Preface
This document contains instructions for the preparation of tenure and promotion portfolios organized in the typical order of preparation and completion. All portfolios are submitted electronically to a Box folder. A timeline and checklist can be found at the conclusion of these instructions, along with some suggested templates for communications with external reviewers and students.

We ask each candidate and potential candidate for review to read this document carefully and to raise any questions or points of clarification early in the process. The Faculty Handbook (https://facultyhandbook.richmond.edu) asks the dean, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee, to provide “a memorandum of instructions detailing the timetable and the preparation of the portfolio.” This timeline and memorandum, in alignment with the Faculty Handbook, is updated annually, so we ask that you please consider this document carefully.

In the School of Arts & Sciences, tenure and promotion cases are evaluated according to standards in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix VI: https://facultyhandbook.richmond.edu.
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Process & Guidelines for Solicitation of Materials

Solicitation of External Reviewers of Scholarship and Creative Work

Normally a case will include input from at least five external reviewers. At least two of the final five external reviewers engaged should come from a list provided by the candidate, and at least two should come from the department’s list. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, every possible effort should be made to ensure that the number of external reviewers drawn from the candidate’s recommended list does not exceed the number independently drawn from the department’s list. The department will not inform the candidate of the identity of any persons invited to serve as external reviewers.

By the last Monday in April, candidates should provide their department chairs with the following materials to ensure the timely recruitment of external reviewers. At the earliest, the candidate may begin to submit names of external reviewers to their department chair during the spring semester prior to the year of review.

1. Selection of external reviewers (from the candidate)

   ▪ The names and addresses (email and department) of five persons from outside the University who are recognized as experts in the candidate’s field and whom the department chair may contact for confidential assessments of the candidate’s scholarship/creative work.

   ▪ A paragraph on why each expert has been recommended and a notation of the candidate’s personal/professional relationship with each.

   ▪ Some examples of information that the candidate should disclose include, e.g., co-authors, dissertation committee members, editors of a volume in which the candidate is published, editorial board of publication journal in which the candidate is published, or a mentor in graduate school.

   ▪ A list of any experts who should not be invited to comment on the candidate’s work and the reason for exclusion, in keeping with the Faculty Handbook guidelines.

2. Selection of materials for external review

   ▪ The candidate makes the ultimate decision about which work should be sent for external review. However, the candidate should consult their department chair to make that selection. Note: work substantially begun and completed at the University of Richmond will be the primary basis of the tenure and promotion review.

   ▪ An identical selection of materials must be sent to all reviewers.
A current curriculum vitae (CV) should be included with those materials. The candidate may also include any organizing guidelines for the reader, not to exceed one typewritten page, regarding the selection of this work.

3. **Department’s selection of external reviewers**

   The department chair consults tenured members of the candidate’s department and outside experts to identify at least five qualified external reviewers from the candidate’s field.

4. **Guidelines for choosing external evaluators.**

   In cases where these guidelines make finding suitable reviewers difficult, exceptions can be made in consultation with the dean.

   - Every effort should be made to choose evaluators whose scholarly or creative work is aligned with that of the candidate and who have perspective to review the candidate’s works in the context of a larger body of work.

   - If the candidate specifies that their work is interdisciplinary, reviewers from each discipline or that specialize in similar intersections of scholarly work should be sought.

   - Extra care should be taken to identify all connections between reviewer and candidate. Departments should make every effort to avoid reviewers with connections that could influence the review, including, for example, co-authorship, editor of book in which the candidate’s work appears, or shared thesis advisor.

   - Reviewers from academic institutions should be tenured at the rank of associate or full professor (with the latter preferred).

   - Having at least one of the reviewers from an institution similar in size and focus to the School of Arts & Sciences at University of Richmond is helpful.

   - It is desirable to have a diverse set of reviewers, particularly in terms of gender and, when possible, race and ethnicity.

   - The department chair will review the candidate’s and the department’s lists of proposed external reviewers with the dean, who will approve the final list. The dean will discourage the chair from engaging external reviewers who have previously evaluated the candidate’s work or whose engagement in the review may present an appearance of impropriety.
5. **Chair’s solicitation of external reviewers**

With the dean’s consent, the department chair invites the approved external reviewers to participate. The following method is required:

- To obtain the right balance, the department chair may engage external reviewers from the candidate’s list first and then engage more external reviewers from the department’s list. (See Appendices A-B for required templates.)

- In correspondence with the external reviewer, the chair must independently ask the reviewer to address their relationship with the candidate, even in cases where the candidate has done so for the reviewers they select.

- The chair’s correspondence should direct the reviewer to disclose whether they are, e.g., co-authors, dissertation committee members, editors of a volume in which the candidate is published, the editorial board of publication journal in which the candidate is published, or a mentor in graduate school.

- Solicitation letters must ask external reviewers to evaluate the candidate’s scholarship or creative work, including strengths and weaknesses, but to refrain from recommending tenure/promotion.

- Any additional correspondence between the chair and the reviewers must be recorded and submitted to the T&P Committee.

