

Faculty Promotion & Reappointment Process Packet Handout

**SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
2023-2024**

- **TIMETABLE for SAS CHAIRS**
- **PRE-SOLICITATION /
SOLICITATION LETTERS**
- **TIPS & GUIDELINES**
- **ORDER OF FORMS**
- **FAQs**

For questions, contact:

Dale Koznecki
dkoznecki@sas.rutgers.edu

Tamara Pakela
tpakela@sas.rutgers.edu

Promotions and Reappointments Timetable for SAS Chairs

Important Deadlines

- Deadline for promotion packets to be submitted to SAS: **October 2, 2023***
- Deadline for reappointment packets to be submitted to SAS: **February 1, 2024**
- Deadline for new appointments with tenure: **Contact Dale Koznecki for alternate deadlines**
- Deadline for Non-tenure track promotion packets (for promotion to Associate Teaching/Research Professor, Teaching/Research Professor, and Distinguished Teaching/Research Professor): **February 1, 2024**

** Chairs with multiple packets or exceptional circumstances should contact Dale Koznecki as soon as possible to set up an alternative schedule, if needed.*

FEBRUARY AND MARCH

- Discuss viability of potential cases with candidates and divisional dean
- Who is up for consideration? Decided by the chair in consultation with the appropriate faculty, except:
 - Up-or-out cases
 - After 6 years in rank, faculty can bring themselves up every 4 years (rank review)
 - 10 year rule cases

APRIL AND MAY

- Provide URL for *Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions* to promotion candidates <https://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty>
- Send 30-day notification letters (*Instructions*, Appendix F-1/F-2).
Text cannot be modified without prior approval.
- Chairs should consult candidate and colleagues re: referees. Draft bios of proposed referees on Form 3-a. Obtain Divisional Dean's written approval for list. You must have at least **five** letters by independent referees. Referees must be "arm's length" meaning they are NOT the candidate's dissertation or thesis chair or mentor, the candidate's coauthor or collaborator, a family member of the candidate, or a personal friend of the candidate. Ordinarily, letters from individuals with whom the candidate has worked closely in the past would not be considered arm's length. Referees should normally be at the rank of full professor.
- **If a candidate has a secondary department center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program, the chair/director of that secondary department/unit must participate with chair in the selection of external referees and must also sign the pre-solicitation email and the solicitation letter.**

- Send pre-solicitation email to external referees (*Instructions*, Appendix G). ***Text cannot be modified without prior approval.***
 - Work with candidate to assemble scholarly materials and draft Form 1-a (extended and transformed CV) and Personal Statement. The candidate is responsible for completing the Form 1-a, although departments are encouraged to help the candidate in this task. Give the candidate a deadline for submission of the completed Form 1-a to you (date should normally be in August).
- **Please note:** the candidate is ***strongly encouraged*** to generate their Form 1-a by filling in their Faculty Survey at <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/facsurv>. If the candidate has any questions about that process the candidate should contact Tin Lam (tlam@irap.rutgers.edu or 848-932-7350).
- Mail solicitation letters to referees with CV, scholarly materials, personal statement (*Instructions*, Appendix G-1/G-II, G-2). ***Text cannot be modified without prior approval.***
 - If it is the department's practice, appoint Reading and/or Teaching Evaluation Committees.
 - Begin the process of monitoring and recording responses of referees. Solicit replacements as necessary.

JUNE, JULY AND AUGUST

- Set up a schedule for reminding and checking with referees, as appropriate. Verify that all letters are received.
- Obtain completed Form 1-a from the candidate. Verify that the Form 1-a includes all relevant information under appropriate categories and there are no duplicate entries. Sign within 10 days of receipt. **Form 1-a must be signed before the date of the department meeting.**
- Obtain Supplemental Materials from candidate (*Instructions*, Inventory Listing, Appendix H).
- Two summer tasks, as needed:
 - Work with Divisional Dean to identify ad hoc members of the department (if needed); need six department members at proposed rank or higher for the department vote.
 - Keep secondary unit on track to deliver a timely report prior to the department meeting
 - Department should expect to receive the CTAAR teaching grids from Human Resources –Academics

SEPTEMBER

- If applicable, make sure the secondary department/unit evaluation memo is received *before* the department meeting.
- Make completed Form 1-a available to all department members before department meeting.
- Lead the department meeting on the candidacy. As chair, vote, unless the candidate's proposed rank is higher than your own.
- *Notify the candidate in writing of the outcome (positive or negative recommendation, not actual votes), immediately. **This is mandatory and must occur within 5 days of the meeting.***
- Draft the department narrative; invite comment from attendees at decision meeting.

OCTOBER 2, 2023* - Deadline for promotion packets to be submitted to SAS Dean's Office

- Upload packet into the SAS Online Packet Depository** (<https://secure.sas.rutgers.edu/apps/packet/main>). Be sure to click on "FINAL: Submit to SAS Dean's Office."
- Submit supplemental materials via the SAS Online Packet Depository and/or hard copy delivery to the SAS Human Resources, Room 238, Scott Hall. Can be provided in any combination of hard copy, Sakai link, flash drive, Box.

