

College of DAAP Proposed and Approved RPT Procedural Guidelines

Contents (section headings function as hyperlinks)

Introduction (approved by College Faculty 4/28/05)

Section I RPT Timelines (approved by College Faculty 6/3/04)

The March 1, 2018 approved DAAP RPT Timelines supersedes this Section.

Section II Preparation of the Dossier (approved by College Faculty 11/4/04)

Section III Content/Format of the Dossier (approved by College Faculty 11/4/04 and

11/23/04) **Section IV** Evaluation (approved by College Faculty 4/28/05)

Section V Faculty Appointments (approved by College Faculty 4/28/05)

College of DAAP RPT Procedural Guidelines

These Procedural Guidelines were developed in the spirit of fairness, collegiality, and mentoring with a clear recognition of the culture of the College.

The purpose of these guidelines is to:

- _provide a consistent, understandable framework for the RPT process*
- _to address the procedural issues, allowing faculty to concentrate on the more complex issue of criteria*
- _positively and proactively assist faculty in preparation for the RPT process*
- _help RPT committees carry out their duties efficiently and effectively*
- _streamline the RPT process*
- _provide for a system of review that is equitable for all faculty.*

The ordering of categories (Teaching, Creative/Scholarly Work/Research, Service) called for in this document does not imply a priority of importance. This will be determined by unit level criteria.

Section I RPT Timeline for Penultimate Year

For Reappointments

1. First Level of Review for Reappointment

- A. The College expects the candidate to provide to the School Director a list of recommended internal and external reviewers no later than:

November 15

It is suggested that the candidate provide a preliminary list at the Annual Review with the School Director in the academic year prior to review

- B. The School Director is expected to send request letters to internal and external evaluators no later than:

December 1

for return to the committee by **January 1**

- C. The College expects the candidate to submit his/her full dossier¹ to the first level of review (School RPT Committee) no later than²:

January 1 (AAUP contract date is March 1)

¹ Materials to be sent to internal/external reviewers are to be submitted by November 15 so that the School Director can send them with request letters.

² AAUP contract requires that candidates be notified 6 months in advance of an earlier due date than the one required by contract; the College expects candidates to meet the above deadlines to provide sufficient time for review at all levels.

- D. It is expected that the School Committee will provide its letter of recommendation to the School Director no later than:

February 1

2. Second Level of Review for Reappointment

It is expected that the School Director will provide his/her letter of recommendation to the Office of the Dean, for delivery to the College RPT Committee, no later than:

February 15

The School Director will provide the candidate and the School Committee members a copy of her/his letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the College RPT Committee along with the dossier.

The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

3. Third Level of Review for Reappointment

It is expected that the College RPT Committee will provide its letter of recommendation to the Dean no later than:

April 1

The chair of the College RPT Committee will provide the candidate, School Director, and School Committee Chair a copy of the College RPT Committee's letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the Dean along with the dossier. The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

4. Fourth Level of Review for Reappointment

The Dean will provide her/his letter of recommendation to the Provost Office no later than (Provost Office mandated date):

May 1

The Dean will provide the candidate, College Committee Chair, School Director, and School Committee Chair a copy of his/her letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the Provost along with the dossier. The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

For Promotion/Tenure

1. First Level of Review for Promotion/Tenure

- A. The College expects the candidate to provide to the School Director a list of recommended internal and external reviewers no later than:
First day of Autumn Quarter of the penultimate year

While not required, it would be extremely helpful to the School Director for the list to be submitted by September 1.

- B. The School Director is expected to send request letters to internal and external evaluators no later than:

October 1

for return to the committee by **November 1**

- C. The College expects the candidate to submit his/her full dossier¹ to the first level of review (School RPT Committee) no later than:
October 1² (AAUP contract date is November 1)

¹ Materials to be sent to internal/external reviewers are to be submitted by the first day of Autumn quarter so that the School Director can send them with request letters.

² AAUP contract requires that candidates be notified 6 months in advance of an earlier due date than the one required by contract; the College expects candidates to meet the above deadlines to provide sufficient time for review at all levels.