**By the third week of May, letters and selected materials should be sent to all external reviewers.**

All references to, correspondence with, and reports from external reviewers must be kept confidential. These reviewers should be kept anonymous to the candidate. The tenured members of the department, the department chair, the dean, and, later in the process, the T&P Committee, provost, and president will be aware of the identity of the external reviewers.

- All reports from external reviewers must be submitted with the dossier in Box folders.

- Each report should include a curriculum vitae from each external reviewer.
Solicitation of Student Letters

By the second Monday in May, the candidate should submit a list of up to five students the candidate wants the department chair to contact and up to five whom the candidate does not want the chair to contact.

- The candidate should not contact the suggested student reviewers about their willingness to serve in this capacity.
- The department chair is responsible for soliciting letters from a minimum of 80 students randomly selected from courses the candidate has taught.
- The candidate may choose not to include student representation from courses taught during the candidate’s first semester at Richmond.
- Student letter solicitations should come directly from the department chair and not from an administrative assistant or other proxies to achieve a higher response rate. The dean’s office will provide a link to a dynamic form to be included in the chair’s email.
- In June, emails requesting student feedback should be sent. The chair should send two reminder emails one month apart to ensure a high response rate. Chairs are strongly encouraged to obtain as many responses as possible.
- The Chair will receive a BOX folder with all of the student responses after the deadline for submission has passed.
- See Appendix C for a student letter solicitation template.

How to select students for solicitation letters:

- The department chair should use the Report Request Form available at the Registrar’s Office website (https://registrar.richmond.edu/faculty-staff/report-labels.html) to obtain class lists for all classes taught by the candidate during the candidate’s probationary period, with the possible exception of courses taught by the candidate during the candidate’s first term at Richmond.
- The former students contacted by the department chair should be randomly selected and include majors and non-majors.
- The number of students randomly selected from each course taught should be based on the teaching unit value of the class, not class size. For example, if the candidate taught 27 teaching unit classes during the probationary period, at least three unique names should be drawn from each class (yielding 81 students). This approach is required in lieu of drawing names based on class size; otherwise, large enrollment classes have a disproportional representation in assessing
the candidate’s overall teaching record.

- Candidates who have supervised students’ research or creative work outside of regular classes may submit a list of names to the department chair. Typically, 15 to 20 students would constitute a course with one teaching unit value.

**Solicitation of Service Letters**

**By the second Monday in May, the candidate is responsible for providing a complete list of service activities to the department chair.**

- The department chair is responsible for soliciting service letters from the appropriate heads of the committees or groups on which the candidate has served.
- See Appendix D for a service solicitation template.
Digital Portfolio Format and Procedures

Tenure and promotion portfolios are submitted as digital “binders” on Box. The A&S Dean’s Office supplies a digital portfolio template for tenure and promotion candidates (below). The template features clearly labeled folders into which the candidate can deposit digital materials. Candidates are removed from the Box folder when the completed portfolio is submitted to the department. The chair and other administrators are removed from the folder when the portfolio moves to the T&P committee for consideration.

We recognize that not all creative/scholarly work will fit into the available digital template. In such cases, the candidate should submit representative work as a material object (or as appropriate).

The template is designed to a) simplify the candidate’s organizational task and; b) maximize consistency and ease of use for T&P readers. Any changes you make to customize the template should further these goals..

Core Portfolio Binder Contents (Folder 01)

A clear and persuasive case is characterized by thoughtful reference to the Faculty Handbook standards, careful analysis, coherent organization of evidence, and documentation. Any questions about the selection and arrangement of materials or any other aspect of the portfolio preparation process should be referred to the department chair or dean.

The structure of a case is centered on a single Core Portfolio Binder supported by appendices of supplemental information in Supplemental Binders. The checklist below can be used to ensure that the Core Portfolio Binder is complete.

The candidate cross-references materials between the Core Portfolio Binder and the Supplemental Binders. Therefore, the first binder of the portfolio includes the core of a tenure/promotion case.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion who wish to include in their statements COVID-related or other circumstances may do so under the guidance provided by the Faculty Handbook, which invites them to “… include in his or her portfolio all required information and any additional information the candidate believes pertinent to the review process.” (p. 58)

- Please reference the checklist at the end of these instructions to ensure that your Core Portfolio Binder is complete. The checklist is also located in the Box folder.

- Please upload documents as PDF files when possible.
Materials in the Core Portfolio Binder Include:

1. Table of Contents

2. Curriculum Vitae
   - An up-to-date full CV. Please indicate University of Richmond undergraduate (*) student co-authors on presentations and publications.
   - A two-page condensed CV strictly following the template provided by the Provost’s Office. (Appendix E).

3. Annual Reviews
   - Copies of each of the candidate’s annual merit reviews and each of the chair’s merit reports. Please put these reports together by year.
   - In a promotion case, this section should include merit reviews for the preceding three years (if available).
   - If a department rubric is used in the context of merit reviews, please include a copy.

4. Mid-Course Review
   - In a tenure case, please include a copy of the department’s mid-course review report and the dean’s mid-course review report to the candidate.
Scholarship Portfolio Contents (Folder 02)

This folder includes evidence of the candidate’s scholarly or creative program and ability to complete work of high quality.

