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**CAS PROMOTION AND TENURE CURRENT WORKING GUIDE[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The “current working guide” is designed to facilitate the development of complete application files as well as the process of rank and tenure review. This guide is used to insure the consistent interpretation and implementation of current policy.

This working guide to promotion and tenure is compiled from policies and procedures in the Faculty Handbook and those of the CAS. The College is aware that changes in policy require faculty action and that College policies are often more detailed and stringent than the University policies found in the Faculty Handbook. At the same time, the Faculty Handbook contains some details that are not included in this guide. Both documents should be consulted, and adhered to, in the formation of a dossier for promotion or tenure.

Promotion in rank is the recognition that a faculty member has demonstrated professional performance and growth at a level appropriate for faculty of a particular rank. Thus, review for promotion primarily evaluates performance in teaching, scholarship and service over a period of time (teaching and service only for those on the Lecturer track). Tenure is “an expression of mutual confidence between the university and a faculty member and an expectation that continuing service of the faculty is appropriate and desirable… It is an expression of confidence that a faculty member will continue to be a valued colleague, a good teacher, and an active scholar, artist or leader in one’s profession” (FH III 3.4). Thus, review for tenure evaluates **past performance as a projection of the future** with particular attention to the match of the faculty member with the department and university.

While there are differences in the purposes and materials that should be included for review of promotion and for review of tenure, the process followed for each of these is very similar. Furthermore, faculty members often combine a review for tenure with a request for promotion. Given this tendency, the following guide combines processes that are shared between promotion and tenure requests but notes when differences exist.

**General Preparation for Promotion and Tenure**

*Best advice: Begin to keep a promotion file as soon as you are hired and collect documents that might be helpful.*

*Carefully read the Faculty Handbook Part III, particularly Sections 3.3 and 3.4, and check to see*

*if Appendix J includes your discipline.*

A. Long term planning

“Each faculty member seeking promotion [and tenure] will make long range plans, in consultation with the department chair and dean, to develop a program to successfully address such criteria that would best assist them in meeting their professional goals and attaining the desired rank” (FH III 3.3).

In addition to ongoing development and long range plans, actual preparation should begin at least **at least** **two academic years** prior to the expected review date.

B. When is a faculty member reviewed for promotion and/or tenure?

1. Promotion:
   1. A faculty member can request promotion when the basic criteria for the requested rank have been met (See FH III 3.3.b).

b. Candidates wishing to include professional experience towards eligibility for promotion should please confirm this with the CAS Dean.

1. Tenure:
   1. Tenure review is set at the time of hire for tenure-track faculty, generally at the beginning of the seventh year of probationary status (See FH III 3.4.b).
   2. The tenure review date is usually included in the Dean’s offer letter.

**Begin with the ‘Review’ in Mind**

When hired, the faculty member should consult with their department chair to develop an initial planned trajectory for their teaching, scholarship, and service for their first six years prior to their tenure review. Generally, in the first year (or two) on campus, the faculty member will primarily focus on teaching and learning the culture of the university, along with working to maintain pre-existing research lines and embracing limited service opportunities. As they enter their second and third years, the faculty member should consider ways to engage more meaningfully in service at the College and University levels, which may also include a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate. At this point, they may want to investigate teaching as part of their annual teaching load a course in University Studies or Honors, and/or qualify one of their departmental courses as a Service Learning course. The faculty member should plan this transition into a greater impact in service and a diversified teaching load conscientiously and in quarterly consultation with the departmental chair.

Around year three, the faculty member should seek input from an experienced faculty mentor about their progress (and documentation) in teaching, scholarship, and service. They should consider taking advantage of the mid-term review (available to tenure-track faculty, per policy) to get a sense of their progress thus far, and what they should consider planning for years 4-6 in order to continue in a trajectory of growth in teaching, scholarship, and service and strengthen their candidacy for tenure.

Engaging in this suggested process will facilitate an appropriate trajectory and equip the faculty member with confidence as they prepare their dossier for submission, typically during their sixth year on campus in preparation of submitting the dossier fall quarter of their seventh year.

**Preparing for the Review**

“Given the complexity of the materials and the shortness of the timeline it is expected that the applicant and department chair shall collaborate in the preparation of the application and dossier during the previous academic year” (FH III 3.3.c and 3.4.c.1).

