

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC TENURE AND PROMOTION

School of Health & Human Performance

Indiana State University

(Approved November 2001)

The annual paperwork timeline, review procedure, and application format (but not the tenure standards) contained in this document are effective starting with tenure reviews in Fall 2001.

The tenure standards contained in this policy will apply to annual faculty evaluation and tenure review in academic year 2002-2003 and subsequent academic years.

Introduction

Upon the recommendation of various levels of peer and administrative review, the University may grant a faculty member academic tenure. Tenure is earned through high-quality academic and professional performance during a probationary period stipulated in the initial letter of appointment. With tenure, the faculty member becomes eligible for continuous reappointment. Academic tenure ensures the tenured faculty member of the University's commitment to both academic freedom and sufficient economic security to keep the profession attractive to persons of ability (*AAUP Policy Documents & Reports* 2001). In return, accepting tenure expresses the faculty member's long-term commitment to enhancing the academic life of his/her Department and the School as well as the mission of the University. During the probationary period a candidate for tenure is expected to show consistent and progressive evidence of achieving effectiveness in (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and/or creative achievement appropriate to his/her discipline, (3) service to the University and profession, and (4) any additional areas that might be stipulated at the time of the candidate's appointment. The faculty member must demonstrate this over the *entire* probationary period (typically, 6 years).

The School recognizes the central role of Departments in the evaluation of their faculty. It is the responsibility of each Department to define the acceptable terminal degree, develop specific evaluative criteria and performance standards for tenure, consistent with the guidelines contained within this document, and to submit Departmental documents to the Dean for review and the University Oversight Committee for approval. Departmental criteria and guidelines should not be less than those contained in this document but (1) provide additional information designed to assist candidates for tenure in better recognizing what is expected of them and (2) provide certain key measures that peer and administrative evaluators will use in determining whether or not to recommend the tenure of a faculty member from that Department. Further, this document in no way supercedes the section of the most current *University Handbook* that discusses faculty tenure (III-1 to III-6), but it does attempt to define qualitative standards of performance for

School faculty while recognizing that no single standard can be taken as sufficient for the award of tenure. The School - Faculty Affairs Committee is to ensure, insofar as possible, that recommendations made by Departments with similar expectations for professional accomplishment yield similar outcomes for equally qualified candidates. The tenure policies and practices outlined in this document are also consistent with those articulated in the *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*.

This document also acknowledges that, for good programmatic reasons, faculty appointments are occasionally made that place different demands on pre-tenure faculty than is the average in their unit. Whenever such appointments are made, it is incumbent on Departmental and School officials to make such demands clear to both the affected faculty member and to those evaluating that individual for reappointment and tenure. Normally, this information is contained in a memorandum of understanding created by the Dean at the time of the individual's appointment and/or in the faculty member's initial letter of appointment.

The candidate will be evaluated for tenure and promotion at multiple levels--by their Department Faculty Affairs Committee, their Chairperson, the School of Health & Human Performance Faculty Affairs Committee, the School Dean, the Provost, and the President--and awarded tenure by the action of the University's Board of Trustees. The annual letters of reappointment that pre-tenure faculty receives from their Departments, the Dean, and the Provost convey crucial information about their progress toward meeting these expectations. Just as it is incumbent on review committees, Chairpersons, the Dean, and the Provost to express performance-related concerns to pre-tenure faculty, *the obligation to demonstrate that one has meaningfully addressed all concerns that might be raised at any level of evaluation rests squarely with the pre-tenure faculty member*. Ordinarily, one must be evaluated favorably for tenure at each level of evaluation--Departmental, School, and University--in order to receive tenure.

The procedure for tenure evaluation will be followed for promotion application from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor.

Performance Evaluation Levels for Pre-Tenure Faculty

Satisfactory and *unsatisfactory* are the two recognized performance evaluation levels for pre-tenure faculty. A rating of *Satisfactory* should not be understood as a standard, which accepts mediocrity. Rather, a rating of *Satisfactory* signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a high standard, as understood both in the faculty member's field of expertise and within the University community. Without a rating of *Satisfactory* in each of the three basic areas of academic responsibility - teaching, scholarship, and service - a faculty member cannot expect to receive a positive recommendation for tenure.