We will continue to use the Packet Depository System to address questions and concerns regarding the packet. As comments are entered into the system an email notification will be sent directly to you, asking you to log into the Packet Depository System to view said comments. You have the ability to respond to their questions or ask questions of your own, directly in the Packet Depository System.

**Please see the Packet Depository Training Guide for more information about the interactive process between the Dean's Office and the department.

OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER

- You will be notified of the date of the applicable A&P meeting(s) and asked for contact information. Please make yourself available by phone during the A&P Committee meeting; its members may have questions about the case.
- Keep Human Resources-Academics and Divisional Dean apprised of material changes in the candidate's publications, grants, etc.
- If the Dean is considering a decision different from the Department's, you will be asked to meet with the Dean to discuss concerns.
- Provide URL for *Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions* to **reappointment** candidates and NTT promotion candidates.
<https://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/academic-reappointments-promotions>

- Send 30-day notification letters to reappointment and NTT promotion candidates (*Instructions*, Appendix F-1). ***Text cannot be modified without prior approval.***
- If applicable, notify secondary department/unit of upcoming reappointment.
- Work with reappointment/NTT candidate to assemble scholarly materials and draft Form 1-a (NTT Form 1-a) and a Personal Statement. The candidate is responsible for completing Form 1-a (NTT Form 1-a), although departments are encouraged to help the candidate in this task. **Give the candidate a deadline for submission of the completed Form 1-a, to you (date should normally be in December).**

****Please note:** the candidate is ***strongly encouraged*** to generate their Form 1-a by filling in their Faculty Survey at <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/facsurv>. If the candidate has any questions about that process the candidate should contact Tin Lam (tlam@irap.rutgers.edu or 848-932-7350).

JANUARY

- If applicable, make sure the secondary department/unit evaluation memo is received ***before*** the reappointment/NTT department meeting.
- Hold department meeting to consider reappointment/NTT cases. Draft department narrative; invite comment from attendees at decision meeting.
- **Goal of reappointment reviews:** careful review and discussion with the candidate of record regarding progress and expectations for tenure.

FEBRUARY 1, 2023 – **Deadline for all reappointment and NTT promotion packets (to Associate and above) to be submitted to the SAS Dean’s Office.**

Communicate with SAS if you expect any delay.

- Upload packet into the SAS Online Packet Depository. (<https://secure.sas.rutgers.edu/apps/packet/main>).
- Be sure to click on “FINAL: Submit to SAS Dean’s Office.”
- Submit supplemental materials via the SAS Online Packet Depository and/or hard copy delivery to the SAS Dean’s Office.

We will continue to use the packet depository system to address questions and concerns regarding the packet. As comments are entered into the system an email notification will be sent directly to you, asking you to log into the Packet Depository to view said comments. You have the ability to respond to their questions or ask questions of your own, directly in the Packet Depository System.

Please see the Packet Depository Training Guide for more information about the interactive process between the Dean’s office and the department.

*New appointee/new hire with tenure packets (expedited) – tenure decisions may be made at the December or February Board of Governors meeting

APRIL AND MAY

- Tenure decisions are made official at the meeting of the Board of Governors in mid-April. Some promotion decisions may also be made at this meeting.
- Final reappointment decisions are made in the Dean's Office in late April or May.

JUNE

- Remaining promotion decisions are made official at the meeting of the Board of Governors in mid-June.

Pre-Solicitation and Solicitation Letters for External Referees

Pre-Solicitation Letter

For all candidates: use Appendix G

May send via email

Do not include letters/emails in packet

Chair must keep a copy of letters/emails, list of recipients, dates sent, and responses

Solicitation Letter

For individuals who are candidates for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:
use Appendix G-1

For individuals who are candidates for promotion to Distinguished Professor:
use Appendix G-II

For individuals who are candidates for promotion under the 10-year rule: use Appendix G-2

For new appointees with tenure: contact Dale Koznecki for special wording

BE CAREFUL:

- For candidates whose work focuses on a foreign country, at least one letter of support should be requested from an authority native to the country under study.
- Referees must be “arm’s length” meaning they are NOT the candidate’s dissertation or thesis chair or mentor, the candidate’s coauthor or collaborator, a family member of the candidate, or a personal friend of the candidate. Ordinarily, letters from individuals with whom the candidate has worked closely in the past would not be considered arm’s length. Referees should normally be at the rank of full professor.
- Any changes in the text of the pre-solicitation or the solicitation letter must be approved by Academic Affairs prior to sending the letter to external reviewers - contact Dale Koznecki.
- Include all required information in the first paragraph of the pre- solicitation letter and the solicitation letter (e.g., department name, tenured or untenured, current rank, proposed title, effective date, etc.).

