School also expects all tenured and tenure-line faculty to make University-level service contributions to DePaul University, external to SCPS, by

- Serving on committees, task forces, boards, councils and related entities constituted at the University level, for example, as charged by Faculty Council or the Office of Academic Affairs, and/or
- Serving as the appointed liaison or representative between the University and an external institution.

#### 2.1.3.2 PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

In addition to serving the School and the larger University, each tenured and tenure-line faculty member is expected to participate in one’s profession(s). (Note, such service, particularly when compensated, is subject to the requirements set forth in the Faculty Handbook.) 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.
- Uncompensated consultation 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.

### 2.1.3.3 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. Examples of community service include

- Uncompensated consultation with public and/or private organizations.
- Providing uncompensated services to the public through a university clinic or center.
- Giving uncompensated presentations, clinical services, workshops, media interviews, and performances for the public.
- 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 School evaluates the quality and importance of candidates' service contributions in light of the following criteria:

- 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.

## 2.2 PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

In addition to the requirements for promotion to 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 continued, notable service contributions. 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.

### 2.2.1 TEACHING AND LEARNING

A candidate for full professor should demonstrate continued commitment to teaching and learning, through instruction and academic advising/mentoring. The candidate should present a consistent record of good to excellent teaching and learning, along with evidence of having progressed in the candidate's development as an instructor and academic advisor/mentor of students.

The candidate may demonstrate performance in teaching and learning by providing evidence in areas such as the following: course development, for example, successful course innovation or revamping; the development and successful application of pedagogical methods and tools to enhance student learning; the development and successful application of innovative approaches to interdisciplinary teaching; engagement in teaching advocacy and consultation beyond the School; the acquisition of instructional grants; and the successful implementation of changes in academic advising and/or mentoring activities and approaches based on careful reflection of sound practices and principles.

### 2.2.2 SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The School expects that the candidate for promotion to full professor has made additional, substantial contributions while in the rank held at the time of review for promotion ("in rank"), which have had a significant impact in one's disciplinary or cross-disciplinary field(s). The School will evaluate the body of work that the candidate produced in rank against the

body of work that the candidate produced prior to the held rank in order to establish the candidate's trajectory of scholarship and potential for continued production at a rate and of a quality commensurate with leaders in the field. The School will use the criteria specified in Section 2.1.2.2 (see above) for evaluating the candidate's scholarship in terms of quality and quantity, again relying upon the professional norms of the candidate's discipline(s) and as evaluated by the external peer reviewers.

The School expects that the scholarship of the candidate has achieved national or international recognition establishing the candidate as an expert in one's field. In some disciplines, leadership in the application of research to social ends may be considered among the evidence evaluated for promotion.

Evidence of successful grant funding, particularly from sources beyond the University, will strongly enhance the candidate's scholarship dossier.

### 2.2.3 SERVICE

In addition to the expectations for service in rank, the School expects candidates for full professor to have effectively exercised responsibilities for mentoring tenure-line faculty and providing leadership in service and governance at the School and University levels. The School expects candidates, while in rank, to show evidence of substantial service marked by extraordinary contributions to the home academic unit, the University, the profession, and the community. For definitions and examples of service, see Section 2.1.3 above.

## 3 PROCEDURES

### 3.1 TENURE-LINE PROBATIONARY REVIEWS

#### 3.1.1 OVERVIEW

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 the tenure-line probationary period, a faculty member shall undergo probationary reviews that are both summative and formative in nature according to the schedule specified by the Faculty Handbook. The SCPS Faculty Review Process Committee coordinates the reviews and communicates the results of the reviews to the Dean and the faculty candidates.

The purpose of a probationary review is to

- assess a tenure-line faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching and learning, 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 the faculty member to meet before the next probationary review;
- produce a recommendation as to whether or not the tenure-line faculty member's contract should be renewed.

#### 3.1.2 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.

The Faculty Review Process 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 FRPC 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 the type of review or its timing, the candidate should consult with the FRPC for detailed instructions in preparing for the review.

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.