Evidence for the Performance-Based Evaluation of Teaching

The centrality of teaching in the University's mission, and its prominence in faculty activity demand that the evaluation of teaching be given high priority in the assessment of any faculty

member's performance. It is because of this centrality and the continual need to monitor one's teaching effectiveness that student evaluations should be conducted in the majority of classes a faculty member teaches and collection of additional student input is encouraged.

For most faculty members, classroom and laboratory instruction and associated work such as student outcomes assessment, curricular development, student advisement, and sponsorship of student internships and scholarly work constitute their most important and time-consuming activities. The evaluation of teaching can be guided by defining certain behaviors, characteristics, attitudes, and activities that are common among outstanding teachers, along with tools that may be used to identify and document these qualities. Departments will develop criteria and indicators of teaching effectiveness within their disciplines; it is expected that such criteria will allow for peer evaluation and student input (utilizing SIR II forms). A guide to documenting teaching performance appears in Appendix A. School-level teaching standards appear below:

- **Satisfactory Teaching** — To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member must (1) present a variety of significant evidence which documents teaching effectiveness, (2) meet all instructional expectations established in the faculty member's Department and in annual performance reviews, and (3) meet the basic instructional expectations of University faculty specified in the most recent *University Handbook* (III-7 to III-10).
- **Unsatisfactory Teaching** — An *Unsatisfactory* rating means that the candidate has not fully met performance expectations and/or has not sufficiently documented teaching effectiveness. This judgment may result from the fact that the candidate has not presented enough evidence of high instructional quality and/or has not presented sufficiently compelling evidence.

Evidence for the Performance-Based Evaluation of Scholarship

The School of Health & Human Performance is also committed to the value of scholarship, which may be defined as the documented distribution among peers of work grounded in research through publication; and through presentations at professional conferences. Basic and applied research that is quantitative or qualitative in nature, with the integration of knowledge through interdisciplinary exploration is included in this definition of scholarship. This recognizes the diversity of talents among School faculty.

According to this definition, scholarship takes the form of, but is not limited to: published books, book chapters, peer-reviewed data generated publications, peer-reviewed research reports or literature reviews, substantial peer-reviewed theoretical or application-oriented publications, research abstracts, electronic media, grant proposals and contracts, and conference presentations. A guide to documenting scholarly achievement appears in Appendix A. School-level scholarly standards appear below:

- **Satisfactory Scholarly Achievement** — To qualify for a *satisfactory* rating, a faculty member must demonstrate a record of *sustained* scholarly achievement within his/her academic discipline. Exact expectations regarding the type and quantity of these scholarly achievements will vary some, depending on one's academic assignment and discipline. A *satisfactory* rating requires a *body* of scholarship that has earned favorable peer review at the regional or national level.
- **Unsatisfactory Scholarly Achievement** — An *unsatisfactory* scholarly rating indicates that the faculty member's scholarly achievements fail to fully meet Departmental, School, and/or University expectations. This judgment may result from the fact that evaluators deem the quality and/or quantity of the faculty member's scholarly achievements to be insufficient.

Any faculty member applying for tenure has the *option* to have his/her scholarly accomplishments reviewed by peers external to Indiana State University as part of the tenure review process. A suggested practice for obtaining such external reviews is presented in Appendix B.

Evidence of Performance-Based Evaluation of Academic Service

The School of Health & Human Performance expects all members of its faculty to document a pattern of significant, high-quality University, professional and community service related to the profession of the candidate. A guide to documenting academic service appears in Appendix A. School-level standards in this area appear below:

- **Satisfactory Academic Service** — To qualify for a *satisfactory* rating, a faculty member must make consistent contributions to the University, profession, and community (related to candidate's profession) that are deemed significant in terms of their quality and quantity. Such service could take the form of intra-departmental assignments; a range of Departmental, School-level, and University-level assignments; or major service efforts that draw upon a faculty member's expertise within his/her professional organizations and discipline.
- **Unsatisfactory Academic Service** — An *unsatisfactory* service rating indicates that the faculty member's service achievements fail to meet Departmental, School, and/or University expectations fully. This judgment may result from the fact that evaluators deem the quality and/or quantity of the faculty member's service achievements to be inadequate.

