

**PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENGLISH
University of North Carolina at Greensboro**

Approved by the English Department Faculty, April 11, 2011 Revised April
24, 2012; October 25, 2017; March 28, 2018

I. General Criteria

The Department of English subscribes to the scholar-teacher-participant model of faculty responsibility described in the College of Arts and Science's *Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion* (October 2010). Like the College, the Department expects faculty to demonstrate achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarly or creative work, and service, and to attain the different degrees of achievement and distinction appropriate for each level of reappointment and promotion, as described in the College's *Guidelines*. Although the procedures governing each type of decision differ, the decisions about reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review are made based on these criteria, with the variations appropriate to level and occasion as described below.

This document replaces the Department's "Promotion and Tenure: Expectations and Procedures" (2007, 2009). The criteria and procedures described below conform to the current *College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines and Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion*, which in turn conforms to the University *Guidelines and Regulations* and other governing documents, as indicated in the College documents (available on the College website). In the case of any unforeseen conflict of the Department of English "Guidelines" with any of the College, University, or North Carolina governing documents, the provisions of those governing documents will supersede these department "Guidelines."

II. Three Categories of Evaluation

II.A. Teaching

At all levels of review, a faculty member's teaching record should document a commitment to and effectiveness in teaching. Good teaching may be recognized in ways that include: understanding and knowledge of subject matter; accessible organization of course materials; curriculum design and course development. Good teaching may also include membership in and/or

direction of thesis and dissertation committees; supervision and mentoring of students; participation in workshops, institutes, and interdisciplinary programs; development of instructional technologies or other innovative pedagogies; and availability outside of the classroom to consult with students about the course material.

Both peer and student evaluations will be considered as measures of the faculty member's teaching. A teaching portfolio in the tenure and promotion to Associate Professor dossier should provide evidence of a faculty member's instructional abilities. The teaching portfolio should consist of such materials as a philosophy of teaching statement; course syllabi and assignments; student papers with teacher comments; peer and self-evaluations. Teaching awards given to faculty either within the university or from professional organizations provide further validation of overall instructional effectiveness.

For promotion to Professor the continued commitment to and effectiveness in post-tenure teaching should be documented in the teaching portfolio section of the candidate's portfolio.

II.B. Research and Creative Activity

The Department requires clear and significant evidence of continuing and successful research or creative activity for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. Such a demonstration of progress typically consists in the publication of a monograph (or, for MFA faculty, a second novel, collection of stories, novellas, or poems) with a nationally recognized university, independent, or commercial press that engages in rigorous professional review. If the volume has not come out by the time of the initial review of the dossier in the department, the candidate must provide, no later than the meeting at which the tenured faculty formally vote on promotion and tenure, proof of final acceptance by the press of the completed manuscript; a contract based on an incomplete manuscript will not fulfill the requirement.

Other published work (or work that has received final acceptance or approval) may be submitted as evidence of research or creative activity if the total body of work is judged by the tenured faculty, taking into consideration the recommendations of the outside reviewers, to be equivalent to a monograph or book in substance and quality. Peer-review and the quality of the publication or presentation venue or venues (as judged by the tenured faculty, taking into consideration the evaluation of outside reviewers) are significant factors in determining whether the body of work meets this standard. Such work may include a co-authored book, an edited collection of academic essays, a critical

edition, a sustained series of articles on a coherent topic, a sustained and coherent body of creative work, textbooks, digital archives and databases, and external grants and awards related to scholarly or creative outcomes. Contributions to co-authored books and other collaborative projects will be evaluated by the tenured faculty based on the scope and nature of the candidate's contributions to the project.

In addition to publication, progress in successful research and creative activity should be indicated by public performances and professional interactions in national and/or international venues, such as conference presentations, conference panel participation, public lectures, public readings, and their web-based equivalents.

Generally, scholarly activity may be undertaken through a variety of methods, which may be interdisciplinary, collaborative, or community-engaged. As defined in the College "Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion," "Community engaged scholarship produces research products such as publications or exhibitions. It is not merely descriptive but is grounded in theory, applicable to other contexts, and demonstrates methodological rigor in terms that give it disciplinary or interdisciplinary status." (Please see the College "Guidelines" for further clarification of Community-engaged scholarship.) A candidate who expects to present Community-engaged scholarship as a significant component of his/her dossier should consult with the department head as early in the review period as possible about how it should be documented.