### 3.1.3 LEAVES AND THE TENURE/REVIEW CLOCK

If a faculty member accepts postponing tenure review because of a leave, this may also change the scheduling of that faculty member's progress reviews. The School therefore expects all faculty members on leave to arrange with the Faculty Review Process Committee an alternate review schedule upon returning from the leave. Although the revised timing of the probationary review following a leave may not coincide with the timing of the Dean's decision regarding contract renewal, the FRPC will still issue a summative and formative evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure.

### 3.1.4 PROBATIONARY REVIEW PROCEDURES

At the beginning of the academic year in which a particular probationary review will be conducted, the Faculty Review Process 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 review.

#### 3.1.4.1 Informal Tenure Progress Review

Before the deadline given by the Faculty Review Process Committee, the candidate shall prepare and submit to the FRPC the following materials:

- an updated *curriculum vitae*;
- a separate summary of the current academic year and planned activities in the categories of teaching and 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), supplemented as needed to account for an academic year period;
- any other material the candidate wishes the FRPC to review.

The Faculty Review Process Committee meets with the candidate, assesses the evidence, votes, 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 FRPC to discuss any questions or concerns the candidate may have about the report.

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

#### 3.1.4.2 Formal Tenure Progress Reviews

Before the deadline provided by the Faculty Review Process Committee, the candidate shall prepare and submit to the FRPC 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;



- Scholarly or creative materials produced since the last formal review.
- Other material the candidate deems relevant.

In addition, the Faculty Review Process Committee shall obtain:

- Student evaluations of teaching done since the last formal review;
- Peer evaluations of teaching done since the last formal review;
- Evaluations of faculty advising and/or mentoring solicited by the School and done since the last formal review.

The FRPC meets with the candidate, reviews the completeness and adequacy of all presented material, makes the material available to the tenured faculty, and organizes a special meeting to be attended by the tenured faculty and the candidate. The tenured faculty meets with the candidate, then excuses the candidate from the meeting and discusses the candidate's progress in all areas of evaluation based on the candidates' presented evidence and other types of evidence collected, for example, written input by other full-time untenured faculty members. At the end of the meeting, the tenured faculty votes by secret ballot on two questions: whether it recommends the candidate has made adequate progress toward tenure, and whether the candidate's contract should be renewed.

The FRPC summarizes the assessment of the tenured faculty both in terms of adequate progress towards tenure as well as recommendation towards reappointment, and it makes a written report to the Dean with a copy to the candidate.

The candidate may request a meeting with the FRPC to discuss any questions or concerns about the report.

Any written material used by the FRPC in conducting formal reviews will be made available to the faculty member being reviewed.

## 3.2 REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

### 3.2.1 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's tenured faculty and Dean have responsibilities for evaluating the evidence contained in a candidate's tenure and/or promotion portfolio and providing recommendations for tenure and/or promotion to be added to the candidate's portfolio for review at the next level.

### 3.2.2 SCHEDULE

The candidate's review schedule shall follow the timeline provided in the Faculty Handbook. The School's Faculty Review Process Committee shall provide further guidance on deadlines and the timeline for the process to the candidate upon the commencement of the review cycle.

### 3.2.3 FACULTY REVIEW PROCESS COMMITTEE'S DETAILED RESPONSIBILITIES

As given in Section 1.2 above, the Faculty Review Process Committee is charged with coordinating the reviews and writing the tenured faculty reports on cases. To carry out its charge, the FRPC shall exercise the following responsibilities:

- Coordinating and providing oversight of a candidate's review.
- Guiding the completion of the Dossier, 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 and communicating with external reviewers of scholarship.
- Meeting with the candidate to discuss the dossier.
- 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.

### 3.2.4 THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

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

- Providing the Faculty Review Process Committee with a list of possible external reviewers. The FRPC shall consider the candidate's list as well as further prospective reviewers from the disciplinary or cross-disciplinary field(s) in which the candidate's scholarship resides. The Faculty Review Process Committee makes a decision regarding which external reviewers to invite to assess the candidate's scholarship see (see Section 3.2.6 below).
- Soliciting written statements from collaborators that articulate the specific contributions of the candidate to collaborative works. See Section 2.1.2.3 above.
- Soliciting written statements that assess the candidate's service contributions from DePaul University colleagues, members of the candidate's profession(s), and, where appropriate, from community members.
- Preparing and submitting parts of the Primary Portfolio that are designated as the candidate's responsibility (see Appendix A).
- Compiling the Supplementary Material.