Performance Evaluation and Tenure Review Procedures

Annual Reviews of Performance Prior to the Tenure Year

Each year, pre-tenure School faculty, are evaluated by their Departmental Faculty Affairs Committee, Department Chairperson as well as the School Faculty Affairs Committee, Dean and Provost. These annual evaluations usually lead to reappointment, but can lead to conditional reappointment or non-reappointment if the faculty member is not fully meeting performance expectations. At each level of review (i.e. Department, School) the committees and personnel involved *must* consider the candidate's performance based on the number of years at that point. For instance, a faculty member being evaluated during the third year of their probationary pre-tenure period must have the areas of teaching, scholarship and service evaluated for three years worth of achievement. Evaluation before and leading up to tenure must consider all years previously served as stipulated in the terms of the candidate's contract of employment at Indiana State University. Furthermore, their dossier or supporting materials must document three years of achievement. It is incumbent upon all evaluators at each level of review to keep this in perspective when considering faculty materials. Each level of the annual probationary pre-tenure review includes a candid written assessment of the materials presented by the faculty member in support of his/her success in (1) teaching, (2) scholarship, and (3) service to the University and profession—as well as any additional areas that might be stipulated in writing at the time of the person's appointment. The deadlines concerning the dates that materials are due for evaluation, regardless of what year the evaluation is for, are established through the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. All faculty will receive these dates through their respective Department Chairpersons. Candidates submitting their dossier for reappointment and tenure should exercise significant care in preparing materials for review. Solid performance and continuing achievement in each of the areas identified above are required as a basis for a recommendation for reappointment and, eventually, for tenure. Reviewers are obliged to make concerns and shortcomings known to pre-tenure faculty members, and faculty notified of performance concerns have the obligation to document their success in addressing these matters satisfactorily by the time of their next evaluation. Each pre-tenure faculty member and Department Chairperson will meet following the year's evaluation cycle to discuss the faculty member's performance and goals that are placed on him/her for the coming year. If necessary, the faculty member has the right to request an informational meeting regarding their annual review with the Dean.

Generally, persons not reappointed for a second or third year have failed to meet performance standards in teaching, scholarship, and service. In keeping with AAUP guidelines, the contracts of those not reappointed in this time frame are terminated at the end of the first or second year of service, respectively. Those who are not reappointed during the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service are allowed to serve one additional year; the principal purpose of this practice is to provide the faculty member with ample opportunity to pursue employment elsewhere. The reappointment status of first-year faculty is determined by March 1; the determination date for second-year faculty is December 15; and the determination date for faculty in the third year and beyond is the close of the spring semester. Normally, the tenure evaluation occurs during one's sixth credited year of service. Tenure is formally conferred on those recommended for

continuous reappointment at the beginning of the fall semester of the seventh year of credited service.

Persons who are conditionally reappointed receive formal notice of the need to improve performance in one or more areas, or face non-reappointment. Although a conditional reappointment does not preclude the possibility of the candidate receiving tenure, subsequent review materials must address performance concerns outlined in the annual evaluation. Those candidates who are granted tenure will also be promoted to Associate Professor unless stipulated otherwise within the candidate's terms of employment.

Preparing Materials for the Tenure Review

The preparation of tenure review materials is extremely important. Professionalism and expertise are represented not only in the content of the application materials, but also in the care and efficiency with which the materials are presented. Therefore, faculty should attend carefully to the format recommended for tenure applications in Appendix A and should seek the advice of tenured faculty. As part of the tenure review process, Departments *may* receive statements from external referees on achievements related to scholarship. All documents prepared and submitted by the candidate for tenure, along with documents solicited on behalf of the candidate, are transmitted through each step of the tenure review process.

If the candidate so chooses an external referee to evaluate his/her scholarly activity, it is quite possible that among those reviewing a candidate's work for tenure beyond the Departmental level are colleagues who do not know the candidate or his/her work personally and who have different fields of expertise. Therefore, it is incumbent upon candidates to present their accomplishments clearly, specifically, and succinctly. Candidates are required to provide adequate documentation/evidence of both the quality and the quantity of their performance in each of the areas to be evaluated, and any concerns raised in pre-tenure evaluations should be addressed directly by candidates in their tenure review materials.