SHARED APPOINTMENTS:

- Chair/director of secondary department center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program, must participate with chair in the selection of external referees.
- Chair/director of secondary department center, bureau, institute, decanal unit or degree-granting program, the must also sign the pre-solicitation email and the solicitation letter.

Note: The official instructions are the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions distributed by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs each year. <https://academiclaborrelations.rutgers.edu/tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty>

Promotion Packet

General Tips &

Guidelines

I. FORM NO. 1-a

- Make sure there is a header and footer:
 - Header has the candidate's name/dept and the AY.
 - Footer has the form and page number.
- Include the page number but NOT the total number of pages. For page numbering, put page 1, page 2, instead of page 1 *of 25*, 2 *of 25*, etc. (**Reason: this will make it easier if you need to make changes to the Form 1-a that cause a change in the page numbers**).
- Do not duplicate information in various sections throughout the packet. Determine best, most appropriate area and list in one section only.
- Put the Certification and signatures on a separate page; do not put a page number on this page (**Reason: so that you do not need to have the form re-signed if there are changes to the Form 1-a that cause a change in the page numbers**)
- Try to keep all formatting consistent; this makes it easier to read.

A. Candidate Information

- Ensure that all information is completed:
 - Candidate's Name
 - Present Title, Tenure status, Evaluated for, Tenure
 - Effective Date
 - College/Faculty
 - Department – if shared appointment, include secondary unit
 - Evaluation Initiated By
 - Academic Degrees with institutions and dates
 - Employment History
 - List in reverse chronological order
 - Primarily paid positions only – may list post-doc positions
 - All other positions, such as Administrative, will have a place under the Service section
 - Note the date when tenure stream was entered
 - Budgetary Distribution

B. Teaching

- Only information since last successful evaluation
- List in correct reverse chronological order:
 1. Anything current should be listed in the first group. Then within this group of current entries, list in reverse chronological order by the beginning date
 2. Remaining entries – first by the latest date, secondly by the beginning date

Example A:

10. Other

1. **2015-ongoing:** With thesis student, development of...
2. **2010-ongoing:** With thesis student and Rutgers research scientist...
3. **2014-2016:** With postdoctoral fellow as the convener, updated existing..., designed and implemented...
4. **2006-2008:** As the Coordinator for...theory models...
5. **2005-2008:** On XXX experiment, carried out: 1) Assembly and in-situ installation, 2) Measurement of... and 3) Validation of software.

Example B:

As Submitted:

1. Editor-in-Chief, **2017-present**
2. Editorial Advisory Board, University Press, **2017-present**
3. Editorial Board, **2016-2018**
4. Selection Committee, **2014-16**
5. Executive Committee, **2013-2018**
6. Review Editor, **2011-18**
7. Society Program Committee, **2010-12**; Advisory Board, **2008-present**
8. Committee member, Association, **2009 and 2012**
9. External Reviewer, Program, Fairfield University, spring **2012**
10. Association, Board member, **2011-13**
11. Chair, Service Award Committee, Association, **2007-08**
12. Consortium, founder and coordinator, **2007-2010**

Correct Reverse Chronological Order:

1. Editor-in-Chief, **2017-present**
2. Editorial Advisory Board, University Press, **2017-present**
7. Society Program Committee, ~~2010-12~~; Advisory Board, **2008-present**
3. Editorial Board, **2016-2018**
5. Executive Committee, **2013-2018**
6. Review Editor, **2011-18**
4. Selection Committee, **2014-16**
10. Association, Board member, **2011-13**
9. External Reviewer, Program, Fairfield University, spring **2012**
7. Society Program Committee, **2010-12**; ~~Advisory Board, 2008-present.~~
8. Committee member, Association, **2009 and 2012**
12. Consortium, founder and coordinator, **2007-2010**
11. Chair, Service Award Committee, Association, **2007-08**

** Teaching Charts**

- The Center for Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (CTAAR) will produce Teaching Charts for use in promotion packets for current faculty. We have been told that the Office for Academic Affairs will forward the CTAAR charts to the various deans' offices by mid-August/early September. The charts will be forwarded to you as soon as they are received.
- The charts will be “pre-filled” with most of the required information. You will need to insert any missing information (e.g., Fall 2023 courses). The Teaching Chart should account for ALL semesters. If no classes were taught, list the semester and state the reason (e.g., sabbatical, CFL, LWOS).
- If particular evaluations are not available, provide footnote explaining their absence.
- If you choose not to use the CTAAR charts, you must complete the teaching chart on your own. *It is strongly recommended that you use the CTAAR charts.*
- Include footnotes at end of Teaching Grid if additional explanation is necessary.
- Do not include Independent Study Courses on teaching charts.
- In Sections 3 & 4, list students “supervised” only, when noted. Roles as readers, etc. may be listed in the Service section.
- It is suggested that Section 6-Academic Advisement, include some information, even if only informal office hours.