*Best advice: Begin working on the dossier early!*

*The candidate should consult often with the chair, and the chair periodically with the Dean.*

*Do not work in isolation – consult with colleagues.*

1. Early in the academic year prior to review the **Faculty Member** should:
2. Carefully read the appropriate section of the Faculty Handbook (III 3.3 for promotion and 3.4 for tenure), the CAS Promotion and Tenure Current Working Guide and, if applicable, Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook.
3. Collect documents to support teaching effectiveness (e.g., selected syllabi, course materials, service-learning elements, and peer teaching reviews).
4. Collect documents to provide evidence of scholarship (e.g., copies of publications, copies of presentations, and copies of conference program cover pages and panel information pages).
5. Collect documents to provide evidence of service (e.g., documents and policies that the candidate had an active role in crafting, materials created or other evidence of church and/or community service, etc.).
6. Request letters of support from people who can comment on teaching, scholarship, and/or service (i.e. department and university colleagues, professional peers, and former students (See FH III 3.3.c.2.iv).
7. Make copies of awards and other recognitions.
8. Compile materials such as Annual Individualized Faculty Plans (AIFPs), Annual Faculty Reports (AFRs), and Faculty Load documents for the years in review.
9. Create an updated Curriculum Vitae using the format developed by the Faculty Senate (available in the Provost’s office).
10. Begin writing the Personal Statement, which should discuss philosophies involving teaching, scholarship, and service, and address such issues as identity, growth, trajectory, and institutional and departmental fit.
11. Consult with the chair and departmental colleagues or work with a mentor during the process.
12. Consult with the Dean to see if any dossiers from prior years are available to borrow from the Dean’s office, or seek out dossiers from candidates who recently have submitted theirs for promotion or tenure.

B. Early in the academic year prior to review the **Department Chair** should:

1. Compile Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEIs), peer teaching reviews, chair teaching reviews, and annual chair evaluations for the years under review.
2. Begin to evaluate the trajectory of the faculty member’s teaching development during the years under review using the data compiled above as well as in comparison with other faculty in the department, within the college, and institutionally (comparative scores available in the quarterly SEI overview documents).
3. Collect discipline-specific standards that will help contextualize the candidate’s scholarly productivity and service to the discipline and consider seeking external evaluations from peers within the discipline which might serve to even further contextualize the candidate’s performance and contributions.
4. Work with the candidate in the development of the dossier including a review of the Curriculum Vitae and draft of the Personal Statement.
5. Consult Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook to see if any additional documents or processes are required by the department when analyzing scholarship.

**Developing the Application File**

“The “application file” consists of two collections of materials: the “dossier,” compiled and submitted by the faculty candidate, and the “accompanying documents,” beginning with the materials submitted by the department chair and other documents accumulated in the review process” (FH III 3.3.c.1 and 3.4.c.2).

**A. Dossier** (developed by the faculty candidate)

Due to the department chair on the 1st Monday of Fall Quarter of review year

*Best advice: Write for your audience: intelligent colleagues who are not in your discipline.*

*Make the case, telling the story of who you are and what you value.*

*Label sections, use tabs to separate them, and paginate each section.*

*Review your CV and Personal Statement so that there are no errors or discrepancies.*

1. General Required Documents and Materials:
   1. CAS Promotion and Tenure Application Checklist (available from the CAS Dean’s office) listing documents and materials to be included in the application file.
   2. Cover sheet with name, date, department, degrees, present rank and signed request for promotion or tenure review.
   3. Curriculum Vitae (in R&T format developed by the Faculty Senate and available from the office of the Provost).
   4. Personal statement
      1. For promotion, the statement must “…discuss the candidate’s philosophy and achievements in teaching, scholarship and service, making a clear case that they satisfy the promotion criteria” (FH III 3.3.c. 2.ii).[[2]](#footnote-2)
      2. For tenure “the candidate shall develop a case that demonstrates his/her effectiveness as a faculty member [at the current or requested rank] and his/her commitment to the university’s mission” (FH III 3.4.c.2.i.e).
      3. For both, a single personal statement that includes the elements above (a and b).
   5. A copy of the original hire letter from the dean
   6. If relevant, copies of any previous CAS Rank and Tenure letters
   7. Annual Individualized Faculty Plans (AIFPs) and Annual Faculty Reports (AFRs) for the years under consideration.[[3]](#footnote-3)
   8. Annual faculty loads, including teaching, scholarship and service (actual load rather than planned).
   9. General letters of support from external and internal colleagues, former students, service learning director, committee chairs or relevant others.
2. Required Documents and Materials in Support of Teaching
   1. Annotated list of classes with elements such as class level, number of times taught, range of class size, laboratory activities, major or service course, Service Learning, University Studies, or Honors.
   2. Sample syllabi to reflect the range of courses described above.
   3. Evidence of grant support applications and grant support received in regards to curriculum development, delivery, and/or assessment.
   4. Letters of support for teaching from external and internal colleagues, former students, and relevant others (letters that address more than one area–i.e., both teaching and service–should be included in this section and not duplicated elsewhere).
   5. Any additional evidence that supports the applicant’s teaching.
3. Required Documents in Support of Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Professional Development