Since evaluation for tenure leads to a one-time decision based upon performance over the *entire* pre-tenure probationary period, and since the tenure review process takes several months to complete, a candidate for tenure may request in writing that pertinent new documentation be added to his/her application portfolio at any level of review. Generally, this new material should document outcomes of performance referred to in the original application, not introduce new initiatives undertaken after the review process has begun. This documentation should be submitted to the Department Chairperson who will then forward to the information the appropriate committees. Those considering whether or not to accept new material into a portfolio are obliged to confer with persons at previous levels of review about the advisability of adding to the file, and copies of any added material must be made available to previous reviewers.

The Tenure Review Process

Departmental Review

At the Department level, an identified committee (FAC) composed of tenured faculty members, will conduct the tenure review process. This committee will prepare and transmit to the candidate being evaluated, and to the Department Chairperson its evaluation and recommendation. At the time of evaluation, the committee will have available all pertinent provisions of appointment, such as educational and scholarly expectations and years remaining until tenure eligibility. The committee will also have copies of all previous annual evaluations of the candidate. These materials are a requisite part of a candidate's tenure application portfolio.

Candidates for promotion and tenure submit to their department materials documenting faculty achievements in teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity, and service. These materials are reviewed independently by the Department's committee and Chairperson. Each makes a separate recommendation, applying the recognized department evaluative criteria and performance standards, and taking into account the precise terms and conditions of the appointment letter and the comments generated during previous annual reviews.

Candidates are notified of these recommendations and their rationales in writing by the Department Chairperson and Department FAC chair, separately. At this meeting, the candidate must initial and date the evaluation form to acknowledge that s/he has received it. If both department-level recommendations are positive, the candidate's materials and the recommendations are forwarded to the school for consideration. If one, or both, of the department-level recommendations are negative, candidates may choose to a) terminate the process; or b) prepare a response, which is forwarded with their materials to the school level for review. The written response need to be completed within five (5) working days from the date the candidate initials the evaluation forms, s/he may submit to his/her Chairperson any statement responding to this evaluation.

In choosing to terminate the process, except in cases of early consideration a candidate for tenure also withdraws from consideration for further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the year of the process.

A tenured candidate for promotion who terminates the promotion review process may later apply for promotion without prejudice.

School Review

The School FAC and the Dean, whose separate recommendations are based on School's evaluative criteria and performance standards, evaluate candidates' materials independently. The School FAC members shall not substitute their own assessment of discipline-specific faculty achievements for that of the department.

Candidates are notified of the committee's and Dean's recommendations and their rationales in writing by the Dean and School FAC chair, separately. At this meeting, the candidate must initial and date the evaluation form to acknowledge that s/he has received it. If both school-level recommendations are positive, the candidate's materials and the recommendations are forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs for consideration. If one, or both, of the school-level recommendations are negative, candidates may choose to a) terminate the process; or b) prepare a response, which is forwarded with their materials to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs for review. The written response needs to be completed within five (5) working days from the date the candidate initials the evaluation forms, s/he may submit to his/her Dean any statement responding to this evaluation. A copy of the written response is also forwarded to the candidate's department committee and chairperson. In choosing to terminate the process, except in cases of early consideration a candidate for tenure also withdraws from consideration for further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the year of the process.

Subsequently, the Provost acts on the Dean's recommendation; the President acts on the Provost's recommendation; and the Board of Trustees, acting upon the recommendation of the President, does or does not award the candidate tenure.

In choosing to terminate the process, except in cases of early consideration a candidate for tenure also withdraws from consideration for further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the year of the process.

A tenured candidate for promotion who terminates the promotion review process may later apply for promotion without prejudice.

Grounds for Formal Reconsideration of a Decision Not to Reappoint

The policies of the AAUP provide, in exceptional cases, for the reconsideration of non-reappointment decisions by those alleging (1) violation of academic freedom, (2) improper discrimination, or (3) inadequate consideration. Allegations in the first two categories can lead to a formal institutional review, the result of which could be a recommendation to reappoint (or tenure) the complainant; an allegation of inadequate consideration can lead to a formal review the purpose of which is to request that the faculty body (ies) or administrator(s) who did not afford the pre-tenure faculty member adequate consideration reconsider that individual's qualifications for reappointment or tenure. *In all three cases, the burden of proof rests upon the faculty member requesting reconsideration.* (See AAUP Policy Documents & Reports 1995: 18-20).