Scholarly or creative activity, toward tenure, is expected to be primarily in the field in which the candidate was hired. The candidate's overall scholarly agenda and accomplishments must show promise for a successful Professorship review.

The Department requires that candidates for promotion to Professor publish, by the beginning of the academic year in which they are reviewed, a second monograph or the equivalent, as described in paragraph two. MFA faculty are required to publish a third book (which could be a novel, a work of creative nonfiction, a collection of poems, stories or personal essays, also with a nationally recognized press), even if the tenure standard was met with a body of work other than a second book. Promotion to Professor will be based primarily on new material subsequent to the material reviewed for the last promotion. Candidates at this level are expected to demonstrate significant and sustained contributions in their fields and to enjoy national reputations. The significance of the candidate's work can be demonstrated by means that include reviews of the candidate's scholarship or creative activity, external letters of evaluation, and invitations for lectures and readings.

II.C. Service

Service to the Department, the College and the University, and to the profession is understood to be an integral part of the faculty member's work.

The Department expects all faculty to perform regular service to the Department and the institution. Service to the profession is also considered part of the faculty member's role. Faculty are expected to undertake all levels of service as appropriate to their rank.

Typically, untenured faculty will not be expected to direct programs inside the Department or undertake major service obligations outside the Department. For faculty not yet tenured, conscientious performance of assigned service within the Department, including service on standing committees, is expected for successful progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. With the approval of the head, other service to the College, the University, and the profession may be undertaken as appropriate.

Although most departmental service by members of the MFA faculty will be within the MFA program due to the program's many obligations in graduate admissions and supervision and in co-curricular programming, tenured members of the MFA faculty are expected to share service obligations with other members of the Department. Although tenured MFA faculty do not normally serve as program directors within the Department, they are expected to contribute substantial service to the College and University.

Tenured faculty are expected to accept reasonable service assignments, including departmental administrative positions. The Department expects candidates for promotion to Professor to accept and carry out leadership roles such as Associate Head or program director or the equivalent in terms of time commitment and responsibility in the Department, College, or University.

Although service to the Department and institution constitutes the primary obligation for promotion and tenure, such service can be supplemented by service to the profession (including various forms of peer reviewing, participation in academic conferences, service to and leadership in academic organizations, and scholarly editorial work) and to the community (including outreach programs that apply and disseminate knowledge and creative work beyond the confines of the University, and developing and participating in partnerships between academic programs and external agencies).

III. Directed Professional Activity

Currently the Department does not include this category in its considerations for Promotion and Tenure. However, as specified in the UNCG *Guidelines*, the Department recognizes the possibility of including Directed Professional Activity, defined in the Guidelines as “University activities whose contribution is sufficiently distinctive that their significance is diminished when embedded in the areas of Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service.” Should the Department decide at some point in the future to include DPA, it will follow the procedures outlined in the College *Guidelines* for adding this category to these Department "Guidelines."

IV. General Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

These procedures follow those mandated in the College and University *Regulations*, with the addition of some procedures defined only in these Department "Guidelines." It is the candidate's responsibility to review the College *Regulations* and *Guidelines*, as well as any English department documents referred to below, while preparing for any of these levels of review.

IV.A. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

While some departments appoint only some members of their faculty to the Promotion and Tenure committee, the English Department functions as a committee of the whole, as defined by rank and tenure. In cases of promotion to associate professor with tenure, the full body of tenured professors are considered members of the committee; for promotion from Associate to Professor, the committee is made up of tenured Professors.

IV.B. Timelines for Review Processes

As required by the College Regulations, the description below includes general timelines for the reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews. In order to specify these timelines for each candidate, the Department will follow the process outlined in Section V of the College Regulations: "During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is scheduled, the department head shall establish a timetable for the departmental review process which ensures that all phases will completed prior to the date when all materials must be sent to the Dean. The department head will also provide the candidate, in writing, with this timetable along with a clear statement of what information the candidate must provide and the dates when each item is due." For an outline timetable, see Appendix A.

IV.C. Meeting Procedures: Separation of Decisions in Formal Reviews

In all formal review meetings during which the tenured faculty or Professors

deliberate and make formal recommendations, determined by a binding vote, on a candidate's reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, they will follow the procedures for departmental review in the University Regulations, section 4.B:

"The meeting of the faculty members shall be presided over by a chair, who is not the head, whose duties include assuring that the meeting is divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, conducting a secret ballot, counting the votes, preparing a written summary of both majority and dissenting opinions, forwarding the summary and the results of the vote to the Head, and ensuring that all present sign the appropriate page of the Promotion and Tenure Form. The department head may not be present during the deliberative phase and vote of the faculty members, but may participate in the evidence-gathering phase."