C. Scholarship

- List all entries in every section in reverse chronological order
- For all Publications, make sure to include:
 - A date of publication. If in progress, note the expected date
 - Page numbers or the number of pages/length
 - An explanation of the candidate's contribution to jointly-authored work

Try to keep all formatting consistent; this makes it easier to read. E.g. for page numbers - either use a “p” or maintain formatting for all entries

- If starting with a packet from a previous review period, don't forget to update information that was previously listed as “forthcoming”
- For all Conferences, make sure to include:
 - The city and state or country, even if institution is listed
- For all Grants:
 - Use the grid format.
 - Name any Co-PIs and percent of candidate's effort

D. Service

- List all entries in every section in reverse chronological order
- A list format for all sections is suggested

E. Signature Page

- Must be signed and dated *before* date of the department meeting
- Upload this page separately from the rest of Form 1-a, above.

II. FORM NO. 2 (Criteria Applicable to this Candidate)

- Must be signed and dated *before* date of the department meeting

III. FORM NO. 3 (Report on External Confidential Letters)

- List **ALL** referees who responded positively to the Pre-Solicitation and were sent a Solicitation letter, even if they did not send a letter.
- List referee's name, institute of affiliation, and relationship to candidate. Make sure this is the same on both the Form 3 and 3-a.
- Need a minimum of 5 letters of evaluation (8-10 are the norm).
- Provide explanation for letters that arrive after department meeting.
- Include typed version of any handwritten letters.
- **BE CAREFUL:** If the writer sent both a hard copy letter and an emailed copy, enter the received date of each format under "Response Rec'd Date." Do not list the date on the letter itself. Date stamp letters, faxes and e-mails when they arrive in the Department to facilitate this process.

IV. SAMPLE LETTER

Upload one sample solicitation letter, even if letter was sent on different days. *Include a note at top of letter that states that "the same letter was sent to all referees". If sent on different days, list names & dates sent. Do not use Adobe Typewriter for this. It does not show up when printed from our system.*

V. FORM NO. 3-a (Letter cover sheet) and EXTERNAL LETTERS

- Use biosketches from external referees to complete Form 3-a's.
- Biosketches and cv's should be kept in the department.
- Place Forms 3-a and letters in the same order as they appear on Form 3 listing.
- Include completed Form 3-a even if referee did not respond.

- List full title of referee (same as it appears on referee’s letterhead).
- Explain rank lower than Professor I.
- Provide a comprehensive description in the field and standing of evaluator.
- Check external letters: if letterhead differs from evaluator’s institution of affiliation, (listed on Form 3-a), explain discrepancy (e.g. currently on leave at UCLA).
- Check that “relationship to candidate” corresponds with what is written in the letter.
- Make sure “relationship to candidate” on Form 3 and Form 3-a’s are consistent.

VI. FORM NO. 4 (Departmental Narrative)

- Must NOT identify external referees. Refer to them by # that corresponds with their listing on Form 3. E.g. Referee #5. Do not give any other indicators or descriptors, such as reference to their affiliation.
- Information in narrative must coincide with information in Form 1- a/II-1.
- Address negative votes and/or abstentions in the narrative.
- Address negative external letters in the narrative.
- Describe anticipated teaching responsibilities for new appointments.
- Address necessity of an early evaluation (5th year), if applicable.
- Last page - TWO checks.
- 2/3 vote (66%) is necessary to be credited as “positive” vote; include positive, negative and abstaining.
- For ad hoc department members, include home department name.
- List by name all department members at the meeting who voted and list all who are absent. Include the reason for faculty who were absent (e.g., on sabbatical leave).
- Department meeting must take place after the date of signature on Form 1a.
- Narrative must be dated after the date of department meeting.

Attachments that follow FORM 4 (if necessary)

- If Reading Committee Report attached, must be attached for all candidates in department

- If shared appointment, attach memorandum from Secondary Department/Unit.
- A Personal Statement (not mandatory, but HIGHLY recommended)
- *The above attachments must be dated before date of departmental meeting.*

When Corrections and Changes Have Been Requested by Human Resources-Academics

- Once suggested changes are returned to you do NOT make any additional changes to the packet that have not been requested
- It is helpful to download the requested changes from the Comments section to a Word doc, type a response to each request individually and then upload all back to the Comments section of the depository
- **The Department Administrator should retain access to packets. ALL corrections should be submitted to the Administrator by the candidate. The Department Administrator should have control of the packet including the Form 1-A once it has been submitted to the Dean's Office.**