- D. It is expected that the School Committee will provide its letter of recommendation to the School Director no later than:

November 7

The chair of the School Committee will provide the candidate a copy of the Committee's letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the School Director along with the dossier. The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

2. Second Level of Review for Promotion/Tenure

It is expected that the School Director will provide his/her letter of recommendation to the Office of the Dean, for delivery to the College RPT Committee, no later than:

November 21

The School Director will provide the candidate and the School Committee Chair a copy of her/his letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the College RPT Committee along with the dossier.
The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

3. Third Level of Review for Promotion/Tenure

It is expected that the College RPT Committee will provide its letter of recommendation to the Dean no later than:

January 15

The chair of the College RPT Committee will provide the candidate, School Director, and School Committee Chair a copy of the College RPT Committee's letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the Dean along with the dossier. The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.

4. Fourth Level of Review for Promotion/Tenure


The Dean will provide her/his letter of recommendation to the Provost Office no later than:

February 1 (Provost Office mandated date)

The Dean will provide the candidate, College Committee Chair, School Director, and School Committee Chair a copy of his/her letter of recommendation at the time the signed letter is forwarded to the Provost along with the dossier. The original letter is to be placed in the Candidate's dossier.


DAAP Tenure/Promotion Schedule
 for penultimate year

Revised and approved by College Faculty 6/3/04



DAAP Reappointment Schedule
 for penultimate year of appointment term

Revised and approved by College Faculty 6/3/04



Section II: Preparation of the Dossier

Preparation of the dossier is primarily the responsibility of the candidate, with guidance as needed from the School Director, School RPT Committee, and other senior faculty.

All information received and considered in making recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion, or tenure, at any level becomes part of the candidate's dossier. New material pertinent to candidacy may be added to the dossier at any time until the Provost renders a recommendation. A copy of any material added shall be provided to the candidate. The candidate may review the material and respond, in writing, within fourteen days of receipt of the copy (AAUP/UC 4.4.3 and 4).

In all steps of the process, each person involved in RPT committee deliberations has the responsibility to maintain confidentiality regarding RPT deliberations.

Responsibilities of the candidate:

1. The candidate shall familiarize herself/himself with School RPT criteria, DAAP Procedural Guidelines, and the RPT requirements in the current UC/AAUP contract.
2. The dossier should be clearly and concisely organized, in accordance with the procedural guidelines set forth in this document, as a reflection of the faculty member's comprehensive creative and intellectual accomplishments, teaching, and service.
3. Quality of dossier documentation is to be emphasized over quantity, including only that which is absolutely necessary to effectively describe one's activities and accomplishments. The binder with a 3-inch maximum spine width is recommended; use of plastic sleeves is recommended.
4. The binder must be clearly and neatly marked with the candidate's name, current rank, school name, and level of review (reappointment, tenure, promotion) on both the front cover and spine of the dossier binder.
5. If additional information is requested of the candidate by the School RPT Committee, School Director, College Committee, and/or Dean, the candidate shall review the request and respond if the candidate wishes.

Responsibilities of the School RPT Committee:

1. The School RPT Committee shall review the dossier upon receipt to determine if it is complete and organized correctly.
2. Should the Committee find that the dossier is incomplete or requires any organizational modifications, the Committee should notify the candidate and provide sufficient time to make modifications.
3. The School RPT Committee shall provide the candidate with a copy of its recommendation letter at the same time the letter goes forward to the School Director.

Responsibilities of the School Director:

1. The School Director shall provide a summary of student course evaluations for the candidate, insert it into the dossier prior to the due date for the dossier to be submitted to the School RPT Committee, and shall copy the candidate at same time.

2. The School Director shall prepare a summary sheet listing for the letters of evaluation, organized into 3 categories: School; UC (outside the candidate's school); external (outside UC). [see Section III, 11.A.]
3. Should the School Director find that the dossier is incomplete or requires organizational modifications, he/she may return the dossier to the candidate for modification prior to making a final recommendation.
4. The School Director shall copy the candidate upon receipt of letters of evaluation.
5. Letters of evaluation submitted by internal and external reviewers are to be admitted to the dossier by the School Director. If materials are received at a later stage in the review process, the School Director will forward them to the appropriate review level and copy the candidate.
6. The School Director shall provide the candidate and the School RPT Committee with a copy of his/her recommendation letter at the same time the letter goes forward to the College RPT Committee.

Responsibilities of the College RPT Committee:

1. Should the College RPT Committee find that the dossier is incomplete or requires organizational modifications, it may return the dossier to the candidate for modification prior to making a final recommendation.
2. The College RPT Committee shall provide the candidate, the School Director, and the School RPT Committee with a copy of its recommendation letter at the same time the letter goes forward to the Dean and copy the candidate.

