Section 12: Tenure, Promotion and Rank Adjustment Criteria and Guidelines

12.1 Overview

The purpose of this section is to provide detailed information about tenure, promotion, and rank adjustment criteria, processes, and procedures at SDSU. The intent is to provide faculty members and academic administrators with clear guidelines to facilitate the process.

Faculty members are hired to assist in achieving the mission and strategic plan of the University. Decisions to promote faculty members and to award tenure are some of the most important actions made by the University, for they determine the quality of faculty into the future. Departments and colleges are expected to be selective in their recommendations, particularly for tenure. Due to the long-term consequences of the tenure decision, it should only be awarded when the best interests of SDSU are clearly served by doing so.

A multi-stage process for rank adjustment, tenure, and promotion decisions is used at SDSU. The faculty member notifies the department head/supervisor of his/her desire to seek tenure, promotion, or rank adjustment based on the number of years in rank at the institution, and level of performance. (Note: promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is assigned upon the granting of tenure.)

12.2 Tenure and Promotion

Faculty members who desire to seek tenure and promotion are responsible for submitting all needed documentation of performance and accomplishments following the dossier outline. The dossier is submitted to the department head. All dossiers are reviewed by at least two levels of review committees (College and University). If departmental by-laws call for a tenure and promotion review, the process shall be followed as outlined in departmental guidelines and the recommendation forwarded to the department head, who in turn forwards to the dean, along with their recommendation. An established timeline is presented later in this document.

The role of Tenure and Promotion Committees above the unit/department is not to judge any specific work, but rather to judge how well the case has been made either for the granting of tenure or for promotion. In essence, it is the overall quality of the candidate’s record and the accompanying documentation, or the claim made for the significance of any single piece of work, which determines the final outcome. The President makes the final decision based on recommendations from the Provost and University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

12.3 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Decisions to award tenure and promote faculty members determine, in part, the quality of the faculty into the future. Departments and Colleges must be selective in their recommendations, particularly in regard to tenure. The most important criterion for awarding tenure is whether it is in the best interest of SDSU to do so. One must pose important questions when considering tenure such as: Will the candidate improve the quality of the unit’s tenured faculty? Is the unit better able to improve itself by granting tenure and promotion or by hiring anew? Is the candidate likely to maintain or improve his/her quality and contributions into the future? If there are serious doubts or concerns about any of these areas, the University should not promote or award tenure.
A distinguishing feature of SDSU is its designation as a Land-grant university. This designation gives SDSU its breadth and emphasis on the three foundational and inter-related functions of the tripartite mission: teaching and advising; scholarship, research and creative activity; and service (assigned professional and general). In tenure and promotion reviews, consideration is given to the performance of the candidate in all three areas. However, the three need not be treated equally. Faculty fulfills the three interrelated components of the SDSU mission depending on their individual professional responsibilities within their role. For most faculty, the primary basis for tenure and promotion will be evidence of high quality in two of three roles such as research and teaching/advising, with further consideration given to service; or assigned specific service and research with further consideration given to teaching/advising. Rarely will tenure/promotion be granted on the basis of strong performance in only one role.

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is the major milestone in one's academic career. Granting tenure is a significant commitment by the institution to a faculty member and vice versa. The outcome of this process determines those faculty members who will most likely make a long-term commitment to the institution.

The decision to tenure and promote to Associate Professor should be made when a faculty member has demonstrated significant accomplishments and shows promise of becoming a master teacher, recognized scholar, and/or exemplary provider of service. Mastery is evidenced when the candidate has made significant contributions in the quality and quantity of research, teaching and service, and shows likelihood of sustaining these contributions to the discipline.

Tenure with promotion to Associate Professor requires faculty members to show the potential for promotion to full Professor. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate a high likelihood of sustaining contributions so as to achieve the rank of Professor. Each department and college should define and publicize in their standards documents performance indicators expected of Professor.