ORDER OF FORMS

Organization of Promotion Packets

- FORM NO. 1-a - minus Signature Page
- FORM NO. 1-a – Signature Page +Supplemental Form 1
- FORM NO. 2 (Criteria)
- SUPPLEMENTAL FORM 2 (scan with Form 2 in Packet Depository)
- FORM NO. 3 (External Confidential Letters)
 - If the writer sent both a hard copy letter and an emailed copy, enter the received date of each format on Form 3.
- Sample [Solicitation] Letter
- FORM NO. 3-a (one for each requested external letter) and External Letters – order of preference
 - signed original hard copy letter
 - if you have this, do not include any email correspondence
 - signed emailed letter on letterhead
 - if you have this, do not include any email correspondence
 - signed emailed letter not on letterhead
 - include only the first page of email correspondence that identifies the institution
 - put the one page email correspondence behind the letter
 - unsigned emailed letter on letterhead
 - include only the first page of email correspondence that identifies the letter writer
 - put the one page email correspondence behind the letter

Additional Information Regarding External Letters:

- include other emails only if they have material information. For example, if the writer agreed to write, but then lost everything in a flood and ended up writing only a short email, or if there is a material reference to the candidate in the email exchange (ex: I have followed X's work and think X is a terrific candidate, deserving of tenure/promotion...)
- FORM NO. 4 (Department Narrative)
 - Attachments if applicable:
 - Reading Committee Report
 - Report from Secondary Department/Unit
- Personal Statement (not mandatory, but HIGHLY recommended)
- CV
- Inventory Listing of Supplemental Materials (Appendix H) signed by the candidate and chair (mandatory)

FAQs

Prospective Candidates for Reappointment, Promotion and/or Tenure

Provided courtesy of Rutgers AAUP-AFT based upon the University's Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions, University policies, and experiences of the staff of the Rutgers AAUP-AFT, with revisions/additions by SAS Human Resource-Academics. These guidelines are provided for general informational purposes and the information provided herein may not apply or be advisable in all circumstances.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. When will I be evaluated?

For tenure-track faculty, evaluations generally occur in the 3rd and 6th year of the probationary period. That is, appointments are usually for two three-year terms with the evaluation for tenure occurring in sixth and final year of the probationary period. Tenured faculty who have been in rank at least six years and have not been evaluated for at least four years may self-initiate an evaluation. A department may determine to put forward a candidate at any time. Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion to a higher rank should discuss the appropriate timing with their department chairs/deans/directors.

2. Are there circumstances where a faculty member can request to have time excluded from the probationary period?

Yes. Provisions in the Collective Agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT allow for an exclusion of time from the probation period if a faculty member has: 1) been on Family Leave; 2) taken a leave of absence without pay; and/or 3) has become a parent during the probationary period or immediately prior to appointment. The language explicitly disallows exclusions during the final year of the probationary period. Faculty members with questions regarding the probationary period should consult the language of the Agreement (Articles XVI and XVII) and contact the AAUP-AFT with any questions.

3. When should I talk with my department chair about the evaluation process?

It's never too soon to have a discussion with your department chair about the evaluation process. As a prospective candidate, you need to have a full understanding of the requirements and standards appropriate to your field - engage your department chair and colleagues in an ongoing dialogue regarding these matters. Also, talk with other senior colleagues in your department or in areas allied with your own especially if your department chair isn't able to provide you with the information you need or if you need further clarification.

4. What can I do during the probationary period to help me prepare for the task of putting my packet together?

Keep an ongoing file to document your activities in the areas of research, teaching and service (or criteria appropriate to your appointment). It's recommended that you start the task of completing Form 1 from day 1. Form 1 is the "Recommendation Information Form" that's found in the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions. This form may be generated from the Faculty Survey at <https://oirap.rutgers.edu/facsurv/> or by keeping the Form on your computer and updating it continually. Keep copies of invitations, contracts, awards, etc., that you will want to include in your packet in a separate file for easy access when it's time to put the packet together. It's also a good idea to keep notes regarding people you meet at conferences or elsewhere who are known experts in your area. This may be helpful when considering potential external letter writers – all the better if they've remarked favorably on a presentation or recent article, etc.

5. Whose responsibility is it to prepare Form 1 for inclusion in the packet?

It is the candidate's responsibility to prepare and present Form 1. The department chair (or Unit Director for the Libraries) is required to sign off on the Form and indicate whether the information provided is accurate or, alternatively, indicate why, in the Chair's view, the information is not accurate. The candidate should be in close contact with the department chair regarding the preparation of Form 1 and the Chair and candidate should have a shared understanding of the "why's and how's" of what's included. For example, is there sufficient explanation of the quality of a journal or press? Are papers appropriately placed under the category of "refereed" or "non-refereed?" Is the current status of work accurately described? Has the candidate been too selective (or not selective enough) in representing contributions in teaching and/or service?

6. I have several projects underway that haven't yet been submitted and/or accepted, can I list them on Form 1?

Form 1 allows you to list "works in progress", e.g., books, articles, conference proceedings and presentations, notes, reviews, abstracts, etc.

