

INSTRUCTION FOR PREPARATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PORTFOLIOS SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

(Revision: May, 2017/pdr April 26, 2016/hrs)

Preface

This document contains instructions for the preparation of tenure and promotion portfolios. The instructions are organized in the typical order of preparation and completion. All portfolios are submitted electronically to a Box folder ~~Blackboard site~~. 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.

In the School of Arts & Sciences, tenure and promotion cases are evaluated according to standards set out in the *Faculty Handbook, Appendix VI* :
http://facultyhandbook.richmond.edu/Ch_VI/as.html.

Section	Page
1. Solicitation of external reviews of scholarly and creative work.....	1
2. Solicitation of student letters.....	2
3. Solicitation of service letters.....	3
4. Digital Portfolio Format and Procedures.....	3
5. Contents of Core Portfolio binder	4
6. Supplemental Teaching and Advising Binder.....	5
7. Supplemental Scholarship/Artist Binder.....	6
8. Supplemental Service Binder.....	6
9. Department Report.....	6
10. Important Process Issues.....	8
11. Timeline of Major Target Dates.....	9
12. Core Binder Checklist.....	11
Appendix A: Exemplar email to potential outside reviewers.....	12
Appendix B: Template letter to outside reviewers.....	13
Appendix C: Exemplar letter to former and current students.....	14
Teaching Evaluations.....	15
Appendix D: Template Letter to service reviewers.....	16

1. Solicitation of external reviews of scholarship and creative work

Normally a case will include input from 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. 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 of the persons invited to serve as external reviewers.

To complete this component of the review and ensure timely recruitment of external reviewers, the candidate should provide his/her chair with the following by the first Monday in May.

a. Selection of external reviewers

- The names and addresses (email and department) of four or 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 personal/professional relationship (if any) the candidate has with each.
- A list of any experts who should not be invited to comment on the candidate's work and the reason for exclusion.

b. 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 with the chair in making that selection. Note: Work substantially begun and completed at the University of Richmond will be the basis of the tenure and promotion review.
- The identical selection of materials must be sent to all reviewers.
- A current curriculum vitae should be included with those materials

c. 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.

- The chair will review the candidate's and the department's lists of proposed external reviewers with the dean, and the dean 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.

d. Chair's solicitation of external reviews

- With the dean's assent, the department chair invites the approved external reviewers to participate. The following method is recommended:
- In order 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 templates. All solicitation letters must ask external reviewers to give an evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or creative work, but to refrain from making a recommendation for tenure/promotion.

By the beginning of June, 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 to others and anonymous to the candidate.

- All reports that are received from any external reviewer must be submitted with the dossier.
- Include a curriculum vitae from each external reviewer with each report.

2. Solicitation of Student Letters

To complete this component of the review, the candidate may submit a list of up to five students whom she or he wants the chair to contact and up to five whom she or he 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 candidate should submit the list of students to contact/not to contact to the Chair, normally by the second Monday in May.

The department chair is responsible for soliciting letters from a minimum of 80 students randomly selected from courses that the candidate has taught. The candidate may choose not to include student representation from courses taught during his or her first semester at Richmond.

- The department chair should use the Report Request Form available at the Registrar's Office web site < <http://oncampus.richmond.edu/academics/registrar/>> to obtain class lists for all classes taught by the candidate during his or her probationary period, with the possible exception of courses taught by the candidate during his or her first term at Richmond.
- The former students contacted by the department chair should be randomly selected and include both majors and non-majors.
- The number of students randomly selected from each course taught should be based upon the teaching unit value of the class and 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 a total of 81 students). This approach is required in lieu of drawing names based on class size; otherwise large enrollment classes have a disproportional representation in the assessment of 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. Emails requesting student feedback are normally sent out in June. Usually it is necessary to send one or two follow-up emails, especially at the beginning of August, to ensure a high response rate. See Appendix C for template.

3. Solicitation of Service Letters

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

The department chair is responsible for the solicitation of letters from the appropriate heads of the committees or groups on which the candidate has served. See Appendix D for a template.

4. Digital Portfolio Format and Procedures

Tenure and promotion portfolios are submitted as digital "binders" on Box ~~a Blackboard site~~. The Dean's Office supplies a digital portfolio template for tenure and promotion candidates. The template features clearly labeled folders into which the candidate can deposit digital materials. ~~Candidates are enrolled as the "course builder" on their individual Blackboard site by May 1st.~~ Candidates are removed from the Box folder ~~Blackboard site~~ when the completed portfolio is submitted to the department. The Chair and other administrators are removed from the folder ~~site~~ when the portfolio moves to the T&P committee for consideration. ~~Please see relevant instructions and FAQs on the Blackboard site for details.~~

We recognize that not all creative/scholarly work will fit into the available digital template. In such cases, you should submit your 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. If you choose to submit material copies of your scholarly or creative work, please list them clearly at the front of the Scholarship binder.

5. Contents of Core Portfolio Binder

The structure of a case is centered on a single Core Portfolio Binder that is supported by appendices of supplemental information in Supplemental Binders. 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. To ensure that your Core binder is complete, please see the Checklist at the end of these instructions. The checklist will also be located on the Box folder ~~your Blackboard site~~ for convenience.