Materials in the Scholarship Portfolio Binder Include:

1. Table of Contents

   ▪ The links should be to documents within the Scholarship Portfolio folder.

2. Scholarship Statement

   ▪ This document (4 to 5 single-spaced pages) is the candidate’s statement regarding their professional scholarly or creative activities (objectives, approach, self-evaluation, etc.), including a statement about the significance of these activities for the advancement of the candidate’s field and a statement of plans for further scholarly or creative activities.

   ▪ **Do not exceed the 5 page length restriction for this statement.**

   ▪ Candidates should identify work substantially begun and completed at the University of Richmond.

   ▪ **For all co-authored work (except for student co-authors), candidates should clearly describe their contributions to the work.** The faculty member must demonstrate the ability to complete work judged to be of high quality by professional peers.

Materials in the Scholarship Sub-Folders Include:

1. Copies of all scholarly, artistic, or other appropriate creative work by the candidate that has been professionally reviewed or published.

2. Work under peer review, including grant applications for external funding. Document the current status of the work, for example, whether it is accepted and scheduled for publication or exhibition, by including a letter from the editor, press, or venue.

3. Information on the quality of journals, galleries, musical series, and other sources in which this work appeared, as defined by such measures as the journal’s general reputation in the field, its acceptance rates, whether or not submissions are blind-reviewed, etc.
4. Evidence of work in preparation (e.g., drafts, sketches, grant proposals) if such work is clearly contextualized as germane to the case.

5. Conference presentations and/or invited talks.

Teaching Portfolio Contents (Folder 03)

Ultimately, the teaching portfolio (teaching statement and accompanying materials) should be a well-crafted presentation of the candidate’s growth and trajectory as a professor. Candidates provide a critical, holistic evaluation of their teaching based on strong documentation and analysis so readers can gain insights into their pedagogical values and their impacts on student learning. A good selection of materials is systematic, representative, and comprehensive. It is not sufficient to provide materials or data without analysis. Candidates should attempt to show how and why they are an effective professor with critical analysis and the use of illustrative evidence.

Materials in the Teaching Portfolio Binder Include:

1. Table of Contents
   - Links should be to documents within the Teaching Portfolio folder.

2. Teaching and Advising Statement
   - This document (4 to 5 single-spaced pages) is the candidate’s statement regarding their approach to teaching and advising (goals, methods, self-evaluation, etc.). The candidate should include a self-reflective analysis of their teaching and advising, with reference to the Faculty Handbook standards and the evidence submitted in the portfolio. The teaching statement guides reviewers to understand the faculty member’s development as a teacher and mentor and to demonstrate the faculty member’s commitment to excellence in teaching.
     - Do not exceed the 5 page length restriction for this statement.
     - Include any special workshops, training sessions, or other evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness.
     - Candidates are encouraged to present a thoughtful narrative statement that appraises one’s teaching experiences, including an overview of the candidate’s pedagogical goals, a review of successes and failures, reflections on these experiences, and thoughts of what lies ahead. The statement should make a persuasive case to the reader about how the candidate’s teaching and supplementary materials are systematically designed to improve student learning.
     - The statement may link to emblematic materials in the portfolio that would constitute strong evidence of “excellence in teaching.”
3. **Teaching Load, Class Size, Grade Distribution Information**

- A semester-by-semester list of all courses taught, including enrollments and credit/contact hours for each course.
- If a course was team-taught, the candidate’s role in the course should be indicated.
- In cases of promotion to full professor, candidates will normally include evidence for at least the most recent ten semesters of teaching. Evidence from teaching at other institutions since tenure may be included.

4. **Course Materials**

- Course materials should be organized in subfolders by class and include materials demonstrating the development of courses at each curriculum level.
- Provide a folder for each class that you are including, and organize syllabi, sample assignments, and sample student work by class.
- **Please annotate materials that are written in a language other than English.**

5. **Course Evaluations**

- Documents include SEI Reports, SEI Summary Statistics, or SEI Individual Forms, as well as the computer-scored summations of their quantitative results.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will provide a complete set of SEIs to the candidate.
- All forms must be submitted with the summative narrative responses for each semester (although the candidate may choose not to share the results of evaluations given in the candidate’s first semester at Richmond.)

6. **Classroom Visit Reports (if applicable)**

7. **Additional Evidence of Teaching or Advising Effectiveness**

- These materials may include and are not limited to: peer assessments, major tests/examinations, reading quizzes, essay guideline hand-outs, statements of course goals and objectives, relevant examples of marked and graded student work including sample graded work with formative learning comments for students (if relevant), scaffolded assignments that build upon course goals/skills, argument-mapping assignments designed to develop metacognition, final presentations that apply relevant course concepts, etc.
Service Portfolio Contents (Folder 04)

This portfolio binder includes evidence of the candidate’s effectiveness as a faculty citizen including service to the department, to the University, and (if appropriate) to other professionally relevant groups and organizations. This evidence may take the form of annotated lists of committees on which the candidate has served or other contextualized descriptions of the candidate’s service contributions.