Though you do not have to submit items listed as “in progress” with your supplementary materials, you do have to indicate the status of the work in progress, e.g., “in preparation”, “second review”, “submitted.” If you have questions re: what should or shouldn’t be included consult with your department chair and/or senior colleagues. Note also that packets remanded for re-evaluation (following a determination that defects occurred in the original evaluation) include status updates to Form 1 -- positive changes in the status of materials originally listed as “in progress” could be significant in a re-evaluation taking place later in time. (Updates may not include items not originally listed.)

7. How should my contribution to co-authored work be explained?

Following is an example of an explanation of jointly authored works:

This paper was developed jointly. I designed the survey instrument, directed the data collection effort, established contacts with all the hospitals, did the background research, supervised the data analysis, and wrote the first draft of the paper. Professor [collaborator] was involved with conceptualization and commented on the draft. Professor [collaborator] did data entry and analysis.

8. Some of my work doesn’t exactly “fit” the categories of Form 1 – what should I do?

If you and/or your department chair determine that something doesn’t fit in one of the categories on the Form, create your own section or include the material under “other.” The important thing is that your accomplishments appear in some way. You and/or department chair may want to check with the dean’s office to ask for guidance in this area.

9. Should I include a personal statement in the packet?

Yes. Though it’s not required, this is your chance to put all the pieces together. The further your packet moves away from the department, the less likely evaluators will know the context in which to place the content. It’s unlikely they will know you personally, know your work, or have any specific knowledge or expertise in your field. Use the personal statement to explain who you are and what your work is about. Explain, for example, how your teaching relates to your scholarship and vice versa, what the trajectory of your research is, the aim of your experiments in the lab, what you have accomplished and how you intend to build on it.

Provide appropriate information and avoid the mistake of using the personal statement to provide excuses for a lack of productivity or problems in one or another area. If you think that an explanation is required with regard to something specific that happened (or didn't happen), stick to information that you think an evaluator charged with making an academic judgment would consider relevant and pertinent. In some cases having two personal statements makes good sense: One that is prepared to accompany the packet for the internal evaluation and one that is specifically prepared to be sent with materials to external confidential letter writers (this personal statement can also be included in the packet). Having two statements allows a candidate to discuss the details of his/her research in "shorthand" to external experts who will understand the jargon and in more general terms for members of the PRC and other levels of internal review.

10. How long should the personal statement be?

There's no prescribed length. Our advice is to be concise – anything longer than four or five pages is probably too long. Of course, there are exceptions and the best advice is to seek advice and review by others. Ask trusted colleagues to review the statement – does it cover the bases and provide a window through which your accomplishments can best be viewed? It is a good idea, also, to ask someone who is not familiar with your work or discipline to read the statement– is it clear and appropriately focused?

11. What does the "packet" consist of?

When you submit your packet, it will include Forms 1 and 2 (applicable criteria), your personal statement, and the inventory of supplementary materials. The supplementary materials (e.g., copies of articles, manuscripts, contracts, teaching evaluations, etc.) will accompany the packet throughout the evaluation.

Form 3 and 3a are later added to the packet and these provide reports regarding the external letters. The confidential letters are added and, as the packet makes its way up through the different levels of review, the evaluative narratives are also added and available for review by later levels.

12. Should I provide an inventory listing of supplemental materials?

Yes. The list of materials submitted should be provided to the Chair when you sign Form 1. The supplementary materials and the index of materials will accompany the packet throughout the evaluation – be sure that you present the materials in an organized way – one that will allow for quick and easy access.

13. What should I do if I'm missing evaluations for a course?

Talk with your department chair and do everything possible to locate them – explanations must be provided on Form 1 for missing evaluations. If you weren't teaching during a semester, make note of the reason, e.g., "on sabbatical leave".

14. Am I required to provide translations of material(s) not written or reviewed in English?

Consult with your department chair and/or dean regarding the materials you would like to have translated in the packet. The dean's office may agree to pay to have the materials translated and/or work with you and the Chair on figuring out how to best go about ensuring that the materials are translated so that evaluators will have a full understanding of your work and its impact. With regard to external letters, departments may ask colleagues who are able to provide translations. These translations may then be appended to the external letters and accompany the packet through all levels of review.

15. Will external letters of evaluation be solicited?

External letters are not required for reappointments not involving the grant of tenure. They are required for evaluations for tenure or promotion within the tenured ranks.

16. Do I have a role in determining who will be solicited to provide external confidential letters of evaluation?

While the department chair is required to consult with you regarding appropriate experts in your field, the dean and the department chair will determine who is ultimately solicited. External referees are normally at the rank of full professor and are selected on the basis of their standing in the

field and institutions they are associated with. It's very important that you do your homework and have the information needed to make the case for suitability of the referees you suggest. Referees must be "arm's length" meaning they are NOT the candidate's dissertation or thesis chair or mentor, the candidate's coauthor or collaborator, a family member of the candidate, or a personal friend of the candidate. Ordinarily, letters from individuals with whom the candidate has worked closely in the past would not be considered arm's length. Referees should normally be at the rank of full professor.