A. Curriculum vitae.

- An up-to-date vita. **Also include a two-page, condensed CV.**
- Please indicate University of Richmond undergraduate (*) student co-authors on presentations and publications

B. Teaching and Advising Statement. This document (typically 3 to 5 single spaced pages) is the candidate's statement regarding his or her approach to teaching and advising (goals, methods, self-evaluation, etc.). The candidate should include a self-reflective analysis of his or her 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 formation as a teacher and mentor, and to demonstrate the faculty member's commitment to excellence in teaching.

C. Scholarship Statement. This document (typically 3 to 5 single spaced pages) is the candidate's statement regarding his/her 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. Candidates should identify work substantially begun and completed at University of Richmond in the Scholarship Statement. For all co-authored work (except for student co-authors), candidates should clearly describe their contributions to the work. The faculty member must demonstrate ability to complete work that is judged to be of high quality by professional peers.

D. Service Statement. This document (typically 1 to 2 single spaced pages) is the candidate's statement regarding involvement in service activities and responsibilities of the department, of the School of Arts and Sciences, and of the University. 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.

E. Chair's Merit Reviews. This section should include copies of each of the candidate's 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 there is a special department rubric used in the context of merit reviews, please include a copy.

F. 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.

G. Student Letters. Once the candidate has submitted materials, the chair should add

the following:

- 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 copy of the letter or email sent to former and current students soliciting evaluative comments on teaching and advising
- The original evaluative letters (copies of emails) received from students

H. External Review Letters. The candidate should include a copy of his/her list of suggested reviewers (including explanation of existing relationship with each reviewer). Once the candidate has submitted materials, the chair should add the following:

- 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 the letter sent to external reviewers 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, a current curriculum vitae of the reviewer
- All original letters of evaluation received from the external reviewers.

I. Service Letters. Once the candidate has submitted materials, the chair should add the following:

- A list of service reviewers from whom evaluations were requested.
- A copy of the email sent to service reviewers.
- The original letters of evaluation received from the service reviewers.

6. Supplemental Teaching and Advising Binder includes evidence of the candidate's commitment to excellence in teaching. This will include:

- 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 the most recent ten semesters of teaching.**
- Materials demonstrating development of courses at each level of the curriculum, for instance, syllabi, statements of course goals and objectives, major tests/examinations, and representative reading assignments.
- Individual Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) 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 of the 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 his/her first semester at Richmond.)
- Include relevant examples of marked and graded student work
- A list of all advising responsibilities.
- Any special workshops, training sessions, or other evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness.

7. Supplemental Scholarship/Artist Binder includes evidence of the candidate's scholarly or creative program and ability to complete work of high quality:

- Copies of all scholarly, artistic, or other appropriate creative work by the candidate that has been professionally reviewed or published.
- For work under peer review, 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 or press or venue.
- 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.
- The candidate may submit evidence of work in preparation (e.g. drafts, sketches, grant proposals) if such work is clearly contextualized as germane to the case.

8. Supplemental Service Binder includes evidence of the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty citizen:

- Evidence of the candidate's 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.

9. The Department Report

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 departmental faculty then 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 relation to the Faculty Handbook standards. At the department meeting, the tenured faculty vote on the candidate's tenure and promotion through a secret ballot. A summary of the vote is sent confidentially by email directly to the dean. The dean includes this summary in the portfolio. The candidate does not receive a summary of the vote.

The departmental report should be an assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. The report should express the range of opinion in the department, the presence of any dissenting views, and the strength of any consensus, but it should not resemble in any way a transcript of the department's confidential deliberations.

Before being forwarded to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean, the departmental report is circulated, revised as necessary, and the final version signed by all tenured members of the department. Signature only means agreement that the letter fairly represents the departmental discussion.

Normally, drafting the departmental report is the responsibility of the department chair, 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 retains the responsibility of submitting the report to the Dean.

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

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

“The School of Arts and 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, of the development of the candidate's teaching skills during the probationary period, and of 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).

Department Report on Scholarship: 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's 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's 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.

Department Report on Service: 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's 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 he or she has effectively served his or her 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’s 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 the department considers that the candidate has demonstrated that she or he has done so. This 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 and University.
- A statement summarizing the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in each area of evaluation
- Preserving confidentiality, this statement should include a summary of the various opinions expressed in the meeting
- A positive recommendation requires a majority vote. The departmental recommendation should be clearly stated with no modifying language. The Report should not indicate the vote.

The department chair should send the dean a separate email summarizing the actual vote. 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 and the provost and the president.

The dean vets a draft of the Department Report for legal and procedural issues. With approval by the dean, the report should be shared with the candidate and included in the portfolio.

10. Important Process Issues

Preparation of the Portfolio: 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 about any other aspect of the portfolio-preparation process, should be referred to the department chair or dean. The Checklist below can be used to ensure that the Core Binder is complete.