Materials in the Service Portfolio Binder Include:

1. Table of Contents
   - Links should be to documents within the Service Portfolio folder.

2. Service Statement
   - This document (1 to 2 single-spaced pages) is the candidate’s statement regarding their involvement in service activities and responsibilities for the department, the School of Arts & Sciences, and the University. Do not exceed the 2 page length restriction for this statement.
   - If applicable, this statement may include comments on service rendered to appropriate professional groups and organizations outside the University.
   - The faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in service to the department, School, or University.

3. List of Service Activities

4. Additional Evidence of Service Effectiveness (if applicable)
Core Portfolio Contents (NO CANDIDATE ACCESS)

This portfolio contains all the documents the candidate cannot access including student letters, external review letters with associated correspondence, and service letters.

The chair adds the following materials after the candidate has submitted materials:

1. **Student Letters**

   - Verification that the chair followed the prescribed process in selecting the student evaluators.
   - A list of all 80(+) students asked to provide evaluations and reasons why individual students declined to write (if a reason is given).
   - A representative copy of the initial email and reminders sent to former and current students soliciting evaluative comments on teaching and advising.
   - In one PDF file, include the original evaluative letters (copies of emails) received from students, as provided by IFX. Note that some students may wish to respond to the chair rather than through the Dynamic Forms system: Any responses received by email should be collated into a single PDF file that is submitted by the chair as a separate document.

2. **External Review Letters**

   - The candidate’s recommended reviewer list (with explanations).
   - The department’s recommended reviewer list (with explanations).
   - The dean’s email approval of the lists of recommended external reviewers.
   - A list of all external reviewers solicited.
   - A copy of all correspondence (email) sent to each external reviewer who agreed to evaluate.
   - A list of the selected scholarship or other materials sent to the external reviewers.
   - For each external reviewer who writes an evaluation, include a current curriculum vitae of the reviewer.
   - In one PDF file, include all original letters of evaluation received from the external reviewers.
3. **Service Letters**

- A list of service reviewers from whom evaluations were requested.
- A copy of the email sent to service reviewers.
- In one PDF file, include the original letters of evaluation received from the service reviewers.
The Department Report

Preparing the Department Report (5-7 pages, approximately 3000 words)

The Department Report is due by the first Monday in October.

Tenured members of the candidate’s department should prepare for the department’s meeting on the case by reviewing the candidate’s portfolio and supporting materials. Tenured faculty on leave or sabbatical may elect not to participate in evaluating candidates, but they must be allowed to participate if they wish. They must be present for the department meeting and discussion (either in person or via Zoom). The department chair is responsible for communicating with the dean whether or not faculty on leave will be participating and how they will be included in the discussion if they are not physically present.

Tenured departmental faculty will meet to discuss the tenure and/or promotion case, reviewing and assessing the portfolio submitted by the candidate, the external review letters, and the candidate’s performance in accordance with the Faculty Handbook standards. Tenured faculty vote on the candidate’s tenure and promotion through a secret ballot at the department meeting. **Only those faculty who have participated in the department meeting (either in person or via Zoom if necessary) may vote on the candidate’s tenure and promotion.** A summary of the vote is sent confidentially by email directly to the dean. The summary of the vote should not be shared with the candidate. The dean will include a summary of the vote with the report when it is shared with the Tenure & Promotion Committee, the provost, and the president.

Normally, drafting the departmental report is the department chair’s responsibility, but this responsibility may be assigned to another tenured member of the department. In such circumstances, unless the dean has approved an exception, the chair must submit the report to the dean.

The departmental report should assess the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, including any professional challenges the candidate has had and any efforts made to overcome them. The report should be based on analysis of the evidence in the portfolio and should cite such evidence. **The report should express the range of opinions in the department and must discuss the presence of any dissenting views as well as the strength of any consensus, but it should not resemble in any way a transcript of the department’s confidential deliberations.**

The departmental career profile may be appended to the department report if both the candidate and the department chair agree to include it. Because, however, career profiles vary widely across departments, are living documents, and do not have binding force, the dean or the T&P Committee will not use the profile to assess the candidate. As noted in the Faculty Handbook (p. 58) “Thoughtfully prepared profiles may offer a rough outline of expected progress, but should not be considered a checklist for tenure and promotion.”

The dean vets a draft of the department report for legal and procedural issues in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. With approval by the dean, the report is first signed by all tenured members of the
department who participated in the review and then shared with the candidate and included in the portfolio. **Signature only means agreement that the report fairly represents the departmental discussion; it does not mean that all tenured members of the candidate’s department agree with the majority opinion.** The department report cannot be forwarded to the T&P Committee unless all tenured department members have signed it. In the rare case when a tenured member of the department is not willing to sign the report, the dean will provide a mediator to facilitate.

**Teaching Section to Include:**

The Department Report should reference the standard in the *Faculty Handbook*:

“The School of Arts & Sciences seeks a faculty committed to excellence in teaching, and expects successful candidates for tenure and promotion to have demonstrated a high level of performance in teaching. Such things as measures of student achievement, student evaluations, and reviews conducted by other teachers can be used to demonstrate the quality of teaching. Excellent teaching stimulates students’ interest, increases their knowledge, and requires them to engage in critical analysis. Generally, excellent teaching is the result of the instructor’s mastery of the subject, clear organization and presentation, use of appropriately up-to-date materials and methodologies, respect for and fair treatment of students, thoughtful advising, and willingness to engage with them in open dialogue.”