IV.D. Meeting Procedures: Informal Reviews

There are three meetings which are traditional practices in the English Department, not mandated by College or University Regulations and therefore exempt from these procedures: the preparatory meeting, in the spring before the formal review and vote in the fall, for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; the corresponding informal first review for promotion to Professor; and the informal review of the C.V. of a potential candidate for Professor. While these meetings may include votes, which must always be by secret ballot, the deliberations and possible votes of the faculty at such meetings are advisory and preparatory, not constituting a recommendation. Also, since no recommendation is being made by either the faculty or the department head in these meetings, the head may preside and may be present for the deliberative as well as the evidence-gathering phase of the meeting.

IV.E. Confidentiality of Meeting Proceedings

The proceedings of all faculty meetings at which candidacies for reappointment, tenure and promotion are considered, whether formal or informal review, are confidential, as are any written notes of those meetings, to the extent permitted by University policy and by law. The written summaries of the faculty's decisions and recommendations given to the candidates by the head shall not include any reference to individual faculty views or any other confidential material.

V. Reappointment

During their third year of service, Assistant Professors present their dossiers for consideration for reappointment to a second probationary term of three years.

V.A. In November of the candidate's third year, the candidate submits the dossier to the tenured faculty. See "English Department Faculty

Reappointment Dossier Guidelines" (Appendix B) for a description of the contents and form of the reappointment dossier.

In early December, the tenured faculty will meet for the formal reappointment review. The department head, present for the evidence-gathering phase of the meeting, will leave when the faculty are ready to begin the deliberative phase. A chair, selected by the tenured faculty, will conduct the meeting and will select another tenured faculty member to take notes. At the end of their deliberations the tenured faculty will vote, by secret ballot, to recommend or not recommend the candidate for reappointment.

V.B. After the meeting has adjourned, the chair of the meeting will consult with the faculty member who took notes, and will prepare a brief written report of the meeting that includes a summary of the deliberations and a list of substantive recommendations for the candidate. The chair will submit this report to the head no more than three business days after the meeting. No more than a full business day after receiving the report, the head will circulate the report to the tenured faculty, allowing no less than three business days for their discussion of possible corrections and revisions. This report will be included verbatim in the Reappointment Review form required by the College.

V.C. The Department head will inform the candidate in writing of the decisions about recommendation for reappointment, including the faculty vote, as soon as possible after those decisions are taken. (The head may more immediately give the candidate verbal notification of the results, but this must be followed by the formal written notice.)

V.D. As required by the College, the candidate will review and sign the Reappointment Review form. The head will also give the candidate a copy of the form.

VI. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Assistant Professors ordinarily present their dossiers for consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in their sixth year of service. The preparation of the dossier and initial stages of review begin in the fifth year of service. While an Assistant Professor who has already established sufficient credentials may apply for tenure and promotion early, the candidate wishing to do so should consult with the Department head to determine whether an early application is viable.

At the beginning of the candidate's fifth year, the candidate will consult with the Department head about the tenure and promotion process, including the preparation of the dossier. The candidate and the head together will decide on a tenured faculty member who will act as the candidate's primary advisor on the tenure and promotion process, and who will guide the candidate's preparation of the dossier.

VI.A. The dossier for tenure and promotion should carefully follow the format indicated in the University's Promotion and Tenure form. All documentation should be complete and all materials presented clearly. The

dossier should be complete in content (except for external reviewers' letters and the summaries written by the head and/or senior faculty) and correct in form by the time of the tenured faculty's review in the spring of the fifth year. The candidate and the advisor should consult frequently throughout the fifth year in order to ensure the dossier's completeness and correctness.

VI.B. The candidate will submit the dossier to the Department head by mid-March of the fifth year, at least one month in advance of the scheduled meeting of the tenured faculty at which the candidacy will be considered. The head, together with the candidate's advisor, will review the dossier and inform the candidate if anything needs to be corrected or added. The head and advisor will have the dossier approved for the tenured faculty's review at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled meeting.