Required for Associate Professor rank per the BOR/COHE Agreement (13A.2) are the following minimum qualifications:

- Earned doctorate and six (6) years of successful tenure track or postdoctoral college teaching or research experience in appropriate fields (or appropriate equivalent experience);
- A postgraduate degree other than a doctorate, recognized by the university administration as terminal for the faculty unit members’ discipline, and six (6) years of successful post-degree college teaching or research experience in appropriate fields (or appropriate equivalent experience);
- Evidence of external recognition for scholarly accomplishments consistent with university standards implementing BOR Policy 4:38 for professorial ranks; and
- The award of tenure.

Non-unit professorial faculty members earning the rank of Associate Professor will meet all of the criteria above excluding tenure.

Tenure occurs in the sixth year of tenure-track service. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are linked. With the award of tenure, the faculty member is automatically assigned to the rank of Associate Professor.

**Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to full Professor should only be awarded to a faculty member who has clearly demonstrated leadership through significant accomplishments and contributions to their discipline. The candidate
must prove that he/she is a leading scholar and teacher or provider of public service in accordance with assigned responsibilities. In making a recommendation to full Professor, those reviewing the dossier must determine that since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of significance and demonstrates independence and quality in teaching, scholarship, and service (assigned professional or general). Full Professor requires consideration of performance in all three roles: teaching, research, and service (assigned professional or general). While equal weight need not be given to all three roles, it is the expectation that by awarding the rank of full Professor, excellence is clearly demonstrated in at least two, if not three roles. The awarding of promotion to full Professor if excellence is demonstrated in only one role is extremely rare. Ideally, to achieve full Professor one must have achieved national or international stature.

Promotion from Associate to full Professor must provide evidence that the candidate is recognized in their field through scholarly contributions; has reached high levels of teaching excellence, advises graduate students to completion, or has provided leadership to undergraduate advising; and is engaged in university governance or service to one’s profession. Those recommending promotion to full Professor believe that it is in the best interest of SDSU to do so and clearly feel the candidate has the ability and will continue to sustain this level of contribution.

Required for full Professor per BOR/COHE Agreement (13A.2) are the following minimums:

- Five (5) years in rank of associate professor at the institution; tenure; high level of performance in the areas of responsibilities commensurate with promotion to the rank of professor.
- Evidence of external recognition for ongoing scholarly accomplishment and leadership consistent with university standards implementing BOR Policy 4:38 for professorial rank.

Non-unit professorial faculty members earning the rank of full Professor will meet all of the criteria above excluding tenure.

12.4 Evaluation of the Candidate’s Performance and Potential for Tenure and Promotion

**Department Head’s Role**

The evaluation of the dossier is primarily the responsibility of the department head, although the department head may designate a senior faculty member to assist with the evaluation of a particular role (e.g., teaching, research, assigned professional service, or general service). The candidate will prepare descriptive material for the dossier and the department head or designee will prepare the evaluative information which will be added to the dossier (including a table of external review letters, and the external review letters in the order on the external review letters’ table).

At any point, when significant questions arise, the department head must address these questions or concerns before forwarding the dossier to the next level. For example, the department head should address any concerns at the department level where a split vote results, or concerns are raised in external peer reviewer letters.

**Role of the Tenure and Promotion Committee**

A faculty committee is elected or appointed to provide advice for every level of the review process. At SDSU, departmental Tenure and Promotion Committees are suggested but not required. Those departments with committees will provide advice to the department head. A college committee provides advice to the dean and a university committee provides advice to the Provost and President.
The advice includes a formal vote of the committee with the results of the ballot vote recorded on the cover sheet of the dossier (see Appendix A).

Role of the Dean
The dean will review the dossier following the departmental review and the college committee review. In any case where significant questions were raised at the college review, or a split vote resulted at the college level, the dean must provide commentary on the case before it is sent to the university level. The commentary should address the merits of the case as well as strengths and weaknesses.

Teaching and Evaluation of Teaching
All tenure and promotion recommendations must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate’s teaching. Strong performance in teaching cannot be assumed, it must be demonstrated with evidence. Multiple measures must be used to demonstrate and provide evidence of teaching excellence.

Departmental evaluation of teaching and advising will be inserted into the dossier following the presentation of teaching and advising material. The evaluation may be completed by the department head or a senior faculty member. The name of the person who developed the evaluation for this component and their signature will be provided. Note: the evaluation of roles is NOT included in the external review dossier. The evaluation component should be added before departmental/college/university review begins.