The Awarding of Tenure

As noted above, recommendations for reappointment and tenure are based on the candidate's documented achievement in (1) teaching, (2) scholarly work appropriate to his/her discipline, (3) service to the University and profession, and (4) any additional areas that might be stipulated at the time of the candidate's appointment. To receive a positive recommendation for tenure, a candidate must ordinarily demonstrate *satisfactory* performance in *all* of these categories.

There is a final tenure qualification *not* discussed above. It occasionally happens that an otherwise qualified candidate will not be tenured because that person's competencies are not necessary to a Department's or to the University's meeting its long-range goals. For example, recent or pending changes in program emphasis, or significant enrollment declines, or changes in teaching areas of a discipline may obviate the need to grant an otherwise qualified faculty member tenure. Whenever a Department or the University anticipates such changes, it is obliged to inform potentially affected faculty of contingencies that might affect their being tenured, including the wisdom of their exploring retraining opportunities within disciplines in transition.

The Awarding of Promotion From Associate Professor to Professor

Preface

Teaching, scholarship and service (may be administrative, professional or public) are University promotion criteria. Promotion to Professor rank must take into account differences between Departments, and the individual's contributions to the School and University mission. The award of Professor is documented by evidence of effective teaching, a record of substantial accomplishment in scholarship, which has led to recognition at the national level, and substantive service to the Department, School, University, Profession and Community is required. The procedure for tenure evaluation will be followed for promotion application from the rank of Associate Professor to the rank of Professor. The standards and guidelines for promotion to Professor within teaching, scholarship and service are given below.

Teaching

As faculty members consider being evaluated for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, it is expected that the candidate in question has established a substantial commitment to teaching. This may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, positive evaluations as indicated by the submitted SIR II forms, as well as any other supportive documents from the Chairperson or immediate supervisor (i.e. peer teaching evaluations, teaching awards).

Scholarship

Faculty who are being considered for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor must exhibit a substantial line of scholarly inquiry through, but not limited to: peer-reviewed data generated publications, published books, book chapters, research abstracts, electronic media, grant proposals and contracts. The candidate in question must demonstrate that their scholarship has been nationally recognized and contributed substantially to the knowledge base of their

profession. Evidence of such achievement must be given through appropriate documentation (i.e. re-prints or copies of publications).

Service

Faculty who are being considered for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor must make substantial contributions in service to their Department, School, University, Profession, and community. This may occur through by serving on various committees, advisory boards or task forces. Additionally, faculty demonstrating significant contributions to their professional organization(s) may do so by, but not limited to, serving on various committees or holding leadership positions.

Appendix A

A well-prepared tenure application facilitates effective communication between the applicant and those reviewing his/her application. To this end, the following template has been devised. While candidates need not follow the template in every detail, they must present three sets of documentation - one each for teaching, scholarship, and service. Key generalizations to keep in mind when presenting tenure materials for review are these:

- *Be Selective and Concise:* Include only the most significant information in the main body of your application.
- *Be Well-Organized:* Place important supporting information in appendices. Include a table of contents and clearly labeled binder dividers.
- *Build a Self-Contained Case:* Present your major academic achievements in a way that, based on the evidence contained in the materials you submit, clearly demonstrates the quality, the quantity, and the importance of these achievements.

Body of Application

Application for Tenure

Name _____

Department _____

Year _____

Table of Contents

Part 1 - Preliminary Materials

1. *Curriculum Vita*
2. Letter of initial appointment identifying expectations in teaching, scholarship and service. Also, if applicable, any official memoranda of understanding affecting your appointment. Copies of annual reappointment reviews, including letters of reappointment

Part 2- Documentation of Teaching

Documentation of teaching is the responsibility of the candidate. Presentation of adequate continuing efforts in this area should be presented in an organized format from most recent to least recent. Following are examples of materials that may be included for documentation of research, scholarship, and creative activity.