VI.C. The April Preparatory Meeting

In April of the fifth year, the tenured faculty will hold a preparatory meeting to review the candidate's dossier. The primary purposes of this meeting are to identify and provide recommendations to the candidate that may help in strengthening the dossier materials, and to select the faculty members who will lead the fall voting meeting. Because the English Department's annual faculty evaluation process does not engage all members of the voting faculty, this allows the candidate to revise or add to portions of the dossier over the summer with the advice of the full voting faculty. The early selection of the chair and assisting faculty for the Fall meeting at which the deliberations and decision of the voting faculty will occur ensures a clear process and clear leadership from among the voting faculty for that fall meeting.

For this first meeting, the department head may be present for the entire meeting and will ordinarily chair the meeting, with the exception of a period near the beginning of the meeting when the tenured faculty will select one of their members as the chair of the fall meeting. At this time the faculty will also select an additional tenured faculty member who will assist the chair and the dossier advisor during the fall meeting and the writing of the tenured faculty's recommendation. Once these selections have been made, the head will return to chair the rest of the spring meeting; the chair of the fall meeting and the assisting faculty member will take notes during the spring meeting.

VI.C.1. During the April meeting the fall meeting chair, dossier advisor, and assisting faculty member may note issues or points raised in the discussion that will help them in identifying any features of the candidate's record in teaching, research/creative activity, and service that may require special documentation or interpretation relative to the department's expectations, as these are defined in the department's "Guidelines."

Evaluation of the candidate's substantive record does not occur at the April meeting, but is entirely reserved for the deliberations of the Fall meeting. Faculty members assigned to finalize evaluative narratives at that time will then be able to reflect the deliberations and decision of that fall meeting.

VI.C.2. Besides the selection of the fall meeting chair and the

identification of an assisting tenured faculty member, the business of the spring meeting is to gather any recommendations for the improvement of the dossier materials. Because the University Regulations now stipulate that the pertinent scholarship/creative activity of all candidates will be sent to external reviewers over the summer, the tenured faculty take no vote on the candidate's record at this spring meeting.

VI.C.3. After the April meeting has adjourned, the head will consult with the fall meeting chair to draft a brief written report of the meeting that includes a summary of any substantive recommendations for the dossier. The head will then circulate this draft to the tenured faculty, allowing no less than three business days for possible corrections or revisions.

VI.C.4. The Department head will inform the candidate, verbally or in writing at the head's discretion, of the tenured faculty's recommendations as soon as possible after the meeting. As soon as the meeting record has been circulated and the time for comments has elapsed, the head will give the candidate a copy of this document.

VI.D. Because current University *Regulations* require all departmental recommendations, whether positive or negative, to move forward through all levels of review (University *Regulations* 4.A.ii), a candidate's scholarship is always sent to external reviewers in the late spring or early summer before the formal review meeting in the fall. The department will follow the specific requirements of external review as set forth in College *Regulations* section VI.B. and section 4.B.i.c of the University *Guidelines*.

VI.E. During the summer, the candidate will work with the dossier advisor to complete any necessary revisions to the dossier. Also in the summer, the dossier advisor will begin selecting a representative sample of comments on student course evaluations, to be reviewed by the head and then the candidate, before inclusion in the appropriate section of the dossier.

VI.F. By August 1, ordinarily in the beginning of the sixth year of service, the candidate will submit the revised dossier to the head. The head and the candidate's advisor will review the dossier and recommend any additional changes to the candidate. The head will provide the completed dossier to the tenured faculty for its review at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled meeting.

VI.G. The Fall Recommendation Meeting
In mid to late August, the tenured faculty will meet to discuss whether the

candidate should be recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. As noted in IV.C. above, the department head may be present only during the first, evidence-gathering portion of the meeting. The tenured faculty member selected in the spring meeting will chair the second, deliberative portion of the fall meeting; the tenured faculty member identified in the spring to assist in writing the evaluative narratives will also assist the chair in taking notes of the fall meeting.

VI.G.1. The duties of the chair include assuring that the meeting is divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, ensuring that the candidate's record is fully and accurately represented, conducting a secret ballot, counting the votes, preparing a written statement of both majority and dissenting opinions proportionate to the vote, forwarding the summary of the meeting's conclusions and the results of the vote to the Head, and ensuring that all present sign the official signature page.

VI.H.2 Tenured faculty members who wish to comment on a particular strength or weakness of the candidate's record are expected to come to the meeting with references to specific elements of the dossier, or to other verifiable sources, that document this strength or weakness, so that other faculty and those taking notes in the meetings can readily find and consider these elements. While the significance of the referenced documentation may be a matter for debate, no comment or debate which is not based on documented evidence may be included in the chair's summary of the meeting's conclusions.

