CAS Tenure and Promotion Dossier
CAS Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee Approved: April 28, 2025
CAS Faculty Council Approved: May 1, 2025
CAS Dean Approved: May 2, 2025

3.1 Candidate's Part of the Dossier

A: Candidate CV
The information in the CV should appear in the following order. Fill in all categories. If an item is not applicable, mark N/A.

1. General Information
a. Name, present rank, and department affiliation(s).
b. Degrees earned, including institutions and dates.
c. Academic experience, including institution(s), rank, and dates.

2. Teaching
a. List of courses taught at Saint Louis University during the last five years.
b. List of teaching awards, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
c. Grants or fellowships for teaching innovations, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
d. New courses prepared. Candidates should distinguish between courses that are entirely new to the department and courses included in the catalog but reconceived by the candidate.
e. Involvement in curricular development.
Sample materials such as syllabi and exams are not a part of the dossier but may be included in the appendices.
f. Other pedagogical activities.

3. Advising and Mentoring
a. List of advising and mentoring assignments at SLU.
b. Evidence of advising effectiveness. This may include information about undergraduate and graduate advising as well as involvement in student professional development, counseling, and extracurricular activities.
c. Awards for advising and mentoring, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
d. Grants or fellowships for advising and/or mentoring innovations, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.

4. Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Endeavor
a. Publications critically evaluated by experts.
Indicate at each citation the nature of critical evaluation, i.e., is it a refereed journal? Do the editors do the evaluation?
If a publication is in press, include in the appendices the referees' reports as well as the contract from the press or letter from the editor stating a commitment to publish and expected date of publication.

b. Other publications.
c. Production, performance, exhibition of creative works. In an addition to a list of productions, performances and/or exhibitions of creative works, candidates may provide a brief narrative summary (no more than 1/2 page) of reviews of creative works. The full text of reviews should not be included in item 4c but rather placed in the appendices.
d. Work in progress.
e. National or international awards for research, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
f. Grants, scholarships, fellowships for research (external/internal, proposed/funded), including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
g. Lectures, papers, speeches (contributed/invited) presented at professional meetings or educational institutions.
h. Other.

5. Service
a. Professional
b. University
c. College
d. Department
e. Community
f. Awards for service, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection.
g. Grants or fellowships to pursue service, including a brief narrative description of the criteria and method of selection
h. Other

B. Candidate's Statement
This statement gives the candidate's assessment of the candidate's role in the missions of the University, College, and Department. The statement must not exceed two pages.

C. Summary of Candidate's Teaching Evaluations
Student evaluations should be periodic and systematic; that is, evaluations should be given for most courses taught. Do not submit raw data of all prior teaching evaluations. Instead, provide a summary, samples of which are available from the College of Arts and Sciences. The summary should include at least the course name, the semester taught, the number of students in the section, the number of students responding, the questions being asked, and a report of the student responses.
A one-paragraph narrative of the candidate's teaching philosophy and statement on teaching effectiveness can precede the summary of evaluations

D. Appendices
Include appendices when appropriate (e.g., reviews of the candidate's publications or creative work, referees' reports on publications in press, letters from editors and/or contracts from presses regarding commitments for future publications, etc.).

3.2 Department's Part of the Dossier

The Department Chair is responsible for assembling the departmental dossier. In some departments, a departmental committee is responsible for assembling the departmental dossier. If the Department Chair is the candidate, the Dean will consult with department members to select a faculty member to assemble the dossier and shepherd the evaluation process.

The various committees consider many candidates; therefore, it is important that the dossiers be assembled in a standard order. The following order is from the top down.

1. Front Matter
   a. UCART Cover Sheet/Vote Summary Form (Available on this page: https://www.slu.edu/provost/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure-resources/index.php. Click on the link "Dossier Cover Forms".)
   b. If applicable, documentation regarding negotiated terms for tenure and/or promotion, including years of credit

2. The candidate's part of the dossier

3. Midpoint review report (if one exists) for pre-tenure faculty and third year review report (if one exists) for non-tenure-track faculty

4. Chairperson's form and recommendation. Forms are available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website. If the chairperson is the candidate or did not shepherd the evaluation process, a colleague appointed by the Dean in consultation with faculty will write the evaluation. To the extent possible, letters from Deans and Chairs should address both positives and negatives in the candidate's dossier. Especially important is to explain the reasons behind any dissenting votes in the committees at the school or department level. Specific votes totals should always be included in the chair's letter. Avoid "unanimous" as a substitute for vote totals. Provide totals as follows: # in support, # opposing, # of abstentions, # of recusals. Chairs should explain the nature of recusals and, when possible, the motivations for any abstentions. If applicable to the candidate, the chair's letter must include the number of years of credit toward tenure negotiated at time of hire. The chair must also provide documentation of any negotiated terms of service, to immediately precede the candidate's part of the dossier.

5. Recommendation of the departmental committee, including the committee's vote, if this is a part of the departmental process.

6. In the case of joint appointments, the chair of the unit that is not the tenure home will submit an evaluation. In the case of secondary appointments, if requested by the candidate, an evaluation can be submitted by the affiliated Program Director. In such cases, the chair/director uses the chair form available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website.

7. Saint Louis University departmental or non-departmental colleague letters are not required. In the case of other extra-departmental responsibilities, if requested by the candidate, an evaluation can be submitted by the non-departmental supervisor of those

activities. The supervisor uses the non-departmental colleague form available on the Office of Faculty Affairs Website.

8. Three or more letters from outside evaluators.

   The candidate should not see these letters.
   The outside evaluators should be recognized scholars in the candidate's field. The outside evaluators primarily evaluate the candidate's research and professional reputation but may add any relevant information.
   Outside evaluators must be sent the department criteria for promotion and tenure.
   Outside evaluators must submit letters on letterhead.
   As stipulated in the Faculty Manual, "Ordinarily, peer evaluators will hold a higher rank than that of the applicant." If the chair determines a scholar at or below the rank of the candidate is more appropriate, an explanation must be offered in the Chair's letter.
   The Chair should avoid requesting evaluation by scholars with conflict-of-interest affiliations, including the candidate's mentors and scholars who have been co-authors and/or co-collaborators with the candidate within the past five years. The CAS Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee generally disregards letters that evidence close connections or conflicts of interest.
   Outsider evaluators must be asked to comment in their letters on any connections with the candidate, i.e., mentoring, collaboration, co-authorship.
   The candidate should provide a list of potential evaluators. The Chair should add names to that list. The Chair chooses the evaluators (see note below for selection process).

9. Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure.

10. A minimum of two recommendations from students, unless the department requires more. The candidate provides a list of students from which one student is chosen. The Chair chooses a second student. The CAS Student Evaluation Form is available on this page by clicking the link to "CAS Student Evaluation Form."

NOTE: The selection processes for choosing outside evaluators and student recommendations should be explained in the chair's letter, i.e., which respondents were selected by the candidate, recommended by the candidate but chosen by the chair/committee, or selected independently by the chair/committee. The latter two methods lend credibility to the reference and are viewed as preferable practices. Candidates should not be the sole source of selecting letter writers in any category (external or student).

3.3 College's Part of the Dossier

The Dean adds the following to the dossier:

1. The vote of the College's Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee. The Dean adds the result of the vote to the UCART Vote Summary Form.

2. Recommendation of the Dean. The Dean places this recommendation after the candidate's part of the dossier.

3. Recommendation of the College's Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee. The Dean places this recommendation after the Dean's recommendation.