1. Summary of teaching achievement. (Required)
2. Peer evaluation – Candidates should provide a written evaluation of teaching by colleagues and the department chairperson. (Required)
3. Student evaluation – The SIR II is the primary indication of student evaluation. This instrument should be administered according to School of HHP policy. Other objective and subjective assessments can be used to supplement the SIR II. (Required)
4. Self-evaluation – The candidate should complete a self-assessment of his/her progress for the year. (Recommended)
5. Chronologically arranged list of all classes taught at ISU, including course name and number, credit hours and contact hours and number of students for each class. (Required)
6. Three or four course syllabi that represent the range of courses taught and demonstrate the practical application of the candidate's teaching strategies. (Required)
7. Documentation of any new or significant revised courses, newly employed pedagogies, or significant teaching materials developed at ISU.
8. List of number and type of students advised (Required). A brief description of the candidate's advising practices and student assessment of advising. (Recommended)
9. Summary of undergraduate/graduate student research involvement and student assessment of such involvement (If Applicable).
10. Brief summary of undergraduate/graduate student professional development involvement and student assessment of such involvement (If Applicable).
11. Letters from current and former students (If Applicable).
12. List of teaching awards (If Applicable).
13. Brief description of professional pedagogical-development activities. E.g., Center for Teaching and Learning (If Applicable).

Part 3 - Documentation of Research and Scholarly Activity

Documentation of research and scholarly activity is the responsibility of the candidate. Documentation should include not only the appropriate reference information, but also a description of the publication or conference. The candidate's contribution to joint publications should be indicated. Following are examples of materials that may be included for documentation of research and scholarship.

1. A summary of the candidate's research agenda, goals and achievements (Required).
2. Logically arranged list of research and scholarly publications. Include reference information and a copy of the publication (Required).
3. List of scholarly work in press and document with letter of acceptance or galley proof (Required, if applicable).
4. List of scholarly work under review with copies of manuscripts (Required, if applicable).
5. List of research grants and awards. Identify the purpose, objective, dollar award, duration, and outcome (If Applicable).
6. List of research and scholarly presentations. Indicate the conference, audience, and selection process (Required).
7. List of books published, chapters in books, monographs, reports, published educational hardware or software. Indicate if this publication is the first one or is a multiple listing from previous works (Required, if applicable).

8. [REDACTED]

Part 4 - Documentation of Academic Service Activity

Documentation of service activity is the responsibility of the candidate. Following are examples of materials that may be included for documentation of service.

1. A summary of the candidate's service goals and achievements (Required).
2. A list of service activities categorized by department, school, university, community, and professional (Required).
3. Letters of appointment to editorial review boards and a description of responsibilities and time commitment (If Applicable).
4. A description of work with student organizations. Provide name, function and membership of organization as well as the candidate's function and time commitment.
5. A description of recruitment and retention activities (If Applicable).
6. Documentation of service to departmental, school, and university committees. The documentation should include the name of the committee, the candidate's role in the committee, and an indication of time commitment (Required).
7. Documentation of leadership or membership in professional organizations [document the mission or function of the organization, its membership, a description of candidate's responsibilities, and the amount of time committed] (If Applicable).
8. Documentation of involvement with professional workshops, in-services, conference, and/or professional development for faculty, other professionals, etc (If Applicable).
9. Documentation of professional participation in, leadership of and/or presentations to community organizations [including, the type of committee, its mission or function, membership or participatory function and amount of time committed] (If Applicable).
10. Documentation of professional consultation (If Applicable).

Appendix B

Part I - Guidelines for Utilizing an External Referee for Scholarship Review

- Typically the candidate for tenure requesting an external review would submit to the Department Chairperson a list of three potential referees who share the candidate's area of scholarly expertise.
- The Department Chairperson and Department faculty affairs committee would select one of these individuals from the list to serve, and then the Department FAC would select one referee as well. Both individuals would then serve as external referees in evaluating the candidate's *scholarship*. The candidate, in turn, would provide the Department Chairperson with one set of materials for each referee, and the Chairperson would send the materials out for review. This process would need to be initiated in time for the responses to meet the established Departmental deadline for the submission of materials for tenure review. Every response received by the Chairperson would be regarded as confidential, and would be placed in the candidate's tenure dossier.
- It is critical for the Department - Faculty Affairs Committee and the School - Faculty Affairs Committee to realize that the input received from the external referees is merely a professional judgment of the candidate's scholarly achievements, *only*. It *should not* be viewed as a recommendation for or against tenure of the candidate. Furthermore, if a candidate elects not to have external referees review their scholarly achievements they should not be penalized for this in their review.