Scholarship is not included in determining load in the **lecturer track** or in criteria under which lecturers are evaluated. However, a lecturer should note any scholarship or creative activity during the period under review. A lecturer should also note professional development activities in this section.

1. A chronological list of scholarly production (as well as any grant applications and support received) for the years under considerationwith annotations providing a summary and/or evaluation for each.[[4]](#footnote-4)
2. Copies of selected scholarly production published in appropriate professional journals for the years under review.
3. Copies of selected papers presented at international, national, and/or regional professional meetings.
4. Evidence of other scholarship appropriate to one’s discipline (see FH Appendix J).
5. Evidence of other research and scholarship for the years under review that contribute to “a pattern of research and scholarship” (e.g., other papers or printouts of presentation aids, pictures of poster presentations, encyclopedia entries, etc.).
6. Letters of support for scholarship and creative activity from external colleagues, former students, and relevant others.
7. Any additional evidence (i.e., scholarship with students) that supports the applicant’s research, scholarship, or creative activity.
8. Required Documents in Support of Service

Participation in service is vital for the enculturation of faculty members, who in turn apply their ideas and skills to the betterment of the campus, their discipline, and other communities in which they engage. Candidates should provide evidence of service contributions to the campus in the following areas: university, Faculty Senate, CAS, and department.

1. An itemized, annotated list of all service and/or academic management including departmental, school, institutional, church, and community service.
2. Representative documents produced during committee service, special assignments, committee chair letters, etc.
3. Letters or certificates of recognition referring to talks for general audiences, community service, and church service.
4. Evidence of service-related grant applications and grant support received.
5. Letters of support for service from external and internal colleagues, former students, Service-Learning director, committee chairs, and relevant others (see footnote 4).
6. Any additional evidence that supports the applicant’s service contributions.
7. **Accompanying Documents**

Includes chair documents and other additions to the “application file” as it progresses through review. A separate binder with tabs for department, school, and university materials is provided by the Dean’s office.

1. Documents prepared by the Department Chair
   1. A Summative Analysis of Teaching for the years under review based on chair, peer, and student evaluations. The summary analysis is developed by the chair before the department review and vote and does not include a summary evaluation (which is provided in the “Chair’s Letter”).
   2. The Chair’s Letter (FH III c.3.i for promotion and FH III c.4.11.b for tenure) is an evaluation and recommendation written after the department has voted. It should make an effective case for the candidate. It must address how the candidate meets the criteria for the rank being requested (or for current rank if advancement in rank has not been requested) including an assessment and interpretation of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service.
   3. A statement (often included in the Chair’s Letter) from the department chair on the opinion of the department’s faculty concerning the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. Be specific on departmental vote(s). In the case of requests for both tenure and promotion, indicate votes for each.
   4. Copies of the annual chair evaluations and yearly load (actual, not planned) for the years under review.
   5. Documents prepared by the chair of a secondary appointment department.
2. Documents provided by the Department Chair of secondary appointment.

If a faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department of the university, the department chair will provide documents appropriate for the role of the faculty member in that department (e.g., teaching, scholarship, and/or service).

1. Documents prepared by Honors, University Studies, and/or Service-Learning.

If the candidate has taught in the University Studies or Honors programs, or incorporated Service-Learning, the theme leader or Dean of General Education, the Director of Honors, and/or the Director of Service Learning will provide a letter of evaluation reviewing the candidate’s teaching in the program.