Responsibilities of the Dean:

1. Should the Dean find that the dossier is incomplete or requires organizational modifications, it may return the dossier to the candidate for modification prior to making a final recommendation.
2. The Dean shall provide the candidate, the College RPT Committee, School Director, and the School RPT Committee with a copy of her/his recommendation letter at the same time the letter goes forward to the Provost and copy the candidate.

Section III: Content/Format of Dossier

The dossier is the document that each candidate prepares as evidence documenting performance relative to the RPT criteria established by the candidate's School.

To assist in the preparation and evaluation of the dossier, it is recommended that candidates in the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning use the following format and include only those sections that are relevant. The first eleven items below are listed in the order required by the Provost office. Should that requirement change, these procedures will change accordingly.

Unless otherwise specified in the candidate's appointment letter, the dossier should emphasize the time period at the University of Cincinnati as follows:

- for reappointment, from initial appointment or the last reappointment, whichever is more recent
- for award of tenure and tenure/promotion, full length of service
- for award of promotion only, period in current rank

In all cases, the CV shall document the full range of a candidate's professional and/or academic career. Dates should be provided for all activities and accomplishments, including the means by which reviewers may clearly identify a listed item's relevance to the emphasized time frame.

1. **File Cover Sheet**

The "File Cover Sheet" provided by the Provost's Office must be the first page of the dossier.

The preparation and completion of the File Cover Sheet with signature and indication of the recommendation at each level is the responsibility successively of:

- A. School RPT Committee (chair to sign)
- B. School Director
- C. College RPT Committee (chair to sign)
- D. Dean

2. **Copy of the School RPT criteria document**

3. **Table of Contents**

Sections of the dossier shall be listed and included in the following order, as applicable. In addition, each major section (Teaching, Creative/Scholarly/Research, and Service) will begin with a one-page index or overview of section contents.

4. **Dean's evaluation, rationale and recommendation**

5. **College Committee's evaluation, rationale and recommendation**

6. **School Director's evaluation, rationale and recommendation**

7. **School Committee's evaluation, rationale and recommendation**

8. **Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (CV)**, to include in the following order, as applicable. All entries are to be listed in reverse chronological order.

There are five main categories to be included:

- A. Biographical information
- B. Teaching
- C. Creative/Scholarly/Research
- D. Service
- E. Honors/Awards/Recognition

Please include, where appropriate, the following:

- A. Biographical
 - Name, current address, phone number, and e-mail address
 - Post-secondary education, name of institution, degree, field of study, and date of degree
 - Professional history:
 - academic experience, with dates, title, institution, and location for each
 - professional experience, with dates, title, employer, and location for each
 - representative list of clients and/or projects, if relevant for professional work
- B. Teaching activities:
 - areas of expertise
 - range and type of courses taught (not a complete listing)
- C. Creative/scholarly/research:

(list each section in reverse chronological order; the following list does not indicate hierarchy of importance)

 - exhibitions of art or design work (note whether refereed, invited)
 - publications, full citation (note whether refereed, invited)
 - _ books and monographs authored
 - _ edited books
 - _ chapters in edited books
 - _ bulletins and technical reports
 - _ peer-reviewed journal articles
 - _ editor-reviewed journal articles
 - _ reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer-reviewed)

- _ papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer-reviewed)
 - _ others as appropriate, including electronic equivalents
 - research funding: list principal investigator, co-principal investigators, granting agency, dates of grant, and dollar amount of grant
 - conference presentations
 - invited lectures
 - citations in other publications or media
- D. Service: (list each section in reverse chronological order)
- university service: offices held, committee (membership or chair)
 - professional service
 - community service
- E. Honors, recognition, and outstanding achievements
- F. Professional membership
9. **Candidate's self-evaluation**
In this formative evaluation, the candidate selects, reflects upon, and synthesizes professional development and progress in instructional, scholarly, and service activities, as appropriate to the School's mission and RPT criteria, and in keeping with the mission and goals of the College and the University. This evaluation should be organized in the following order: Teaching, Creative/Scholarly/Research, and Service. The Self Evaluation should be no more than five pages.
10. **Copies of the School Director's signed annual review statements**
(to date, or since the candidate's last RPT review)
11. **Copies of review letters**
- A. Summary sheet listing, organized into 3 categories: School; UC (outside the candidate's school); external (outside UC):
- name, title (rank, if in the academy), and institutional affiliation
 - name of person or committee who suggested each evaluator
 - concise summary of the person's qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate
 - evaluator's relationship to the candidate
 - unsolicited letters are to be clearly indicated
- B. A single representative example of the letters sent to the evaluators. If these letters were not identical, then an example of each must be included, along with an explanation of why the evaluators were treated differently. The letter must list the materials sent to the evaluators.