**For example, the department report may include observations on the following:**

- An evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s syllabi, commitment to growth as a teacher, the development of the candidate’s teaching skills during the probationary period, and such factors as effectiveness in communicating, counseling, and motivating students, in working with different types of students, in evaluating student progress, in developing and implementing course goals and objectives that are rigorous and challenging, and in relating course work to the overall curricular goals of the department and the University.

- A description and evaluation of instructional methods developed by the candidate.

- Evidence of student learning, for example, through analysis of student evaluations submitted for each course and analysis of confidential responses received from students through the department chair’s survey.

- An assessment of the candidate’s student advising (for both undeclared and declared students).

**Scholarship Section to Include:**

The department report assesses the accomplishments and promise of the candidate as a scholar or creative artist in the discipline. The department report should reference the standard in the *Faculty Handbook*:
“Scholarship supports the University’s commitment to teaching. The University recognizes that scholarly and other kinds of creative activity can take a variety of forms. It also recognizes that scholarship, to reach its potential, must be shared and tested publicly.

Typically, this means that the university faculty’s scholarly and creative projects are expected to produce publications, presentations, and works of the creative imagination that are open to scrutiny by professional peers. The quality of such work is more significant than the quantity, but candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to demonstrate that they are involved in ongoing scholarly and/or creative work and that they have the ability to complete work of high quality.”

The department report should include a brief passage that provides guidance regarding the standards of research in the candidate’s field. The statement may refer to such considerations as the importance of the order of the authors’ names on a publication, the status of conference proceedings in comparison to publications, the importance of blind or double-blind peer review, or other factors that are generally applicable to the candidate’s discipline so that the dean and the T&P Committee, who will not be experts in the conventions of the candidate’s field, can more fairly assess the candidate’s scholarly contributions.

The department report should be based upon a careful assessment of all the work at hand, including all work submitted for review by the candidate. The department report should comment on the evaluations provided in confidential letters solicited from external reviewers. Because this statement will be shared with the candidate, the department report should preserve the anonymity of external reviewers.

Service Section to Include:

The department report assesses the candidate’s service activities, including membership on committees and participation in the co-curricular life of the department and the University. The department report should reference the standard in the Faculty Handbook:

“The University of Richmond and its School of Arts and Science rely upon the involvement of its faculty in service to the university community, such as participating in committee work and the life of the University. Every candidate for tenure and promotion is expected to demonstrate that they have effectively served their department and the School of Arts and Sciences and/or the University…A faculty member’s activity in professional organizations, depending on its nature and extent, can count as significant service, but cannot substitute for service at the University of Richmond. Service with community organizations is also noted insofar as it involves the exercise of the faculty member’s professional knowledge or abilities.”

Department Report Summative Statement

To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion, the candidate must meet the standard in each area of evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service. The department’s summative statement should indicate whether or not the department considers that the candidate has demonstrated this accomplishment.
The summative statement should include:

- A description of the position the candidate was hired to fill and a summary of any shifts in the duties of the position, including how they are related to the needs and aspirations of the department, school, and University.

- A statement summarizing the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in each area of evaluation.

- This statement should include a summary of the various opinions expressed in the meeting, being careful to preserve the confidentiality of individual committee members.

- A positive recommendation requires a majority vote. The department’s recommendation should be clearly stated with no modifying language. The report should not indicate the vote. You may use the term “majority,” but descriptions such as “unanimous” or “overwhelming” may breach the confidentiality of the vote and should be avoided.

The dean vets a draft of the department report for legal and procedural issues in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*. With approval by the dean, the report should be signed by all tenured members of the department who participated in the review and only then be shared with the candidate and included in the portfolio.
Important Process Issues

1. **Candidates should submit a portfolio for a promotion decision only after consultation with the department chair and the dean** (*Faculty Handbook*, 41).

2. Once the portfolio is submitted to the A&S Dean’s Office, it is considered part of the candidate’s personnel file. It may not be returned to the candidate during the remainder of the tenure decision process. Ordinarily, portfolios have been returned at the end of the following academic year after the summary of the vote, confidential letters, and other appropriate materials have been removed.

   If the candidate wishes to have any materials available prior to that time, copies should be made before the portfolio is submitted.

   Any items that cannot be copied (e.g., pictures, books, etc.) but will be needed before the end of the subsequent year should be designated at the time of submission.

3. “Once the candidate submits the portfolio, no materials may be added, other than 1) notification of the receipt of a major award, prize, or grant, or 2) status updates on a submission that was included in the original portfolio and that was already out for review when the portfolio was submitted.” (*Faculty Handbook*)

4. **Responses to Department Report or Filing of Grievances**

   The *Faculty Handbook* states the following:

   “At each stage of review, the candidate will be notified of a positive or negative recommendation but the actual vote at any stage will never be included or alluded to in any report to the candidate.