You may want to request a (non-confidential) letter from a significant collaborator confirming your account of the nature of the collaboration and the relative contributions. This letter could be included with the supplementary materials and could be referenced in the Form 1 explanation for multi-authored work.

Note that you may also provide a list of referees that you prefer not be solicited. However, remember that the department chair and dean make the final decision with regard to who is or is not solicited. If a letter is solicited and received from a writer on the candidate's do-not-solicit list, the candidate's written explanation of why the external writer/letter should be excluded will be attached to the letter in the packet.

17. How many names do I need to suggest for potential outside reviewers?

A minimum of seven letters is required – it is usual for departments/ units to solicit eight to ten (or more, in some cases). If you have a concern regarding having too few or too many names to suggest, talk it over with your department chair and/or trusted colleagues. The importance of identifying appropriate referees solicited cannot be overstated.

18. What if an "expert" in my field isn't a faculty member associated with an academic institution?

Though unusual, there's no prohibition against soliciting letter writers not associated with an academic institution (e.g., someone working in government or industry may be well placed to evaluate the research). The goal is to identify individuals who are most qualified and best placed to say why your scholarship is important, how it's important and what impact it's had on the field. (The explanation of why this is an appropriate expert would be particularly important in such a case.)

19. Should I contact the individuals I suggest as potential letter writers?

No. The Instructions state: “Under no circumstances shall the candidate contact experts whose names he/she has submitted for consideration or engage in any substantive discussion about his/her promotion case with any individual whom he/she knows to be serving as an external referee.”

20. Will I know who was solicited or how many letters were received?

Ask to be provided a copy of your packet, including the evaluation narratives after the evaluation is completed. (Forms 3 and 3a and the confidential letters will be removed.) Often, outside letters are referenced by number in the narratives of the department, A&P Committee and/or dean. One can often ascertain from these references how many letters were received. You will not be told who was solicited nor the identity of the writers, this information will be kept strictly confidential from you.

21. What should I do if I’m contacted by an individual who has been solicited to evaluate my work?

This can be awkward. We suggest that you explain that the University’s procedures prohibit the candidate from discussing his/her promotion case with an external reviewer and politely suggest that he/she contact the department chair if additional information is needed or if there are questions about the process. And, of course, thank them for agreeing to write a letter.

22. Is it too late to add things to the packet if something comes through or something changes status after I’ve signed Form 1?

It’s not too late if: 1) the dean concurs that the change is significant; 2) the change has occurred since the initiation of the packet; and, 3) the PRC hasn’t made its final recommendation. An addition to the packet on or before December 1 will result in the packet being circulated to each earlier level of review in order to allow for a revised evaluation if that level determines a revision is warranted by the addition. If the addition is made after December 1, it is circulated only to the dean and the PRC (unless the department has made a negative recommendation in which case it’s also circulated to the department.)

23. My department is very small and has only two tenured members. Who will evaluate my packet at this level?

If a department has fewer than six tenured faculty members (the minimum number required to constitute the “departmental” committee) at or above the rank of the candidate, the dean will appoint an appropriate number of ad hoc committee members. These members may be chosen from related disciplines in the same faculty, college or school and may also be chosen from the same discipline in other units (campuses) of the University. Do your homework and discuss with your department chair who on the Rutgers faculty might be most appropriate as ad hoc committee members. Ask your department chair to communicate to the dean the names of individuals that you would jointly recommend, if any. Ideally, someone whose research methodologies are similar and/or whose area(s) of expertise have crossed or benefited from your own would be found. At a minimum, someone who is familiar with your area and/or who is known to take a careful and deliberate approach in the evaluation process should be asked to serve. If it’s the case that the majority of faculty evaluating your packet at the departmental level is ad hoc, they may request to meet with you before making their recommendation. You might consider expressly asking the department chair and/or dean to be provided this opportunity.

24. My department is large and consists of faculty in a variety of specialties. Many use different methodologies and I’m afraid they may not understand or appreciate the complexity or impact of my research. How can I address this?

The department chair (in consultation with the tenured members of the department) can decide to appoint a reading committee to review your scholarly work and prepare a written assessment of it for the department’s consideration. This can be especially important in large areas with several subfields or specialties. While it would be ideal if all evaluators read and were able to understand each and every article or manuscript included in a packet, it doesn’t always happen. Having a reading committee report prepared by individuals who are especially qualified can be critical to an informed assessment by your peers in the department and also at later levels. While it’s the prerogative of the chair/department, if you believe that a reading committee report is advisable in your case, ask for it.

25. I have a joint appointment – will the work I’ve done in my secondary department be appropriately weighed/considered?

The Dean will consult with the Chairs of your primary and secondary departments to determine a list of appropriate external referees. The “secondary department” includes the Center, Bureau, Institute, Decanal Unit or Degree-Granting Program in which the individual has a significant or principal assignment. The evaluation narrative by your secondary department will be appended to the narrative of your primary department as the packet makes its way through the process. Candidates with more than one departmental affiliation often worry that they’re viewed as not giving 100% in any one department when, in fact, they carry a greater load in trying to be a good citizen and meet faculty service requirements of two departments. Make certain that both department chairs are aware of the demands placed on your time by the other. Be certain that your contributions to both departments are appropriately reflected in the packet.