### 3.2.5 THE DOSSIER

#### 3.2.5.1 The Primary Portfolio

The Office of the Dean, the candidate, and the Faculty Review Process 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. See Appendix A for an itemized listing of the Primary Portfolio contents and the parties responsible for preparing and submitting the specific items included among the contents.

#### 3.2.5.2 The Supplementary Portfolio

The candidate should provide any additional material that supplements, in substantive ways, the material of the Primary Portfolio. This Supplementary Portfolio should be organized according to the main categories of teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. The candidate should consult the Faculty Handbook for instructions on the items to be included in this part of the dossier. Beyond this, the candidate should consider including concrete examples of pedagogical products or processes, scholarly presentations, works-in-progress, and/or material produced in the course of service. It is important that the candidate include all information that the candidate deems relevant to the review, as the candidate may not make any additions to the dossier after the final vote of the University Board on Promotion and Tenure. See the Faculty Handbook for further guidance.

#### 3.2.5.3 Additions to the Dossier

The Faculty Handbook governs the conditions, criteria, and procedures by which additions may be added to a candidate's dossier. Because SCPS is a local academic unit which is a college, the Dean serves as the local academic unit officer. To request an addition to the dossier at any point in the review process prior to the final vote by the University Board on Promotion and Tenure, the candidate should submit the addition and supporting documentation to the Dean. See the Faculty Handbook for further guidelines governing additions to the dossier.

### 3.2.6 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The Faculty Handbook requires that a candidate's works of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity be evaluated by external reviewers whose judgments are respected in the candidate's field of expertise and who can provide impartial assessments. The School follows the guidelines provided by the Faculty Handbook for soliciting, selecting, and using external reviews. This section articulates the School's specific procedures.

The candidate will supply the Faculty Review Process Committee with an extensive list of possible external reviewers who are recognized experts in the particular disciplinary or cross-disciplinary field(s) of the works to be evaluated. The candidate will also provide written explanations of the nature and extent of the candidate's relationships with these

possible external reviewers to provide a basis upon which the FRPC may judge the reviewers' impartiality. The FRPC seeks external reviewers who have had no contact with the candidate or whose prior contact with the candidate would not jeopardize the reviewers' impartiality. Reviewers whose objectivity is subject to question will be excluded, for example a reviewer who served as the candidate's doctoral advisor or who has a personal or financial relationship with the candidate.

The FRPC selects a large enough pool of potential external reviewers so as to obtain the sufficient numbers required for the candidate's particular application; see the Faculty Handbook for the respective minimum number of reviews required.

The FRPC will seek external reviewers beyond the list provided by the candidate.

According to the Faculty Handbook, it is the responsibility of the FRPC to explicitly state in the letters of solicitation to potential reviewers that their identities will be kept confidential. The Faculty Handbook provides a sample letter that the FRPC will adapt in its letters of solicitation to potential reviewers.

The FRPC will redact all information that would identify the reviewers in all copies of the external review letters that are given to the candidate. Any citations from the external review letters in the reports of the unit and the Dean will be similarly redacted. The original (unredacted) external review letters will be accessible only to members of the FRPC, the SCPS tenured faculty, and the Dean, who may wish to consult them during their reviews. The original external letters will also be included in the candidate's dossier when the Dean forwards it to the University level, i.e., once the candidate no longer has access to contents of the dossier.

### 3.2.7 INPUT BY THE STUDENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

See the Faculty Handbook for information relevant to this process.

#### 3.2.7.1 Selection of Student Review Committee

The Faculty Review Process Committee will select a Student Review Committee comprised of at least two and no more than three students from the SCPS program level(s) at which the candidate has taught, advised, 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 candidate for promotion and tenure in a given year, a separate Student Review Committee is convened for each candidate.

Students are eligible to serve on a candidate's Student Review Committee only if they are not currently in a class with the candidate, receiving advising/mentoring by the candidate, or is otherwise working closely with the candidate. Undergraduate student representatives should have successfully completed the Research Seminar course or its equivalent. Graduate student representatives should have completed at least 26 credit hours, or the equivalent, of graduate coursework. All student representatives should possess good organization and project management skills, good quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills, and strong writing and presentation skills.