In preparing this section of the dossier, the candidate must include the following:

- A list of courses taught during the review period, the number of credits for each course (for labs, studios, and clinical contact hours), and the number of students enrolled per course;
- A statement of the candidate’s approach to teaching and learning specifically addressing how the level of student learning is gauged; a statement of philosophy and accomplishments (3 pages or less); and
- Student evaluations, IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment Survey), with some indication of improvement over time, where appropriate, so as to reach an optimal level of teaching excellence. SDSU will provide IDEA, college, and department averages along with national comparisons so faculty can be benchmarked to other teaching data.

Because no single tool can adequately assess instructional performance, evaluation of this role requires multiple measures to ensure that a comprehensive, fair, and just evaluation is done. Each faculty member (with more than 10% teaching assignment), in consultation with department head, will determine a minimum of two (2) strategies/techniques beyond the IDEA survey to evaluate teaching performance. Faculty with 10% or less teaching assignment need only one (1) additional strategy beyond the IDEA. The IDEA evaluation should account for no more than 25% of the teaching assessment rating. Other information on teaching, including (2) additional evidences of teaching effectiveness will account for 75% of the evaluation.

Materials appropriate for evaluation of teaching can be taken from a list of possibilities that are frequently used and accepted in higher education. Evidence can stem from four sources: the instructor, other professionals, students, or student learning.

Examples of measures include but are not limited to:

Evidence from the Instructor:
- Contributions to teaching/learning that extends beyond the classroom;
Course syllabi and materials (e.g., samples of student learning exercises, assignment grading rubric, assignment reading material, procedures for and results of evaluation);
- Evidence of successful innovation including use of technology or emerging pedagogy;
- Grant to improve teaching and documented changes made through the grant; innovative teaching/learning strategies and activities;
- Teaching Awards;
- Teaching portfolio;
- Video/audio electronic files (tape) of teaching.

Evidence from Other Professionals:
- Assessment Coordinator evaluation of the faculty member’s use of instructional assessment data for teaching and learning improvements;
- Department head-supervisor observation in the classroom or senior exit interviews;
- Feedback from employer via clinical, internships, student teaching, and job placement;
- Peer observation in the classroom (as outlined and approved by individual departments);
- Peer review of syllabi and other course materials (by curriculum committee or other faculty groups as approved by individual departments).

Evidence from Students:
- Evaluations from student peer review teams for particular classes.
- Feedback from recent alumni;
- Feedback from students through focused interviews or questionnaires with established procedures or student letters (established procedures for inviting letters);
- Formative/midterm student feedback and evidence of changes made as a result of evaluation.

Evidence of Student Learning:
- Before and after measures used in assessing student learning outcomes (must be clearly stated as measurable outcomes);
- Review of student work samples (e.g., capstone projects, recitals, creative projects, and research publications/professional presentations);
- Student learning as evidenced through program accreditation findings, licensure or registration exams, entrance exams, or other types of objective evidence of student learning.

In summary, the evaluation of teaching, conducted by the Department Head or designee, must include a summary of teaching responsibilities during the evaluation period, IDEA data, and the candidate’s self-review (the faculty member prepares this section).

Scholarship and the Evaluation of Scholarship
Research, scholarship, or creative activity reflect both activity and product or outcomes, employing dynamically interacting processes of discovery and creation, teaching and dissemination, engagement and application, and integration (Boyer, 1990). Products or outcomes developed through these processes are public, open to peer critique, and available for use by others.

All faculty members are responsible for demonstrating scholarly accomplishments independent of teaching assignment or the acceptance of teaching overload. Board policy states that, “The mission of a university requires of each faculty unit member a serious commitment to scholarship” (Statement Concerning Faculty Expectations, BOR Policy 4:38).

The assignment of each faculty member should not be taken into consideration when evaluating the quality of scholarly outcomes. The assignment will be taken into account for “how much” or “what
types” of scholarship accomplishment has occurred. The full array of scholarly outcomes including those that directly relate to teaching, to securing funding for research/scholarly work, and to supporting service is important to consider.