   The candidate will receive the departmental report, the Tenure and Promotion Committee report, and the dean’s report. In each case, the candidate will have a week to file a written response if the candidate desires. This response will be returned to the point of origin (to the body whose opinion is being addressed) for review and a re-vote. If the original recommendation stands, the point of origin body may choose to write an explanation and attach that as an addendum to the original report. If the point of origin body changes its recommendation, that body must write an explanation for the change and that explanation will be attached as an addendum to the original report. In either event, once the response has been reviewed and a new vote taken, the original report, the candidate’s response, and any subsequent re-vote and/or explanation will be included in the portfolio as it moves forward.

   The candidate has the right to file a grievance following the procedures defined in the *Faculty Handbook*, (see III.H.), should the candidate believe there has been a violation of the University’s established procedures. The candidate must act in a timely manner to file a grievance and should not postpone action until the end of the process.”
In cases of a grievance, the *Faculty Handbook* states that the progress of the review process for a tenure and promotion case is suspended until the Grievance Committee completes its report. Please refer to the *Faculty Handbook* for grievance policy and procedure details.

Please note the distinction between a candidate’s response and the filing of a grievance. The former may include responses to factual errors or points of clarification, while the latter pertains to procedural issues.

**Note on Tenure and Promotion Committee Voting**

Abstentions are not allowed at the T&P Committee level. If a member of the T&P Committee decides they would have to abstain from voting on a given case, that committee member must be recused and a replacement solicited before deliberations on that particular case begin.
## Timeline of Major Target Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of March</th>
<th>Candidates for promotion to full let department and A&amp;S Dean’s Office know of their intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of March</td>
<td>Dean distributes instructions on preparation of portfolios and holds meetings with candidates and chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Late April</td>
<td>Candidate submits a list of external reviewers and submits it to the chair. Department compiles its own list of external reviewers. The final list should consist of at least two reviewers from the candidate’s list. The number of reviewers engaged from the department’s list should equal or exceed the number from the candidate’s list. The department chair sends the reviewer list to the dean for consent before soliciting reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-May</td>
<td>Candidate provides chair with a list of students to contact or not contact, a list of service contributions, and a list of selected scholarly or creative products for external review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Mid-May</td>
<td>Chair solicits evaluative letters from external reviewers, students/alums, and service committee chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>Reminder should be sent to students/alums who have not responded to the chair’s request to evaluate the candidate’s teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early August</td>
<td>Second reminder should be sent to students/alums who have not responded to the chair’s request to evaluate the candidate’s teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday in September</td>
<td>Candidate submits well-organized Core and Supplemental Binders to chair via Box by 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Week in September</td>
<td>Chair convenes tenured members to review portfolio and vote on recommendation regarding tenure/promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Monday in September</td>
<td>Chair submits a draft of department report to dean (by email) for vetting of legal or procedural issues. Chair submits vote to dean in separate email by 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday October</td>
<td>Chair submits portfolio with department report via Box to A&amp;S Dean’s Office. The dean consults the checklist to ensure portfolio is complete and in order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, November</td>
<td>T&amp;P Committee meets to discuss each portfolio and to vote on the recommendation. After participating in T&amp;P meetings, dean makes independent recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-December</td>
<td>T&amp;P Committee and dean share each of their recommendations with the candidate, the chair, and the provost. The A&amp;S Dean’s Office shall be responsible for delivering the written correspondence of the T&amp;P Committee to the candidates. The provost will subsequently share the recommendation at that stage with the candidate, the dean, and the president, usually in late December to early January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-February</td>
<td>Positive recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Late February</td>
<td>Provost shares trustees’ decision with candidate, chair, and dean.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Note on Internal Proximity and Recusals

Internal proximity and recusals will follow Faculty Handbook guidelines and University policy. For example, a family member cannot serve in the review of another family member in accordance with University policy. This policy applies to each participant in the review process, including the candidate, chair, dean, provost, and anyone else involved in the process.

If the chair needs to be recused because of proximity, the departmental members and dean will determine an appropriate substitute. Any faculty member from outside a department serving as chair will preferably be a full professor with experience serving as a department chair, program coordinator, and/or on the T&P committee. The decision as to whether the outside faculty member is a voting member of the committee will be at the dean’s discretion, in consultation with the department and T&P chair.

If the dean needs to be recused because of proximity, the chair and provost determine the appropriate substitute, such as the dean of another school.

Each participant in the process can only vote once. That is, if a member of T&P has already voted in the departmental process, that member is recused from the T&P Committee process for that candidate, and so on. Recusals based on proximity are a matter to be discussed between the person recused, the chair of T&P, and the dean. When necessary (such as in the case of a dean’s recusal), the provost will confer with all parties involved.
BOX Organization for Tenure and Promotion Cases
University of Richmond – A&S