Contents of Portfolio. Once the portfolio is submitted to the dean’s office, it is considered to be part of the candidate’s personnel file and 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 of the 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 so designated at the time of submission.

Completeness of the portfolio: The *Faculty Handbook* states the following:

“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.”

Responses to Department Report and 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 he or she 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 he or she 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 more detail on grievance policy and procedure.

11. Timeline of Major Target Dates

End of April	Dean distributes instructions on preparation of portfolios and holds meeting with candidates and Chairs.
By early May	Candidate submits list of five 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.
By mid- May	Candidate provides Chair with list of students to (not) contact, list of service contributions, and list of selected scholarly or creative products for external review.
By beginning of June	Chair solicits evaluative letters from external reviewers, students/alums, and service committee chairs
Early August	Reminder should be sent to students/alums who have not responded to the chair's request to evaluate the candidate's

teaching.

First Monday Sept	Candidate submits well organized Core and Supplemental Binders to chair via Box Blackboard .
Second Monday Sept	Chair convenes tenured members to review portfolio and vote on recommendation regarding tenure/promotion.
Third Monday in Sept	Chair submits draft of Department Report to dean (by email) for vetting of legal or procedural issues. Chair submits vote to dean in separate email.
First Monday Oct	Chair submits portfolio with Department Report via Box Blackboard to Dean's office (Consult Checklist to ensure portfolio is complete and in order).
October, November and December	Tenure & Promotion Committee meets to discuss each portfolio and to vote on the recommendation. After participating in Tenure & Promotion meetings, dean makes independent recommendation.
Third Monday Dec	Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean share recommendations with the candidate and the provost.
By mid February	Provost shares recommendation with candidate, department chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, and dean, and forwards recommendation to the President. Only positive recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Trustees.
By late February	Provost shares Trustees' decision with candidate, chair, and dean.

Checklist for Contents of Core Binder
(April 2016: KRS)

Core Section

- Department Report signed by tenured colleagues
- Email from Dean confirming Report has been vetted
- Summary of vote (remove before binder is returned to candidate)
- Current CV from the candidate
- Teaching and Advising Statement by the candidate
- Scholarship Statement by the candidate
- Service Statement by the candidate
- Annual Merit Reviews (if available)
- Special department Rubric (if any)
- Department Mid Course Review Report (N/A for promotion cases)
- Dean's Mid Course Review Report (N/A for promotion cases)

Student Letters Section (remove before returning binder to the candidate)

- Chair's note on method of selection
- List of the students solicited for letters, and who responded
- A copy of the letter or email sent to the former and current students soliciting evaluation
- Original letters received from students

External Reviewers Section (remove before binder is returned to the candidate)

- Candidate's list of proposed external reviewers, including reasons for their selection and relationship with the candidate (if any)
- Department's recommended external reviewers, including reasons for their selection and relationship with the candidate or other department members (if any)
- Dean's approval of list of reviewers solicited for letters
- List of external reviewers solicited and engaged to provide letters
- Copy of the request made to external reviewers, including the list of materials sent out for review (must be identical for each external reviewer).
- Chair's verification that a) there are at least two external reviews received from candidate's list and b) the number of external reviews received from department's list equals or exceeds number of external reviews from candidate's list.
- All original letters from external reviewers
- Curriculum vitae from each external reviewer

Service Letters Section

- List of colleagues or others from whom service letters were solicited
- Copy of letter of solicitation of service reviews
- Original letters from colleagues or others concerning service

Appendix A: Exemplar e-mail to potential outside reviewers

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 **his/her** 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)

He/She is now working on a study of (include brief description here).

Respectfully,

Appendix B: Template letter to outside reviewers

[Date]

[Address]

Dear Professor X:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate Dr. X's scholarship as part of our consideration of his/her candidacy for **tenure and promotion to associate professor/promotion to full professor**.

Enclosed are:

- Dr. X's curriculum vitae
- Listing of selected materials

We depend on the expertise of distinguished people in the field to help us evaluate the quality of a candidate's research or creative program. We especially value your assessment of the quality and significance of Dr. X's scholarship (rather than its quantity). Where appropriate, we appreciate specific commentary on specific works.

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.

As 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. 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

Appendix C: Exemplar letter to former and current students

[Date]

Dear [Student]:

In the next few months, Dr. X of the XXX 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 his/her tenure/promotion, the Department will evaluate Dr. X's teaching, scholarship, and service. I am writing to ask if you could help us assess his/her teaching. Looking back on your experience with him/her, it will be helpful for us if you address some of the ways in which you think Dr. X fulfilled the criteria for teaching excellence. 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 send your evaluation to me 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,

Chair, XXX Department
yourname@richmond.edu

**TEACHING EVALUATION
JANE DOE**

**Your name
Signature**

**Course(s) you took with Prof. X, term, and your level at the time
(Fr, So, Jr, Sr, Grad)**

Are or were you a X major (Y or N)?

When did, or do you expect, to graduate?

+++++

Please provide your evaluation below. Continue on the backside.

Appendix D: Template letter to service reviewers

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 provide your assessment of his/her work on the following committees:

- List committee's 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.

As 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