12. **Teaching**

- A. Content listing
- B. Courses: Include only those categories which are applicable, and only for the period under review. List each in reverse chronological order.
- listing of undergraduate, graduate, and other courses, in reverse chronological order, by quarter and year—including title, course number, number of credit hours, enrollment
_ indicate if course is co-taught and/or if any special responsibilities
 - 2-3 representative samples of course syllabi
 - a statistical analysis of course evaluations: prepared consistent with the unit RPT procedures document, including final enrollment (as determined by registrar's final grade list) and number of evaluations submitted
 - independent studies, by quarter and year—including course content, number of credit hours, enrollment
 - special circumstances: sponsored projects, service learning
- C. Undergraduate senior thesis/**capstone** project responsibilities
- advisor
 - thesis committee member
 - thesis committee chair
- D. Graduate thesis and dissertation committees and chair responsibilities:
List the graduate students for whom you were:
- advisor
 - thesis/dissertation committee member
 - thesis/dissertation committee chair
- (For thesis/dissertation advisees who have graduated, list name of student, year of graduation, and title of thesis/dissertation).
- E. Curriculum development; list examples of involvement in:
- curriculum development
 - design and implementation of new or revised courses
 - development of new teaching methods or materials
 - creation of new programs of study
 - collaborative and/or interdisciplinary curriculum development
- F. Academic advising: Identify the number and level of advisees seen on a regular basis.
- G. Describe any noteworthy accomplishments of students working under your direction
- H. Teaching awards, honors, and recognition

13. **Creative/Scholarly/Research**

Provide information about creative/scholarly/research accomplishments. Artwork, books, manuscripts, articles, etc. may be placed with Supplementary Documents as needed.

A. Content listing

B. Creative works pertinent to your area of focus:

- exhibitions (indicate date and whether juried/invited; solo/group; international/national/regional/local, etc.)
- professional work (indicate whether commissioned/contracted)

C. Publications: Within each category, place entries in reverse chronological order, and indicate the specifics of your contribution, for each co-authored item, with full citation, including dates and pages. Include co-authorship and degree of contribution where appropriate.

Insert as separate categories:

(the following list does not indicate hierarchy of importance; actual placement should respond to School criteria)

- books and monographs authored, or electronic equivalents
- edited books
- chapters in edited books
- bulletins and technical reports
- peer-reviewed journal articles
- editor-reviewed journal articles
- reference guide entries
- reviews and abstracts (indicate whether peer-reviewed)
- papers in proceedings (indicate whether peer-reviewed)
- others as appropriate

- D. Presentations, lectures, panels (indicate whether invited/refereed, international/national/regional/local).
- E. Creative/scholarly/research: Wherever there is collaboration/ collaborators, describe the nature of your intellectual contribution and indicate an approximate percentage of your contribution, in relation to the total effort involved. List the period, sources, and amount of funding if applicable.
- F. Editorships, or contribution as a reviewer, for journals or other learned publications; referee or juror; chair, discussant, or panelist (if appropriate for scholarly activity).
- G. Awards, interviews, citations and other recognition of your creative, scholarly, or research accomplishments.

14. **Service**

Include only those categories which are applicable, according to School RPT criteria. List each in reverse chronological order.

- A. Content listing
- B. University Service: give dates in reverse chronological order and descriptions of responsibility for:
 - program leadership and support; instructional program development
 - School committees
 - College committees
 - University committees
 - mentoring activities
 - administrative positions held
 - student recruitment and retention activities
 - other service to or for the University
 - service awards, honors, and recognition
- C. Professional Service:
 - offices held and other service to professional societies: List organization in which office was held or service performed and describe the nature of the organization (elected or open membership, honorary)
 - consultation in support of the profession
 - Editorships, or contribution as a reviewer, for journals or other learned publications; referee or juror; panelist (if appropriate for service activity)
 - other professional service
 - service awards, honors, and recognition

- D. Community Service
- offices held and other service to community organizations:
List organization in which office was held or service performed and describe the nature of the organization (elected or open membership, honorary)
 - consultation in support of the community
 - other community service
 - service awards, honors, and recognition
15. **Supplementary dossier**
- This document is optional; it may be recommended by School RPT criteria or included at candidate's discretion. It is intended for review at the School level. This document will remain on file in the School office. Following the Provostal recommendation it will be returned to the candidate along with the primary dossier.
- Examples:
- A. Course syllabi
 - B. Student work
 - C. Professional/creative work
 - D. Publications
 - E. Other items as necessary
- Inserted within the traditional paper dossier, CD-ROMs may be used to document the candidate's own, or student work