- MAIN FOLDER – [School Abbreviation] T&P Materials 20XX
  - Sub-Folder – [Name of Candidate]: Tenure or Promotion Portfolio
    - Folder – 01 Core Portfolio [Viewer/Uploader: Candidate]
      - 00 Table of contents/Summary (Document – Links should be to documents within Core Portfolio folder)
      - 01 Curriculum Vitae (Folder)
        • Full CV
        • 2-page CV (Follow the template)
      - 02 Annual Reviews (Folder)
      - 03 Mid-tenure review (Folder)
    - Folder – 02 Scholarship Portfolio [Viewer/Uploader: Candidate]
      - 00 Table of contents/Summary (Document – Links should be to documents within Scholarship Portfolio folder)
      - 01 Scholarship statement (Document – Links should be to documents within Scholarship Portfolio folder)
      - 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, etc. Scholarship Folders
        • Organize folders to include select published work, work under review, conference presentations, invited talks, and/or other evidence
    - Folder – 03 Teaching Portfolio [Viewer/Uploader: Candidate]
      - 00 Table of contents/Summary (Document – Links should be to documents within Teaching Portfolio folder)
      - 01 Teaching statement (Document – Links should be to documents within Teaching Portfolio folder)
      - 02 Teaching load, class size, grade distribution information (Folder)
      - 03 Course materials (Folder)
        • Class Name (Example SOC 231 - Across the Pond: Europe vs. USA) Folder (Include syllabi, sample assignments, etc.)
        • Include a folder for each class
      - 04 Course evaluations (Folder)
• Documents could include SEI Reports, SEI Summary Statistics, or SEI Individual Forms
  ▪ 05 Classroom visit reports (Folder, as applicable)
  ▪ 06 Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (Folder)

  ▪ Folder – 04 Service Portfolio [Viewer/Uploader: Candidate]
    ▪ 00 Table of contents/Summary (Document – Links should be to documents within Service Portfolio folder)
    ▪ 01 Service statement (Document – Links should be to documents within Service Portfolio folder)
    ▪ 02 List of service activities (Document)
    ▪ 03 Additional evidence of service effectiveness (Folder with documents and/or folders within)

After a candidate submits all documentation, their access to the T&P Portfolio Folder is removed and the Provost and President Folder is added to their Portfolio.

  ▪ Folder – 05 Provost and President Folder [NO CANDIDATE ACCESS]
    ▪ 00 Candidate Summary (Dept. Vote, T&P Vote, Dean Recommendation, External Letter Ask/Receive, Student Letter Ask/Receive)
    ▪ 01 Department Recommendation (when applicable)
    ▪ 02 T&P Committee Recommendation
    ▪ 03 Dean’s Recommendation Letter
    ▪ 04 External Review Letters (Tracker, Letters as one PDF, Folder with CVs of reviewers)
    ▪ 05 Service Letters (Letters as one PDF)
    ▪ 06 Student Letters (Tracker, Letters as one PDF)
Appendix A: Sample Email to Potential Outside Reviewers

Note: This recommended template must be modified at the specified, bracketed points.

Dear [Professor X]:

This fall, we will be considering [Dr. X] for [tenure and promotion to associate professor/promotion to full professor]. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to be among the outside evaluators assessing [the candidate’s] scholarship. We would want your report by late August.

If you agree, I will promptly send you an official invitation and the material to be evaluated, so that you can work on this at your convenience over the summer. We would greatly appreciate your service.

[Dr. X] has written:

[Include representative works here]

[If candidate’s website is current, it may be useful to provide a link to the website in addition to including representative works above.]

[The candidate] is now working on a study of (include brief description here).

Respectfully,
Appendix B: Template Letter to External Reviewers

Note: This template is standard across cases, and can only be modified at the specified, bracketed points.

[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Dr. X]:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Dr. [X] ’s scholarship as part of our consideration of our colleague’s candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor/promotion to full professor.

Enclosed are:

- [Dr. X]’s curriculum vitae
- Listing of selected materials
- [Dr. X’s] statement on organizing guidelines, [if applicable] including information that the candidate believes to be pertinent to the review process.

In your letter, please state your relationship with Professor [X], specifically disclosing whether or not you have any personal or professional relationship with the candidate, such as co-authoring a work, serving on the dissertation committee, serving as an editor of a volume with the candidate or on the editorial board of publication journal in which the candidate has published.

We value the expertise of distinguished scholars and artists like you to help us evaluate the quality of a candidate’s research and scholarship. In your letter, please provide an assessment of the quality of the candidate’s contributions (strengths and limitations) to the field. Where appropriate, we appreciate specific commentary on specific works. Please do not explicitly state whether or not, in your judgment, Professor [X] would be tenured or promoted at your institution.

As a matter of context, the University of Richmond is a highly selective liberal arts University. Faculty in the School of Arts and Sciences engage in scholarship while teaching undergraduates within an academically challenging, intellectually vibrant, and collaborative community dedicated to the holistic development of students.

Your letter will be kept in strict confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding Dr. [X] ’s case.

Because our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by September 1.
Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. We would appreciate it if you would send with your evaluation a copy of your curriculum vitae. If you have any further questions, don’t hesitate to contact me at 804-[289-xxxx] or [yourname@richmond.edu.]

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
Chair, [X Department]

Appendix C: Exemplar Letter to Former and Current Students

Note: This template is standard across cases, and can only be modified at the specified, bracketed points. It is important to include the Dynamic Form link provided by the A&S Dean’s Office.

[Date]

Dear [Student]:

In the next few months, Dr. [X] of the [X] Department will be considered for [tenure and promotion to associate professor/promotion to full professor]. This will be an important decision for [Dr. X], for the University, and for its students.