The key to evidence of accomplishing scholarly dissemination is that there is a peer critique or review and that there is dissemination to a broader audience, typically through a conference paper, peer reviewed publication, or an exhibition or performance. Other forms of scholarly work may yield patents, inventions, grants, or national recognition.

Scholarship includes but is not limited to:
- Creative performances with public critique;
- Industry grants awarded due to reputation and expertise of faculty member;
- Jury (peer) reviewed exhibits;
- Peer-reviewed (regionally or nationally competitive) grant awards;
- Peer-reviewed journal articles, books or monographs, papers/presentations, or other scholarly writing;
- Peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g., curriculum development, teaching strategies/techniques, assessment, innovations in learning approaches, etc.).

For many faculty in the arts (music, art, drama, dance), creative activity is regarded as the equivalent of scholarly publication or scientific research in determining the basis for appointment and advancement in rank and salary. The amount of scholarly effort devoted to creative activity in the arts varies depending on a faculty member’s role. In music, creative activities may take the form of performing, composing, arranging, conducting, or any combination of these. In drama, creative activities may take the form of acting, performing, directing, designing, writing plays, or any combination of these. In art and design, creative activities may take the form of artistic expression, exhibiting, designing, screening, the publication of images, invited residency, or any combination of these.

Faculty may submit for review a single creative project, or an entire series of performances, plays, or exhibitions. A juried invitation to exhibit, a juried performance, a published journal review, or an acceptance into a professional peer-reviewed venue, will be considered the equivalent of peer review.

Creative activity may be submitted to blind peer review in the appropriate discipline or to peer reviewers in academia who hold expertise in the same area, of appropriate rank, and who are employed at institutions with programs in the arts that are comparable in size, scope, and mission. When review is not blind, peers are selected in consultation with the department head. The number of reviews will vary by discipline. For music and art/design, a minimum of three peer reviews is required for a single creative project. In the areas of theatre and dance, national standards indicate that 1-2 peer reviewers per production are typical. For more substantial projects or a series of performances, productions or artistic works, a minimum of five reviews is normally required.

In the event that the faculty member is engaged in off-campus creative activity (e.g., an invitation to direct a play at a reputable theatre or guest conduct with a reputable symphony), external peer review of the off-campus work will still be conducted but may occur at a less frequent rate; simply being accepted to perform or conduct in an external venue conveys an element of external review and acknowledgment of the faculty member’s expertise and reputation.

To best evaluate scholarly accomplishments, the candidate must provide, in three (3) pages or less, a statement of research goals, and achievements. This statement is important to both the internal and external reviewers because it provides context and helps others understand the candidate’s vision, performance, goals, and self-assessment of progress.
In developing this statement, the candidate should place his or her scholarly accomplishments in an intellectual framework which provides evidence of real contributions to one’s discipline. That is, the candidate should make the case that the scholarly work has advanced the discipline. A list of publications is not evidence of accomplishments. The candidate should also address the relationship of past work to future scholarly plans.

The statement should focus on research carried out since initial appointment (for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor), or research accomplishments since the last promotion (for promotion to full Professor). If prior service credit was granted, work completed during the prior service time period may be used. If teaching or service is the primary appointment, candidates should present scholarly outcomes as they relate to the scholarship of teaching and learning or scholarly outcomes regarding public engagement/service.

The departmental evaluation of research/scholarship accomplishments shall be an evaluation. A list or description of research is not an evaluation. The departmental committee or department head will evaluate the impact of research/scholarship to the field, the quality of execution, and significance of work. In conducting this evaluation, the evaluator should address 1 or 2 publications or creative works of greatest significance. Future potential should also be assessed, in part, based on the significance of the candidate’s past record, current status, and plans and goals for the future. In evaluating future potential, the evaluator should think about the candidate’s likely standing 5 to 6 years into the future.

**Evaluation of Assigned Professional and General Service**

Service at SDSU is typically divided into two types: “Assigned Professional Service” refers to one’s appointment in areas such as extension, service/diagnostic laboratory work, departmental specific professional/administrative duties, librarianship, work affiliated with a specific practice site for the clinical sciences, or academic program coordination. “General Service” is professional assistance provided outside the regular realm of the position description but that relates to the individual’s professional education and experience. General Service includes service to the University and to one’s profession.