**Section IV
Evaluation**

The AAUP contract provides that the academic unit establishes the specific criteria by which performance will be evaluated. At all levels of review, evaluation will be based on the evidence presented in the dossier and in accordance with the criteria as established in the unit RPT document. The purpose of this section is to recommend an effective and consistent college-wide process for *obtaining* objective evaluation of a candidate’s teaching, creative/scholarly/research, and service performance. The School retains the right to adopt, amend and/or augment this procedural recommendation.

The following chart illustrates who may act as reviewers in different capacities. Further descriptions of their roles and important distinctions follow.

Levels of Review	School RPT Committee (Elected)	College RPT Committee (Elected)	Internal Reviewers (Letter)	External Reviewers (Letter)
Who May Serve as Reviewers				
School faculty *	x #	x #	x	
College faculty*		x #	x	
University faculty			x	
Collaborator*			x	x
Professional peers				x
Former students				x
External beneficiaries				x

*IMPORTANT: reviewers may fill a single role only; for example, a faculty member may not serve on both School and College RPT committees, nor act as an internal reviewer for the candidate if on either committee.

Untenured faculty may serve only after a first reappointment

There are two categories of reviewers: Internal and External. Definitions of each category follow.

Internal Reviewers

Internal reviewers consist of faculty peers within the University of Cincinnati, including School and College RPT Committees as well as individual peer assessors. Internal reviewers may be any Unqualified Faculty with tenure, untenured faculty in at least their second appointment, or Qualified (Field Service) Faculty members of rank equal to or higher than the candidate.

1. Membership of RPT Committees

School RPT Committee

The School RPT Committee shall be a standing committee, plus alternates elected democratically by the School faculty, in spring quarter, for service the following year.

The committee's structure, size, and method of selection are determined at the School level (AAUP contract). However, in an effort to provide consistency to the College RPT process, it is suggested that each School to follow these guidelines in determining time of election, term length, and composition of membership:

- A. Membership should be an odd number and broadly representative of the various disciplinary areas in the School .
- B. Untenured faculty may serve after a first reappointment.
- C. Members and alternates shall serve 2-year terms with the membership elected in alternate years, as evenly as possible in numbers (e.g. three members the first year, two the second year).
- D Alternates, if indicated by the School RPT Procedures, shall be elected and used only to ensure program representation for the faculty member under review or to replace a committee member who is unable to serve.
- E. The committee shall elect a chair from its members who will serve for the year. This person will sign all letters of recommendation as committee chair. Only tenured faculty members may serve as chair. The Committee is to meet once in the spring quarter, to elect a Chair, so that the Chair will be ready to work with the candidate(s) for tenure/promotion beginning September 1.
- F. One committee member, may take responsibility for preparing an initial draft of the committee's letter but in all reviews, the final recommendation is to be determined, and the final letter composed and signed, by the committee as a whole.

College RPT Committee

The DAAP College RPT Committee shall be a standing committee, plus alternates, elected democratically by the College faculty, in spring quarter, for service the following year.

- A. Membership shall be composed of five full-time tenure-track faculty members of the college with at least one member from each school, plus two alternates. Untenured faculty may serve after a first reappointment.
- B. There shall be no more than two members from any school.
- C. At least 3 members must be tenured faculty members, one of whom must be a full professor.
- D. Members and alternates shall serve 2-year terms with the membership elected in alternate years. Three of the members shall be elected in odd numbered years, two members elected in even numbered years. One alternate shall be elected each year.
- E. Alternates shall be elected and used only to provide the required composition for a case of promotion to full professor, or to replace a committee member who is unable to serve. One alternate must be a full professor from a school other than the school represented at that rank in the Standing Committee.

- F. The committee shall elect a chair from its members who will serve for the year. This person will sign all letters of recommendation as committee chair.
- G. One committee member, may take responsibility for preparing an initial draft of the committee's letter but in all reviews, the final recommendation is to be determined, and the final letter composed and signed, by the committee as a whole.
- H. Evaluation concerning candidates for promotion to full professor should include at least two full professors from two different Schools on the committee performing the initial, in-depth review. All five committee members will finalize the review.