#### 3.2.7.2 Responsibilities of the Student Review Committee in Relation to the Faculty Review Process Committee

The Student Review Committee will be convened for their initial meeting by a designated member of the Faculty Review Process Committee, who will in turn give the Student Review Committee an orientation to the promotion and tenure review process and the roles and responsibilities of the Student Review Committee within it.

The designated member of the FRPC, assisted by the SCPS staff assigned to providing support for the promotion and tenure reviews ("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 (OTEs).
- Data from the survey of current and graduated students who took classes with the candidate or received advising and/or mentoring by the candidate.
- Letters by the candidates' students, if any.

The Student Review Committee reviews and assesses the information that has been provided to it. The student committee summarizes its assessment in a report that it writes and submits to the FRPC. The FRPC may ask the Student Review Committee for revisions to the report, in order to encourage that the report meets the expectations for it provided by the Faculty Handbook. The FRPC may request to meet with the Student Review Committee to discuss the report. This report and the data on which it is based are also provided to the candidate and included in the candidate's dossier.

### 3.2.7.3 Student Input Instrument

The student input instrument for the promotion and tenure reviews is a survey sent to all current and former students that the candidate taught, advised, and/or mentored during the probationary period or the period in rank prior to the review.

A Student Input Instrument Committee is formed for the initial creation and subsequent revision of the survey, data collection process, and reporting template. This committee shall consist of at least two students (a mix of undergraduate and graduate students) and at least two tenured faculty members. The Faculty Review Process Committee must approve the survey, data collection process, report template, and any subsequent modifications. Once the survey, data collection process, and report template have been created or modified by a Student Input Instrument Committee, they can be reused in subsequent years.

The survey responses and any collected data will be anonymous, and the anonymity of respondents will be preserved throughout the review process.

## 3.2.8 SCHOOL DELIBERATION AND VOTE

### 3.2.8.1 Faculty Review Process Committee Meeting

After all items of the dossier have been compiled, the Faculty Review Process Committee reviews the dossier, meets with the candidate, and discusses the case.

The chair of the FRPC chairs the meeting. When the candidate joins the meeting, the candidate may opt to deliver an opening statement. The FRPC's discussion with the candidate will focus on clarifications of the dossier's contents and the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

After the candidate is excused, the FRPC then discusses the case in light of the School's Standards. This discussion draws upon the candidate's dossier and statements made during the meeting. Within this discussion, faculty may offer additional information on the candidate's performance as it relates to the School's Standards insofar as it is supported by documentable evidence. Unsupported comments or opinions regarding the candidate, including those attributed to individuals not present at the discussion (i.e., hearsay), is not admissible in the discussion.

The FRPC does not vote on the case at this meeting. It will provide a summary statement of its discussion at the tenured faculty meeting (see next section).

### 3.2.8.2 School's Tenured Faculty Meeting, Deliberation, and Vote

The meeting of the School's Tenured Faculty has three main purposes:

1. To interview the candidate for clarifications on the contents of the dossier.
2. To discuss the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
3. To vote by secret ballot on the candidate's suitability for receiving promotion and/or tenure.

The Dean will not be present at the meeting and will not vote.

All SCPS tenured faculty members, including the members of the FRPC, are expected to attend the meeting and vote after having carefully read the candidate's material in light of these Standards, exempting those faculty members who may be unable to participate due to an approved leave of absence.

Faculty members may participate in the review meeting via technology in absentia only if they have a valid excuse. The School defines a valid excuse as the inability to attend in person owing to an out-of-town professional commitment (for example, presenting at a conference or teaching off-campus), the sudden onset of a severe illness, or a family emergency. Faculty participating 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 (for example, through simultaneous use of voting technology that preserves the anonymity of the votes). Faculty members participating in absentia are expected to have carefully read the candidate's materials.

The chair of the Faculty Review Process Committee chairs the meeting and generally leads the proceedings as follows.

The chair of the FRPC briefly emphasizes the purpose and structure of the meeting and asks for clarifying questions or comments. The FRPC then gives a summary statement of its discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. It then asks the faculty to consider this assessment as an integral part of the ensuing discussions.