**Process and Timeline**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Dossier developed by faculty member submitted to department chair | 1st Monday of Fall Quarter |
| 2. | Chair’s Summative Analysis of Teaching added to the application file | 1st Monday of Fall Quarter |
| 3. | Department faculty considers the Application File and makes recommendation with formal vote[[5]](#footnote-5) | 1st two weeks of Fall Quarter |
| 4. | Chair adds evaluation letter and copies of additional documents to Application File and submits it to CAS Dean | 4th Monday of Fall quarter |
| 5. | Additional evaluations (e.g., secondary appointment department, University Studies, etc.) are added to application file | 4th Monday of Fall quarter |
| 6. | If candidate meets basic eligibility, Dean forwards application file to the CAS R&T committee. | 3rd Monday of October (est.) |
| 7. | If a tenure review, Dean provides input to R&T Committee | Scheduled by R&T |
| 8. | CAS R&T Committee review and recommendation to dean | End of Fall Quarter |
| 9. | If the CAS Dean agrees with the R&T Committee, a recommendation is added to the application file and forwarded to the Provost | 1st Monday of Winter Quarter |
| 10. | The CAS Dean writes the candidate informing him/her of action | Within time stipulated by policy |
| 11. | The Provost and the University Rank & Tenure Committee review the application file | Winter Quarter |
| 12. | University Council Action | Spring Quarter |

**CAS Rank and Tenure Committee Governance Practices and Recommendations**

1. General Practices
   1. The Committee considers all discussions and decisions confidential. Confidentiality is essential at all times to insure honest and candid discussions of the candidate. Any abuse of this confidentiality will result in the Committee member being censored and may result in the offending member’s termination from the CAS Rank & Tenure Committee.
   2. Committee members will excuse themselves from the discussion and decision-making process when he or she is from the same department or family as the candidate or if the member has mentored the candidate or written a letter of support for the candidate.
   3. The Chair of the Committee is the only individual who can speak for the committee.
   4. In cases where the requirements of the College are more stringent than the requirements of the University, the Committee will adhere to the College’s requirements.
2. Requests for Promotion and/or Tenure
   1. The Committee will not consider a request for promotion and/or tenure unless the application file is complete. The committee deliberates in a thoughtful but timely fashion and therefore cannot alter deadlines because of late or incomplete dossiers.
   2. Contractual agreements involving rank and/or tenure must be in written form by the appropriate and authorized individuals to be considered by the Committee. Verbal agreements are not considered by the Committee.
3. Requests for Additional Information
   1. All Committee communications concerning the candidate and/or department will be made through the CAS Dean.
   2. If the Committee seeks additional information about a candidate, the Committee requests that additional information be given in written form rather than through a phone call or an appearance in person.
4. Interpretations of Policy
5. The Committee views Ph.D. dissertations and other degree-required performances or exhibitions (e.g., MFA exhibitions, DMA performances and presentations, etc.) as part of the degree program and not scholarship for the purposes of promotion or tenure.
6. At this time prior teaching experience is normally limited to regular, full-time faculty appointment, although trends in higher education may soon demand that the university rethink this interpretation of regular employment.
7. Acting as referee for journal articles or as an editor for a professional journal is considered service to the discipline.
8. The scholarship expectations for an associate professor is described as “a pattern of research and scholarship… that yields two or more evidences or products of scholarship within the most recent three academic years” (III.3.3.B.3.iii).
9. The number of evidences or products of scholarship are seen as “necessary but not necessarily sufficient” for promotion or tenure. The CAS Dean uses these minimum expectations in reviewing the *basic* eligibility of a candidate before forwarding it to the CAS Rank and Tenure Committee for review (III.3.3.C.4.iii).
10. In order to demonstrate “a pattern of research and scholarship,” the candidate must have engaged in scholarly activity comprised of scholarly writing and/or creative production that is coherent and continuing.
11. Promotion to full professor rank carries an expectation of “continued growth in teaching, scholarly activity and service beyond that expected for the rank of associate professor” (B.4.iii). When considering whether there has been continued growth, the committee first evaluates the candidate against the associate professor expectations and then considers whether there is evidence of continued growth beyond that rank. The phrase ‘continued growth in scholarly activity,’ as interpreted by the CAS, involves **a pattern of intensification in quality, quantity, focus, and/or impact of scholarly output**.
12. A document is considered published when it is accepted for publication with no further revision.
13. In order for a professional presentation to be counted as part of a candidate’s dossier, it must have been presented *before* the dossier is submitted to the Dean’s office for consideration by the Rank & Tenure Committee.
14. Entries in a reference source (e.g., encyclopedia) and, in the area of music, program notes, do not generally count as part of a candidate’s minimum required publications and/or presentations but rather as part of the total scholarship effort and pattern of ongoing scholarly engagement.
15. Acting as a facilitator of a professional meeting (whether international, national, or regional) or as a moderator/discussant for a panel, symposium, or paper session does not count as a presentation and/or publications since the facilitator’s contributions are not peer-reviewed. These activities are instead considered as part of service to the discipline.
16. Professional presentation at a Seventh-day Adventist conference or publication in an Adventist periodical in one’s discipline are not counted as scholarship but instead are considered to be service because the pool of Seventh-day Adventist scholars in one’s discipline is usually not large enough to provide the peer review demanded by generally-accepted academic standards.
17. Presentations to lay audiences are considered to be service, not scholarship.