In addition:

- A. The RPT committees should be independent across levels; that is, no individual should serve simultaneously on RPT committees at two levels (school or college).
- B. The full Committee must be present and voting for a recommendation to be forwarded. The vote must be a secret ballot and be tabulated and recorded in the committee recommendation.
- C. Faculty who will be reviewed within an academic year may not serve on an RPT Committee in that year.

Note: examples of conflict of interest

- A. Close campus collaborators of the candidate (e.g., co-authors)
- B. Faculty with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate

2. Internal Reviewer Responsibilities

At the School level:

- A. The quality and significance of the candidate's work and performance are assessed.
- B. The Committee members (peers) perform an in-depth review of the dossier and evaluate the performance of the candidate according to established School RPT criteria.
- C. The School Director is responsible for summarizing each candidate's teaching evaluations and placing them in the dossier for review by the School Committee.
- D. The School Director requests letters and outside reviews on behalf of the candidate as indicated Section 3.B.II.
- E. The Committee's numerical vote and recommendation are to be forwarded to the School Director.
- F. Following the School RPT Committee review, the School Director evaluates the quality and significance of the candidate's work and performance and how well the case has been made for reappointment or tenure/promotion. This review must be based on the evidence presented in the dossier, and in accordance with the criteria as established in the unit RPT document. If the School Director's assessment is contrary to the School RPT Committee assessment, the bases for differing judgments must be stated in writing by the School Director.

At the College level:

- A. The College level committee reviews the dossier and evaluations presented to determine if the evaluation and decision made at previous levels are supported by the documentation in the dossier and in accordance with the School RPT criteria.
- B. The Committee's numerical vote and recommendation are to be forwarded to the Dean. If the College level Committee's assessment is contrary to either the School Director or School RTP Committee assessments, the bases for differing judgments must be stated in writing by the College RPT Committee.
- C. The Dean reviews the dossier and evaluations presented to determine if the evaluation and decision made at previous levels are supported by the documentation in the dossier and in accordance with the School RPT criteria. If the Dean's assessment is contrary to either the College RPT Committee, School Director, or School RTP Committee assessments, the bases for differing judgments must be stated in writing by the Dean.

3. Solicited Letters of Evaluation From Internal Reviewers

Letters may not be solicited from any member of either the School or College RPT Committees, nor from Associate Deans.

Internal reviewers are peers within the University, College, and School. External reviewers are peers from outside the University of Cincinnati. Letters of evaluation from external reviewers are expected only in cases of tenure/promotion and promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

A. School Peer Letters of Evaluation:

- I. All Represented Faculty within the School should be invited and have the right to submit a letter of evaluation for any candidate under review. Tenure-track and Field Service faculty with junior rank may submit a letter if they choose, but cannot be required to do so.
- II. Internal reviewers will be provided access to the candidate's dossier for review as soon as it is available to the School Committee. Evaluation letters should be received by the Committee within two weeks of the date by which the dossier is due to the Committee; refer to the Timeline section of this document. [this needs to be stated in the Timeline also]
- III. All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier.

B. College/University Peer Letters of Evaluation:

- I. The candidate may provide the School Director with a list of up to five potential College and/or University peer reviewers.
- II. In consultation with the School RPT Committee and the candidate, the School Director shall choose up to three names from the candidate's list and supplement the list with an equal number of reviewers, not to exceed

the number chosen from the candidate's list. When a candidate presents a valid reason for removing a particular person from the list of potential reviewers the School Director shall respect the candidate's wishes and not solicit an evaluation from that person.

- III. College and University peer reviewers will be provided with the candidate's CV, Self Evaluation, examples of creative/scholarly/research work, and any other materials determined by the candidate in consultation with the School Director. Responses are due to the School Director within two weeks of the date by which the dossier is due to the Committee; refer to the Timeline section of this document.
- IV. All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier.
- V. Unsolicited letters are not to be automatically included in the dossier. If an unsolicited letter is received and the School Director determines in consultation with the candidate that further information is warranted, he or she may request it from the letter's author. Requested clarification, as provided in writing by the author of the original letter, will be included in the dossier and at the same time will be copied to the candidate.

4. External Reviewers (outside the University)

For tenure and promotion reviews, external reviewers are to provide objective assessment of the quality, importance, relevance of the candidate's creative, research, and scholarly work and stature in the field, relative to the candidate's research, creative, and/or scholarly work and service.

For reappointment reviews of tenure-track faculty, external reviews are optional and not expected.