VI.H.3 After the meeting chair submits the drafts of the summary of the meeting's conclusions and the evaluative narratives to the head, the head will distribute the draft report to the tenured faculty for possible corrections. Suggested corrections or revisions must be submitted to the meeting chair within three business days of distribution. When the three days have elapsed, the meeting chair will submit final copies of the summary and the narratives to the department head. The meeting chair, in consultation with the dossier advisor and the assisting faculty member, decides which corrections and/or revisions should be made.

VI.H.4. The Department head will inform the candidate in writing of the tenured faculty's and the head's separate decisions about recommendation for promotion and tenure, including the faculty vote, as soon as possible after those decisions are taken. (The head may more immediately give the candidate verbal notification of the results, but this must be followed by the formal written notice.)

VI.I The Department Head forwards the department's recommended

action, a summary of faculty deliberations, including the number of faculty votes for and against a nomination, his or her independent evaluation of the candidate and the candidate's complete portfolio, to the next, unit level of review. In accordance with new University *Regulations*, even if the voting faculty and/or the Head recommend against promotion, the dossier goes forward to the next level of review. (For the possible permutations of "department's recommended action," see University *Regulations* section 4.A ii and College *Regulations* section X.)

VII. Promotion to Professor

The Department Head and/or a majority of the department's Professors may initiate the formal review of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor at any time after the first promotion when the candidate's further scholarly/creative accomplishments will support their application. (College *Regulations* section V.E.i and University *Regulations* section 3.E.iii.a)

As College *Guidelines* section V.E.ii notes, an Associate Professor also has the right to a formal review no later than the beginning of the seventh year at rank: "A candidate who has not been formally reviewed for promotion to Professor has the right to a formal review after his or her 6th year in rank as a tenured Associate Professor at UNCG, if requested. To exercise this right, the candidate shall write to the department head by March 1st of that year requesting review. The formal review must begin by the following August 1. (See UNCG *Regulations*, Section 3.E.iii.b)."

There is, however, no requirement that an Associate Professor exercise this right, nor does a longer time at rank create a disadvantage for the candidate: recommendations about this promotion are based on the readiness of the candidate's record, not the length of time at rank.

VII.A. An Associate Professor who wishes to apply for promotion before the seventh year should consult with the Department head a year or two before the anticipated application. The head should advise the candidate about the viability of the scholarly/creative record in the promotion process and, if the case looks viable, work with the candidate to identify a Professor to act as advisor to the candidate during the promotion process.

VII.B. In November of the year before the final review would take place, the candidate will submit a complete, current CV to the Department head. In early December, the Professors will meet with the Department

head to discuss the CV and consult on the readiness of the candidate to apply for Professor. The Department head will then advise the candidate about whether to apply at this time, communicating any recommendations of the Professors with regard to the preparation of the dossier and/or the need for additional achievement before seeking promotion. If, with the consultation of the Professors, the head does advise going forward with an application, then the candidate should immediately begin preparing the dossier. If an advisor for the dossier and promotion process has not yet been assigned to the candidate, the head should do that at this time.

VII.C. The procedures and timetable for the preparation of the dossier, the initial informal review, and the formal review, are substantially the same as those described for tenure and promotion to Associate in VI above, with these substitutions:

"Professor(s)" for "tenured faculty" and/or "tenured professor(s)";

"year before formal review" for "fifth year" and "year of formal review" for "sixth year";

"promotion to Professor" for "tenure and promotion to Associate Professor" and "tenure and promotion."

Questions about the expectations and procedures for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, should be referred to the Department head.

Appendix A Outline P&T Timetable

based on CAS and English docs as of Jan. 2012 "E" and "C" show where deadline is set

Spring before the vote

by mid January: dossier advisors selected

by mid February: candidates' list of suggested external reviewers to the head and advisor

early to mid March: head begins to secure external reviewers

one month before tenured faculty's informal review meeting: candidate submits dossier to head for review in consultation with advisor (E)

two weeks before meeting: dossier available for review by tenured faculty (E)

mid to late April: informal review meeting

mid to late May: scholarly publications to external reviewers Summer external reviews underway; candidate and advisor continue to work on dossier as necessary