E. Recommendations for the Candidate

1. It is recommended that a candidate who has been denied promotion should not resubmit his or her dossier for a minimum of two years (except for when the candidate’s tenure clock requires a request for tenure the following year). The Committee believes that fewer than two years does not give the candidate sufficient time to adequately strengthen the dossier.
2. Although it seems obvious, precision and attention to detail in the preparation of the dossier and the chair’s documents are of paramount importance.
3. The most effective dossiers have generally been 400 pages or less. Longer dossiers include more information but they are often repetitive and at the expense of clarity of narrative and a focus upon philosophy, identity, maturity, growth, and trajectory. Information is important, but only as it is marshaled toward establishing these aspects of the file. A more focused dossier will help give the committee insight into who a candidate is, what they value, and how they see themselves fitting into the university moving forward.
4. Frame the narrative but **do not ignore areas that could benefit from improvement**. It is important to identify areas of particular skill and value, and note plans for their continuance. Equally as important, however, is identifying areas that are problematic, as well as factors contributing to the struggles in these areas and plans for mitigating those problems and turning them into growth centers moving forward.
5. The function of a CV is to provide a list of accomplishments. The personal statement is not meant to be an annotation of the CV or a narrative form of bean counting. This portion of the dossier is more about the 30,000 foot, philosophical view of higher education and a candidate’s contributions to, and fit within, La Sierra University and his/her discipline. Good personal statements choose specific courses, assignments, publications, committee postings, or other such *representative* items from the CV and illustrate how these were critical in the formation or maturity of identity, philosophy, and/or institutional fit. The annotation documents for scholarship and service are critical, as they flesh out the CV and allow the committee to understand the value each brings to the candidate’s career trajectory. Instead of providing an annotation for each item, candidates might consider annotation “clusters” (e.g., having a single annotation for a conference that is attended annually, noting how this particular conference has, over the years, facilitated networking and publication opportunities, contributed to scholarly identity, etc.).
6. It is easy to provide too many support letters, which can result in the narrative getting a bit muddied. Choose the minimum number of letters necessary to make the point. Generally, this means 3-4 letters in teaching and 1-2 letters each for scholarship and service. Anything more than 8-10 letters is overkill. Such letters should be mailed directly to the Dean.
7. Letters of support from co-teachers in University Studies theme courses can provide valuable input by providing an evaluation of the candidate in all areas of team teaching: teacher, scholar, cooperative team member, and participant in the creation and development of University Studies.
8. All documents in the dossier should be labeled. A clear separation of sections is helpful.
9. It is appropriate for the candidate to routinely meet with the department chair and understand his/her responsibility within this entire process as outlined in this document.
10. Be sure to check Appendix J in the Faculty Handbook to see if there are any extra disciplinary/departmental requirements for scholarship.
11. Candidates should provide evidence of service contributions to the campus in the following areas: university, Faculty Senate, CAS, and department. Candidates with more career experience should also be engaged in more substantial service leadership that aligns their strengths with the campus’ needs.