For reappointment reviews of Field Service appointments, external reviews are encouraged and should provide objective assessment of the candidate's professional activities relevant to the nature of their appointment.

A. Who may serve as an external reviewer

It is expected that objective peer evaluators will be predominantly of senior rank or significant stature in the candidate's area of expertise.

Letters of evaluation may come from:

Individuals who have personal knowledge of the candidate's teaching, creative/research/scholarly, and service accomplishments may be asked to write a letter attesting to the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions.

Individuals with expertise to evaluate the candidate's work in an objective manner.

Persons who have a relationship with the candidate that could reasonably interfere with objective evaluation will not be solicited as impartial reviewers. However, close collaborators may be asked to comment on the candidate's contribution to their collaborative work.

Letters may also be invited from former students of the candidate, and all letters must be identified as such in the dossier. These letters may be solicited for reappointment or promotion reviews.

B. Solicitation of External Reviewers

- I. Each candidate must be provided an opportunity to nominate external evaluators. The candidate will provide the School Director with a list of up to three potential external reviewers.
- II. In consultation with the School RPT Committee and the candidate, the School Director shall choose up to three names from the candidate's list and supplement the list with an equal number of reviewers, not to exceed the number chosen from the candidate's list. When a candidate presents a valid reason for removing a particular person from the list of potential reviewers the School Director shall respect the candidate's wishes and not solicit an evaluation from that person.
- III. Soliciting external evaluators and providing materials to them is solely the responsibility of the School Director.
- IV. The candidate should under no circumstances contact prospective or actual external evaluators regarding his or her case at any stage of the review process, and should not discuss the case with any evaluator or provide additional materials to any evaluator even if the evaluator initiates the contact, as contact of this nature compromises the integrity of the review process.
- V. The letter of invitation sent to the prospective reviewer should state expectations for the scope and nature of the review, due date for receipt of the completed evaluation, and the realities of the Ohio Public Records Act, which indicates that this correspondence is public information.
- VI. External evaluators who accept the invitation to review the candidate should then be sent all appropriate materials. The reviewers will be provided with a copy of the candidate's CV and the candidate's Self Evaluation Statement, and examples of the candidate's own work (creative, scholarly, professional), in addition to any other materials (such as School RPT criteria) that the candidate and School Director deem necessary.
- VII. All external evaluators for a given candidate should be sent the same materials unless there is a substantive reason for differentiating among evaluators. In a case in which evaluators are sent different materials, the School Director must provide an explanation to be included in the candidate's dossier.
- VIII. All materials are to be sent to the reviewer in a timely fashion, to allow at least thirty days for a response. Responses are due to the School Director no later than the last day for submission of the dossier to the first level of review (refer to Timeline).
- IX. All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier.
- X. Unsolicited letters are not to be included in the dossier. If an unsolicited letter is received and the School Director determines that further information is warranted, he or she may request, in consultation with the chair of the School RPT Committee and the candidate, an additional letter from the unsolicited letter's author. Requested clarification, as provided in writing by the author of the original letter, will be included in the dossier and at the same time copied to the candidate.

- XI. It is far more likely that a useful letter will be obtained when the evaluator is given sufficient time in which to review the materials, and when the nature of the requested evaluation letter is carefully explained. In most cases, evaluators should be asked only to provide an analysis of the candidate's creative/research/scholarly work (at least partly on the basis of provided materials). Evaluators should specifically be asked NOT to comment on other matters such as whether the candidate should be promoted and tenured at the University of Cincinnati or whether they would be promoted and tenured at their own institution.
- XII. Once letters have been received from evaluators, the School Director should send a letter of thank you to acknowledge the contributor's time and effort.

Sample Letter Directed To External Evaluators

The following format of the sample letter is not required, but is suggested, with modifications to reflect variations across the College in the type of scholarly activity of the candidate.

If a School wishes to use an alternate format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Ohio Public Records Act, and how much information the evaluator has on which to base the requested assessment.

The School of ___ is considering Dr. (Assistant Professor, etc) ___ for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure [professor]. At the University of Cincinnati, the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure include the candidate's performance in teaching, research and university and professional service. The institutional committees and individuals reviewing the candidate's dossiers place considerable emphasis on evaluations provided by relevant experts outside the University. Because of your recognized expertise in the area of scholarly activity of Dr. ___, we are seeking your professional opinion.

Dr. (Professor)___'s performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the School, College and University levels to determine whether promotion and tenure [promotion] will be granted. I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. ___'s creative/scholarly/research activities.