Fall in which the vote is taken

August 1: candidate submits revised dossier to head, who reviews it with the advisor (E)

first week of August: external reviews due to head

two weeks before meeting: dossier complete and available for tenured faculty's review (E)

2-3 business days after meeting: meeting chair's draft of meeting summary due to head, who distributes the summary to tenured faculty for correction/revision suggestions

3 business days after distribution of summary: all corrections due to meeting chair, who completes any changes (E)

no less than 10 business days before dossier goes to CAS: corrected summary of meeting and tenured faculty's recommendations due to head (C)

no less than 4 business days before dossier goes to CAS: complete dossier, with faculty and head recommendations, available for candidate's review and, if the candidate wishes, comment (C)

no less than 3 business days before dossier goes to CAS: head's recommendation available to tenured faculty and candidate for review (C—this is the current regulation, and is obviously incongruent with the notation just above)

end of September/first of October: dossier due to CAS

If the candidate seeks promotion to Professor, then the phrase "Professors" replaces "tenured faculty" in the description above.

Appendix B
English Department Faculty Reappointment Dossier Guidelines
Revised November 2, 2011

This document supplements the "College of Arts and Sciences Reappointment Review" document, which was approved August 2011. The College document specifies the general criteria for a positive reappointment recommendation, the contents of the review report itself, and procedures for the meeting of the tenured faculty and for the independent reviews of tenured faculty and department head. Faculty should consult the College document for these specifications, which this departmental guide to dossier preparation does not address. Faculty should also consult the English Department's "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" (rev. 4-11-11) for the Department's general criteria and a further description of Department procedures. If there are any discrepancies between the English Department's guidelines and those of the College, the College guidelines take precedence.

The reappointment process, which takes place in the candidate's third year as Assistant Professor, evaluates the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure, and leads to the tenured faculty's and the head's independent recommendations for or against reappointment.

The reappointment dossier should be ready by the last week of November. The Department meeting will usually take place before the holiday break, to meet the College's mid-January deadline for the submission of recommendations.

The "College of Arts and Sciences Reappointment Review" document sets the following requirements for the candidate's dossier: "At a minimum, the dossier should include the following items: brief narratives from the faculty member about their achievements in the areas of teaching, creative activities or research, and service; appropriate documentation of activity in each of these three areas; peer teaching evaluations; and curriculum vitae. Individual departments are free to determine the exact items required in the dossier, although letters of recommendation or support will not be required."

The English Department expects that the brief narratives (1-2 pages each) on the three areas of evaluation will not merely summarize the candidate's accomplishments but *will* reflect on the candidate's agendas in these areas. For instance, the teaching narrative might include a brief philosophy of

teaching and some reflection on changes in pedagogical practices that have been made or are planned.

English Department reappointment dossiers should include the following, arranged in the order listed below:

1. Current complete curriculum vitae. Please include all relevant publications, etc., rather than "selected" lists, even if some lists are extensive.
 2. Teaching (items 2b, c, and d supplied by department staff)
 - a. Candidate's narrative
 - b. Copies of the candidate's peer teaching observations
 - c. A quantitative summary of student evaluation ratings of the candidate's teaching
 - d. Copies of all student evaluation forms. The originals will be retained in the Department's files.
 - e. Sample syllabi representative of the range of courses taught by the candidate
 3. Research/Creative Activity
 - a. Candidate's narrative
 - b. Documentation of scholarly/creative activity listed on the CV, which might include:
 - copies of publications;
 - manuscript copies of essays, stories and/or poems that have been accepted for publication or submitted for review, and, where appropriate, letters or emails indicating acceptance;
 - manuscript of a book in progress and, if applicable, prospectus, book proposal, and/or chapter outline;
 - grant proposals and, where appropriate, letters or emails indicating award;
 - documentation of other activities as appropriate.
- Larger items in this category may be located in a file box, rather than in the reappointment dossier binder.
4. Service: the candidate's narrative

The candidate should **not** provide more extensive supporting materials, such as:

1. Letters of recommendation or support.
2. A complete teaching portfolio.

3. Further documentation of service (certificates, letters, etc.).

Finally, if budgetary constraints and College policy allow for a semester of leave, normally in the fourth year, for candidates who are reappointed, the candidate should append a brief (1-2 pages at most) plan of work for that semester, indicating which semester the candidate would prefer to take that leave. Reappointment candidates should consult with the Department Head to learn if such a leave will be available.

Questions about the reappointment dossier and the process of reappointment should be directed to the Department Head.