F. Recommendations for the Department Chair

1. Chairs must give careful thought to their documents.
2. The Summative Analysis of Teaching (B.1.A) is developed prior to review and vote by the department faculty and should be available to them. It should be based on data from several years and there must be sufficient detail so that the department faculty as well as other reviewers can make informed evaluations of teaching.
   * + 1. Analysis should include evaluations over time and from various sources (e.g. peer reviews, student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), and chair reviews) with sufficient specificity to provide a comprehensive view.
       2. It is helpful to address specific aspects of teaching (e.g. lectures, assignments, evaluations, feedback) as well as differences between courses (e.g. class size, upper vs. lower division, lecture vs. seminar).
       3. SEI results need to be included with summary data. SEIs should be examined throughout the **entirety** of the review period, including comparative data with the candidate’s scores in relation to university, school, and departmental marks. Although SEI #1 and #2 (instructor and course effectiveness) are the most critical for the Committee’s review, the other SEIs are also important to discuss, in particular those that are at the high and low range of the Candidate’s marks. Representative student comments should also be included, particularly as they support the reality of the quantitative SEI marks.
3. The Chair’s Letter, written after the department has voted, should make an effective case for the candidate – the committee cannot provide the context, particularly since any committee member from the same department is excused from the discussions involving the candidate.
   * 1. Even though much of the teaching evaluation will be in the summative analysis (F.2 above), the Chair’s Letter should include a summary statement and candid evaluation of teaching. The letter also allows the chair to address issues such as expertise and value, the candidate’s ability to teach specialized topics or classes that for various reasons may be difficult for the department to offer.
     2. The Chair’s perspective on the Candidate’s scholarship, which needs to include a candid evaluation of all areas of scholarship endeavors. Be sure to check Appendix J in the Faculty Handbook to see if there are any extra disciplinary/departmental requirements for scholarship.
     3. In reviewing the candidate’s scholarship, the Chair represents the department’s opinion. The review of scholarship should address the following: How does the Candidate meet the requirements for scholarship for the appropriate faculty rank? Using the Handbook definition (FH III 3.3B.iii), begin with a description of the candidate’s “pattern of research” followed by a review of scholarly output. While the Handbook focuses on recent evidences of scholarship (the last three years), the evaluation should include a longer view of the candidate’s scholarship as well as provide the disciplinary context.
        1. Are the publications/presentations considered legitimate peer-reviewed works in the discipline? In this case, the Chair represents the department’s opinion of the work.
        2. What is the prestige of the journal or meeting where the publication/presentation appeared?
        3. For presentations and publications whose peer-review is not obvious, describe the process involved.
        4. For faculty with a large body of work, highlight some of the more significant achievements and provide a more holistic description of the entire body of work.
        5. For books, describe the prestige of the publisher, peer-review process, level of material, originality, and relevance to professional interests of the candidate.
     4. The Chair is responsible for establishing the perspective of the local, regional, national, and international significance of the scholarship. The Chair should also indicate what work is in progress, if it is under peer review, or if it is being disseminated in ways other than by regular scholarly publication. Scholarship conducted with students should be clearly contextualized by the Department Chair as to how it fits within the Candidate’s teaching, service, and scholarship.
     5. A summary and candid evaluation of service, keeping in mind the following points:

For university service, consider separately administrative service, university committees, CAS committees, Faculty Senate service, and departmental service.

What are the candidate’s particular strengths (i.e., service on-campus, in the community, at church, or in the discipline)? How does these strengths fit the departmental service profile?

* + 1. A description and evaluation of the Candidate’s personal and professional development.
    2. The ways in which the Candidate fulfills the objectives of the department and the university (this point is particularly critical in tenure review).
    3. Differences between the candidate’s scholarship and service if not already clear.
    4. In the statement on the “opinion of the department’s faculty concerning the candidate’s promotion and tenure” (FH III.3.c.3.iv), specifics should be given about the departmental vote(s). In the case of both tenure and promotion, indicate votes for each. To be included:

A summary of the process of how the department vote was conducted.

Explanations of both sides of a vote if there is a mixed vote by the faculty.

* + 1. Address the candidate’s contributions as a “team player” in the department. For tenure, address the fit of the faculty member to the department.

*Prepared by the CAS Dean in consultation with the CAS Rank & Tenure Committee*

1. This document is compiled from the *CAS Rank and Tenure Committee Current Working Guide (Spring, 2004; 2016 revision), CAS Rank and Tenure Committee Working Guide (Fall, 1997), College of Arts and Sciences Tenure Guidelines (Approved by CAS Faculty 10/31/94), La Sierra University Faculty Handbook (October, 2013) and various written communications between the CAS Rank and Tenure Committee and the CAS Dean.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The teaching statement should provide evidence of all three substantive categories as listed in the *Evidence of Good Teaching* document, approved by the Faculty Senate on April 1, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Unless otherwise specified, years under consideration are the last five years or those since the last promotion (whichever is longer). In the case of tenure, years under consideration are all the years since occupying a tenure-track position. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Annotations are a summary and evaluation of an activity or product that provides sufficient explanation as to why the journal or professional meeting is considered important for the candidate’s field of study. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It is recommended that the final vote be done by secret ballot. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)