**Assigned Professional Service**

Extension and other professional service centers or labs fulfill SDSU’s Land-grant mission by providing professional expertise and by disseminating information to benefit society. The librarianship role of library faculty is another example of assigned professional service. Assigned professional services such as these shall be addressed in one’s assignment and includes specific outcomes identified in the unit’s Standards Document and in one’s PDP. Criteria for judging assigned professional service should include: quality of service work, impact on clientele, dissemination of service contributions through scholarship; interaction with a community of scholars; and integration of research, teaching; and service.

When assigned professional service is a significant portion of one’s role (e.g., more than 10%), including a context statement of three pages or less, similar to the teaching and research statements of goals and accomplishments is expected. Evaluation of the candidate’s assigned professional service is required and procedures of the same rigor as those used for research/scholarly or teaching will be employed. The dossier should include evidence of excellence in assigned professional service provided by the candidate, the departmental evaluation, and letters from external peer reviewers.

**General Service**

General Service, expected of all faculty, is carried out in various contexts including service to the university, to one’s profession, or to the broader community and does not imply merely attending
departmental or college meetings or membership in professional association(s), which are expected of all faculty. General Service does imply involvement in faculty governance such as serving on and providing leadership to committees, task forces, or representing one’s peers on Faculty Senate and can also include other contributions of significance such as expanding the international dimensions of the University. Likewise, service can be to one's profession such as organizer of regional, national, and/or international research-related conference or symposium, serving on committees, serving as reviewer, editor or editorial board member for journals, reviewer for state or federal granting agencies, or providing leadership through elected office. Professional service to the broader community implies the use of one's expertise and refers to work that draws upon one's professional expertise and/or is an outgrowth of one’s academic discipline.

Evaluation of service should consider the magnitude of contributions to the University, profession, or broader community (quantity). Service will be evaluated based on impact such as that which results in improved university governance, university-wide change or improvement, or significant leadership to one’s profession.

**External Peer Review**

An external (to the institution) peer review will be a part of all dossiers for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and full Professor.

External peer reviewers will provide evaluative comments on the accomplishments of the candidate being considered for tenure and/or promotion. Copies of the actual letters provided by external evaluators will be included in the dossier. Letters are held confidentially from the candidate at all times; only Tenure and Promotion Committees and the department head, dean, Provost, and President have access to the letters.

The external peer reviewer’s primary focus is to provide an objective assessment of the intellectual merit, disciplinary contributions, and impact of the candidate’s scholarship, although reviewers may be asked to consider teaching and service outcomes as well. In constructing their evaluation, the reviewers will consider the proportional weighting of the activities in the roles of research or creative activities, undergraduate and graduate instruction including advising, and service including responsibilities with assigned professional service.

Letters from at least four (4) scholars/professionals outside the University are required. These letters are critical components of the dossier and play an important role in the decision making process. The letters must be appropriate in several ways:

- **Sufficient in number:** A minimum of four (4) and maximum of six (6) letters must be included. A list of all reviewers solicited with appropriate rank and institutional affiliation must be included in this section of the dossier by the department head;

- **From appropriate individuals who hold expertise in the same discipline and research expertise comparable to the candidate.** In selecting reviewers, every effort should be made to find reviewers from institutions similar to SDSU (e.g. Carnegie classification of research universities with high research activity). Reviewers from peer institutions, other land-grant institutions, or from departments offering similar types and levels of programs (including expectations for research), is appropriate. In unique situations, some (e.g., 1 or 2) of the reviewers may be scholars from other settings such as federal or state scientific agencies, national laboratories, research foundations or learned societies. Relatives, mentors, collaborators or others who appear to have a conflict of interest are not eligible to serve as an external peer reviewer for a candidate;

- **From individuals of appropriate rank.** That is, individuals who are typically senior and of higher rank than the faculty member who is seeking promotion;
• From objective reviewers without conflict of interest. That is, the candidate was not a graduate or undergraduate student or postdoctoral research associate under this professional nor has the candidate engaged in collaborative work with the professional during the time frame under review;

• All letters received MUST BE included in the dossier. Elimination of any letter once received is not appropriate. All letters are solicited by the department head and added to the candidate’s dossier after submission to department head. All letters are confidential and will not be shared with the candidate under review. Only those in evaluative positions (e.g., department head, dean, Tenure and Promotion Committees, Provost, President) will have access to the letters. At the conclusion of the entire process, the Provost’s Office will remove external letters from the dossier and keep in a separate file in the Provost’s Office.