Would you please comment in some detail on the significance of the overall creative/scholarly/research program as well as on individual papers/artwork/design, including the merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study? For example, you might address any of the following:

- 1. how long you have known the candidate and in what capacity?*
- 2. the quality of his/her creative/scholarly/research activities,*
- 3. the impact of his/her creative/scholarly/research activities on the field,*
- 4. the level of achievement and recognition in the candidate's field for creative, scholarly and professional activities,*
- 5. the quality of the enclosed artwork/design/publications or other work with which you are familiar,*
- 6. the quality of presentations which you have heard at meetings,*
- 7. the level of productivity as evidenced by funding, publications, exhibitions and citations.*

To assist you in preparing your evaluative comments, a copy of Dr. (Professor)____'s curriculum vitae, self evaluation, and copies of the following artwork/design/publications are enclosed:_____

We do not expect you to comment on whether Dr. (Professor)____ should be promoted and tenured [promoted] at the University of Cincinnati or whether he/she would be promoted and tenured [promoted] at your institution. The University's assessment will be based upon the total record and our own criteria and standards. It is understood that you and the candidate should not be discussing this evaluation.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. The candidate has the right to review the letter upon receipt by the committee. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.

Sample Letter Directed To Former Students of the Candidate

The following format of the sample letter is not required, but is suggested, with modifications to reflect variations across the College in the type of teaching activity of the candidate.

If a School wishes to use an alternate format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Ohio Public Records Act.

The School of _____ is considering Dr. (Assistant Professor, etc) _____ for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure [professor].

Dr. (Professor)____'s performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the School, College and University levels to determine whether promotion and tenure [promotion] will be granted. I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr.____'s teaching and/or advising.

To assist you in preparing your evaluative comments, a copy of Dr. (Professor)____'s curriculum vitae is enclosed.

Would you please comment in some detail on the impact Dr. (Professor)____ had on you through his/her teaching and/or advising? As applicable, please comment on his/her teaching methods, ability to stimulate learning, knowledge of the subject matter, and any other relevant issues.

We do not expect you to comment on whether Dr. (Professor)____ should be promoted and tenured [promoted] at the University of Cincinnati. We must make this assessment based on the total record, not just on teaching, and on our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. The candidate has the right to review the letter upon receipt by the committee. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student evaluations are necessary as a part of the overall assessment of the instructional process, and shall be conducted for each course taught. While the limitations of the student evaluations are clearly understood, they can be a valuable tool in evaluating technique.

Each School shall determine a consistent student evaluation form and process. Evaluations shall be considered as a whole over a period of time, i.e. individual evaluations are less indicative than is the trend. Comparisons should be made to the historical averages, when available, for the courses.

Faculty shall not administer the evaluations for their own classes nor are they to be in the room while students complete them. A student from the class shall be selected to distribute the evaluations, collect them, and take them to the appropriate School office after they are completed.

The School Director shall be responsible for tabulation of the evaluations and their placement in the dossier as described in Section III. Summaries of teaching evaluations for each course taught during the period under review shall be written by the School Director. These tabulations and summaries are to be completed and placed in the dossier prior to first level of review.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review is strongly recommended. Each School is to develop its own methods for peer evaluation and results are to be included in the dossier. This will be in the form of written assessment (solicited by the School Director) or other reports of peer reviews of teaching.

Section V

Faculty Appointments

In accordance with the AAUP contract, faculty appointments are either Unqualified (tenure-track) or Qualified (field service). While the terms of employment differ, the RPT criteria used to evaluate unqualified and qualified faculty members are the same. As may be specified in school-level RPT documents, the distinction between qualified and unqualified faculty appointments is in the *weight* given to each criterion as reflected in the assignment of responsibilities, e.g., a “field service” faculty member may be assigned a heavier professional service load and as such will be expected to accomplish at a higher level in this area compared to tenure-track faculty members in the same school.

Unqualified faculty members are on a mandatory tenure track, requiring reappointment reviews as indicated in the AAUP contract and following the initial time interval specified by the original appointment letter. The length of time from tenure/promotion to Associate Professor until promotion to Professor is not specified.

Qualified faculty members are appointed for a specified number of years, with a mandatory review for reappointment in the penultimate year. The timing for reviews for promotion is not specified.

It is not allowable under present AAUP contract for a qualified faculty member to transfer into a tenure-track faculty line, nor can an unqualified faculty member move into a qualified appointment without being subject to all normal hiring procedures.