In arriving at a recommendation regarding [the candidate’s tenure/promotion], the department will evaluate [Dr. X]’s teaching, scholarship, and service. I am writing to ask if you could help us assess the candidate’s teaching. Looking back on your experience with the candidate, it will helpful for us if you address some of the ways in which you think [Dr. X] fulfilled the criteria for teaching excellence. As you ponder the short and long impact of [Dr. X] in your education, please consider the following standard: “Excellent teaching stimulates students’ interest, increases their knowledge, and requires them to engage in critical analysis. Generally, excellent teaching is the result of the instructor’s mastery of the subject, clear organization and presentation, use of appropriately up-to-date materials and methodologies, respect for and fair treatment of students, thoughtful advising, and willingness to engage with them in open dialogue.”

If [Dr. X] directed any of your research, or served as your academic advisor, we very much want to hear your comments about that too.

Please include the following information in your email:

- courses you took with [Dr. X]
- other academic or mentoring experiences with [Dr. X]
Most important, we want to hear from you. Please submit your evaluation using [this link – link this text to Dynamic Form link provided by the A&S Dean’s Office] no later than September 1. We will not share your letter with [Dr. X]. It will only be used by those faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation about [Dr. X]’s [tenure/promotion].

Thanks for your help with this very important decision!

Sincerely,

[name]

Chair, [X Department]
[yourname@richmond.edu]
Appendix D: Template Letter to Service Reviewers

Note: This template is standard across cases, and can only be modified at the specified, bracketed points.

Dear [Dr. X]:

This fall, we will be considering [Dr. X] for [tenure and promotion to associate professor/promotion to full professor], I am writing to ask if you would be willing to provide your assessment of the candidate’s work on the following committees:

- [List committees here]

Your letter will be kept in confidence and will be used only by the faculty and administrators charged to make a recommendation regarding [Dr. X] ’s tenure/promotion.

Because our department deliberations will occur quite early in the fall semester, we need your evaluation by late August/early September.

Thank you again for agreeing to do this most important work. If you have any further questions, don’t hesitate to contact me at [ext. xxxx] or [yourname@richmond.edu.]

Sincerely,

[Your Name]  
Chair, [X Department]
APPENDIX E: Two-Page CV format

Dolly Madison
Summary Vita (Notes)

Education:

• Degree, institution, year degree earned

Experience:

• Years only in dates
• If an endowed position title is being listed, combine in one entry with rank title first (e.g. Professor of Law and the Williams Chair in Law, 2000-present)
• Department chair service should appear under Service below if you wish to include it

Courses Taught:

• Names of courses only; do not include course #’s, dates, etc.
• Avoid a long list of course titles separated by commas; breaking list into two columns is acceptable

Selected Publications:

• Should divide this category into Books, Articles, etc.
• Use full names of publications, not abbreviations
• Use quote marks for names of articles and chapters
• Use italics (not underlining, bolding, or CAPS) on names of publications and books titles
• Do not bold your name in citations
• Place commas inside end quotation mark
• Date of publication – use years only
• End all entries with a period.

Selected Presentations:

• Include title of presentation, event, location, and year

Professional Affiliations:

Service:

• Should be further divided into University, Professional, Community
• Date of service – use years only; put at end of entry separated from rest of text by comma
• Do not use periods at end of entries

Selected Awards:
• Do not put names of awards in quotation marks
• Put dollar amounts in parentheses

Mechanics:
- Use Times New Roman, 10 font for all text including headings, 11 font for name only (Dolly Madison)
- Margins: 1” top, bottom, left & right
- Bold name and headings only
- Double space between headings only; entries should be single spaced
- Pages should not be numbered; do NOT use headers or footers
- In each section, list entries newest to oldest
- Bullets should NOT be used
- For multi-line entries, the first line should be at the left margin and subsequent lines should be indented 3 spaces. (This entry is an example.)
- Save document in the latest version of Word (.docx) if possible.
Dolly
Summary Vita (Example)

Education:
Ph.D., University of Hawaii, 1995
M.A., James Madison University, 1989
B.A., Valparaiso University, 1986

Experience:
Associate Professor of Biology, University of Richmond, 2000-present
Assistant Professor of Biology, University of Richmond, 1996-2000
Instructor, University of Hawaii, 1995-1996

Courses Taught:
Research Methods and Analysis
Introduction to Cultural Anthropology

Selected Publications:

Article
Journal of Neuroscience, 23, 5627-5633.

Books

Book Chapters

Selected Presentations:
“Computerized Scoring of Interview Data.” Western Psychological Association Annual Convention, Vancouver,
British Columbia, 2011.


**Professional Affiliations:**

American Psychological Association

Strategic Management Society

**Service:**

**University**

Member of Psychology Curriculum Assessment Committee, 2011-present

Chair, Department of Anthropology, 2007-2010

**Professional**

Reviewer, U.S. Department of Education grants, 2010-2012

**Community**

Invited Lecturer, Petersburg Public Schools, 2010-2011

**Selected Awards:**

Robins School of Business Outstanding Scholarship Award, 2010

Faculty Research Grant, University of Richmond, 2008

PETE Teaching Enhancement Grant, University of Richmond, 2007