External Peer Review Process and Timeline

By Sept. 1: The candidate submits a list of no more than six (6) suggested reviewers with an explanation of the qualifications of each to serve as a reviewer. The candidate may also submit a list of up to six (6) individuals who shall not be considered as reviewers. The candidate shall not contact the prospective reviewers. Similarly, the department head will prepare a list of no more than six (6) potential reviewers with an explanation of the qualifications of each to serve as a reviewer. Whenever possible, the professional should be selected from institutions comparable in mission, size, and scope to SDSU. In no case should the professional have any type of conflict of interest such as having served as major Professor or a collaborator.

Between Sept. 1 and October 5: The department head will select at least four (4) but no more than six (6) peer reviewers from the department head’s list and from the faculty member’s list assuring at least one-third but no more than one-half of the peer reviewers are from the prospective reviewers submitted by the faculty member. Only the department head shall contact the reviewers; at no point shall the faculty member contact the reviewers. It is recommended that this contact be in writing and no later than October 5. (See Appendix B for sample letter.)

The candidate for tenure or promotion will submit to their department head sufficient copies of the Tenure and Promotion dossier to be sent to the external reviewers following the “Guidelines for Preparing a Faculty Tenure & Promotion Dossier for External Review” (Appendix B).

The department head will solicit in writing from each external reviewer a letter providing input for the tenure and promotion process. Included in the written solicitation will be a copy of the written peer reviewer guidelines, a copy of the departmental standards document, and a copy of the dossier submitted by the candidate. External reviewers will be asked to provide comments on the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate’s scholarship and will be asked to comment on teaching/advising and service (assigned professional and general). In doing so, the reviewer will be asked to consider the distribution of the candidate’s responsibilities across these activities.

By November 1: The candidate will submit his/her final Tenure and Promotion dossier. (Submission of this material does not satisfy the requirement for the FAR.)

The department head will insert the confidential letters in the dossier along with a completed chart (see Appendix B) listing those professionals invited to review the candidate’s accomplishments, the rank of each professional, the institution from which the professional is affiliated, who selected this reviewer (candidate or department head) and justification for peers selection. The letters will remain in the confidential dossier throughout the review process but after a decision has been reached, the letters will be removed by the Provost and held in a confidential file. The letters will not be returned to the applicant nor placed in their HR personnel file. Throughout and after the review process, the external review letters will remain confidential.
Exceptions

Upon the recommendation of the President, the BOR may grant exceptions to the minimum rank qualifications or the promotion eligibility criteria relating to the minimum number of years in rank in the institution, or both. When time and circumstances reasonably permit, requests for exceptions to the minimum rank qualifications or promotion eligibility criteria will be reviewed under the procedures set out in BOR/COHE Agreement (13A.5). For new faculty and for promotions, the BOR will consider only those faculty unit members who, in the judgment of the BOR, have demonstrated that their level of performance or professional qualifications are notably excellent and sufficient to offset the lack of a required degree or years in rank.

12.5 Timeline and Review process for Tenure and Promotion

- **Between June 1 and September 1.** Names of potential external reviewers are submitted by the candidate to department head; external reviewers selected and contacted inviting them to serve as a reviewer.

  Assigned mentor (in some cases department head) provides mentoring and counsel on preparation of external review and tenure and promotion dossier.

- **Between September 1 and October 5.** Faculty member submits tenure or promotion dossier (including FAR Part B documentation) for external review. Please note: the dossier does **NOT** include evaluation by the department head either for specific roles or the summary evaluation. In addition, the table of external reviewers will not be included with the dossier at this point. All of these components will be inserted later.

- **November 1.** Faculty member submits final dossier for tenure and promotion review.