26. I don’t feel that my department chair is supportive and I have concerns that he/she’s not taking his/her responsibilities as seriously as I would like. What should I do?

Be informed about the process and know your rights and obligations (as well limitations) in it. Read the Instructions and the relevant policy/regulations related to reappointment/promotion/tenure considerations. Ask questions, put them in writing and seek advice from senior colleagues and/or the office of the dean when and where appropriate. Keep good notes throughout the process . . . things that you may hear or come to know about what happened during the course of your evaluation could be important later.

27. When will I know how my department has voted?

You should be informed in writing of the department’s recommendation within five working days after the vote. This notification will come from the department chair and will be the only notification you will receive prior to the final notice.

28. Will my department chair be involved in the process after the packet leaves the department?

The department chair's role is critical throughout the process – if questions or issues arise related to the packet or candidacy, the department chair is likely the first contact. He/she serves as the “spokesperson” for the department and the candidacy. The chair may be asked by the Appointments and Promotions Committee to meet to answer questions or otherwise “amplify the department’s report.” If the dean intends to make a recommendation different from that of the department, he/she is required to first meet with the department chair.

29. My dean/director is new and doesn't know me or my work. Should I be concerned about this?

If timing and opportunity permits, ask for a brief face-to-face meeting with the dean and/or area dean. Ask your department chair or senior colleague(s) to attend with you. It's best to do this at the earliest possible time so that the dean can connect your face and name to any news of your work that comes his/her way. Your department chair should keep the dean apprised of your accomplishments (this means that you must keep the chair apprised). The more familiar the dean is with your work and evidence of its impact, the less work he/she will have to do when it's time to evaluate your packet.

30. What happens if members of the PRC need more information or have questions about my work?

The PRC will ask if information or clarification is needed – most likely these inquiries will go first to the dean who may then turn to the department chair if he/she needs information. If the PRC, on first review, is inclined to differ with the dean's recommendation, the Committee will ask the dean to meet to explain his/her views (it's possible, also, that the department chair will be asked to accompany the dean to this meeting). The Instructions also permit the Committee to return the packet to an earlier level for additional information it may need to make a determination – if this happens, the packet goes to intervening levels before being resubmitted to the dean.

31. Should I be concerned that there isn't someone from my discipline serving on the PRC?

The faculty members selected to serve on the PRC are chosen for their scholarly distinction as individuals and are not selected to represent specific disciplines or areas. The PRC's function is to advise the President from a "University-wide" perspective.

32. Does the President ever reach a conclusion different from the PRC?

Yes, but rarely.

33. When is the final decision made and how am I notified?

If both the department's and dean's recommendations are negative, the packet does not progress to the PRC and the dean notifies the candidate of the final decision in writing within ten days of receipt of the knowledge that the final decision has been made. (An exception to this rule occurs for candidacies that are self-initiated, also referred to as "rank review"—these cases proceed to the PRC for evaluation regardless of the recommendations at earlier levels.) Deans are normally notified of final actions following the April and June meetings of the Board of Governors. Deans may then notify candidates informally of the final outcome. In all cases, candidates are to be notified in writing of the action within ten days of receipt of knowledge by the Dean of the final action.

34. Where do I go if I need more information?

If you have additional questions or concerns about the process for evaluation contact the AAUP-AFT office – if we don't have the answers, we will try to assist you in finding them and are available to confidentially discuss any concerns you might have.

35. What is the role of the union in the evaluation process?

The AAUP-AFT does not provide specific advice regarding packet preparation. Nor do we interpret standards in any given field or have a role in determining the quality and/or merits of a candidacy – these are matters of faculty governance and are best determined by the faculty:

“Informed judgments concerning a faculty member’s accomplishments can be made only by qualified colleagues. Such subjective judgment by persons competent to evaluate duties, responsibilities, services, and accomplishments will protect the interest of professors themselves, the department, the college, the University, and the students better than any objective rating that could be devised.” [University Policy 60.5.15].

Faculty members have a significant and weighty obligation in this area of faculty governance . . . to their colleagues, to the health of their department and school, and to the university.

“As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.” [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics, as revised and adopted in 1987]

All candidates are entitled to a full and fair evaluation process – this requires that all faculty members participate fully and appropriately.

36. Is there anything I should do if I learn that my candidacy was unsuccessful?

Request a copy of your packet and review the evaluation narratives. Talk with your colleagues if you have questions about the process. The AAUP-AFT will automatically send you information regarding your rights under the Collective Agreement and the grievance/appeal process. If requested, we will assist you in determining whether grievable defects occurred and in utilizing the negotiated grievance or appeal procedures.