The faculty then meets with the candidate. The candidate may opt to deliver an opening statement for this part of the meeting. Faculty use the time with the candidate to discuss clarifications of the dossier's contents and to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the case. The candidate then leaves the meeting.

The faculty members then deliberate on the case in light of the School's Standards. This discussion draws upon the candidate's dossier and statements made during the meetings with the FRPC and the tenured faculty. Faculty may offer additional information on the candidate's performance as it relates to the School's Standards insofar as it is supported by documentable evidence. Unsupported comments or opinions regarding the candidate, including those attributed to individuals not present at the discussion (i.e., hearsay), is not admissible in the discussion.

At the end of the meeting all faculty will vote by a secret ballot following the voting guidelines provided by the Faculty Handbook. Only faculty members who participated in the discussions of the meeting are eligible to vote.

Once the votes are tallied, the chair will promptly inform the candidate and the tenured faculty who voted of the numerical vote.

### 3.2.9 SCHOOL'S TENURED FACULTY REPORT

The Faculty Review Process Committee writes the tenured faculty's report that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the case in light of the School's Standards and the discussion had at the tenured faculty's review meeting; this report also enumerates the votes cast by the tenured faculty on the case.

All tenured faculty members who voted on the case are required to sign one of two forms. One form states the faculty member agrees that the report accurately represents the discussion of the tenured faculty on the case. The other form states that the report does not accurately reflect the discussion, and a faculty member signing this form must provide a signed statement, known as a "Signing Statement," explaining why the faculty member believes the report does not accurately reflect the discussion. See the Faculty Handbook for further guidelines pertaining to a Signing Statement.

A faculty member's signature on either form does not reflect his or her vote.

In the event a faculty member is unwilling or unable to sign one of the two forms, or a faculty member who has signed the form requiring a Signing Statement is unwilling or unable to provide a Signing Statement, the report will go forward with an explanation for the omissions from the person responsible for gathering the signatures.

### 3.2.10 MINORITY REPORT

In a case where a faculty member who attended the FRPC meeting or tenured faculty meeting claims that the School violated its guidelines, criteria, or processes, or those of the University, the faculty member must provide a written minority report to the FRPC within five business days of the case's transmission to the next level of review, i.e., the Dean's review. For this purpose, the review of the FRPC and the review of the tenured faculty shall be interpreted as belonging to the same level of review. The minority report is restricted to describing how the School violated its Standards and must not offer any opinions on the candidate that have not already been expressed during the FRPC meeting or tenured faculty meeting.

The FRPC will share the minority report with all tenured faculty and the candidate, write a response to the minority report, and add both the minority report and its response to the Primary Portfolio for consideration at the next level of review.

### 3.2.11 DEAN REVIEW AND TRANSFER OF DOSSIER

Upon completion of its review, and according to the schedule provided by the Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Review Process Committee will transmit the candidate's dossier and all reports to the Dean for the Dean's review. The Dean submits a report on the case based on this review to Academic Affairs and the candidate. The dossier is transmitted to Academic Affairs for the next level of review.

### 3.2.12 CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO COLLEGE REVIEW

The candidate has the option of submitting a written response to all reports generated during the School's review. This response is due to Academic Affairs and the Dean at least two business days prior to the scheduled date of the candidate's hearing by the UBPT. See the Faculty Handbook for further information.

## APPENDIX A: DOCUMENTATION FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

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 (if any).
4. Evidence of service, including, at a minimum, description of individual contributions and supporting documentation such as letters from committee chairs.
5. Other evidence the candidate 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.
2. The written recommendations from the Faculty Review Process Committee, Tenured Faculty, and the Dean, including signature forms.
3. Signing statement(s) 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).
11. Peer evaluations of teaching.

## APPENDIX B: THE PERSONAL STATEMENT

See the Faculty Handbook.

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); a narrative about the candidate's scholarship, research, and/or creative activities; and a narrative about the candidate's service. 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 the candidate's 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 (in their Personal Statement, in annotations to the CV, and/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 or cross-disciplinary field(s) involved; the kinds of collaboration(s) undertaken; and an account of the candidate's original and creative contribution to such collaboration(s).