  Department head or designee inserts evaluation of each role into the dossier. These are placed at the end of each section.

  Department head inserts external letters into the dossier and completes the external review chart found in Appendix B.

  If department Tenure and Promotion Committee is used, the dossier is reviewed by this committee and forwarded to the department head/Immediate supervisor.

  Department head reviews the dossier and recommendation of the departmental committee (if applicable), and completes Appendix F.

- **Approximately December 15.** Department head forwards the dossier and recommendation to the dean’s office for the College Tenure and Promotion Committee to review. Incomplete dossiers will be returned to the department.

  College Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews dossier(s), recommendations from the department head and department Tenure and Promotion Committee, if any, and makes recommendation to the dean of the college.

  Dean reviews dossier and all recommendations and makes any additional comments and recommendation in Appendix F.
• **February 1.** Dean submits all dossiers and recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs. University Tenure and Promotion Committee deliberates during the month of February.

• **March 1.** Provost summarizes recommendations of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee and makes final recommendation to President.

• **No later than April 1.** The faculty unit member will be notified no later than April 1 of the year in which the faculty unit member is being considered for promotion, of whether the President will recommend promotion to the Board. Such notice will indicate the University Tenure and Promotion Committee's recommendation. If the President intends to recommend that promotion be denied, the President will, upon receipt prior to April 15 of a written request, within fifteen (15) working days of the request provide reasons in writing for the decision. The reasons given will be substantive in nature and will transcend the mere fact of the recommendations by the committees by including the opinions of the President from the information available to him or her. The right to obtain reasons will not expand the rights and limitations under § 8.8.

  Deadlines to bring any grievance arising from the denial of promotion will run from the time that the President notifies the faculty unit member of the intended recommendation to the Board; provided a faculty unit member requests a statement of reasons, the deadlines will run from the time that the president provides notice, pursuant to § 22.9, setting forth the reasons for the denial.

• **April 15.** President makes recommendation to the BOR.

• **June 1.** Entire process including BOR action is completed.

### 12.6 Rank Adjustment of Term Faculty Members

Those on term contract are issued contracts annually; therefore it is possible to change rank when a new contract is issued. Term faculty should not be confused with tenure-track or tenured faculty nor make it appear as if these are one and the same. This review should include input from peers and a recommendation then made to the appropriate administrator as to which rank is most appropriate. Changes in term rank are a university decision and do not go the Board of Regents for final approval.

**Lecturer Ladder (Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer)**

- Instructor rank requires an earned master’s degree or other degrees of qualifications recognized under academic program or discipline accreditation standards. A change in rank to lecturer requires three years in rank as instructor at the institution; and performance of assigned responsibilities commensurate with expectations for lecturer.
- Lecturer rank requires an earned doctorate or a postgraduate degree other than a doctorate recognized by the Board as a permitted terminal degree for the faculty member's disciplines at the institution. A change in rank to senior lecturer requires five years in rank at the institution and performance of assigned responsibilities commensurate with expectations for senior lecturer.
- Senior lecturer rank requires an earned doctorate or a postgraduate degree other than a doctorate recognized by the Board as a permitted terminal degree for the discipline, and six years of successful teaching at the university level.

*For additional information and specific standards for each rank, please refer to the Faculty Handbook, Section 5.2.*
Exceptions: Faculty members may go up as an exception if they have multiple years at SDSU (e.g. significantly more than three [3]) of being a highly effective and accomplished instructor. This may include instructors applying for rank adjustment to lecturer who hold a master’s degree.

Preparation of Materials:
- The faculty member will prepare an application to include documentation to establish performance commensurate with the award of the lecturer rank or senior lecturer rank. The format to follow is available in section 12.13. The documentation provided should “make the case” for the rank adjustment, and should address all of the areas in which the faculty member has responsibility in a manner proportionate to the percentage of time assigned to that area of performance in the faculty member’s workload. Suggested length is 15 pages total, but can include appendices.
- For most faculty members in the lecturer track the most important, and sometimes the only area of responsibility will be teaching, for them demonstrating excellence in teaching is of the utmost importance.
- The evidence for teaching should include key components of typical teaching portfolios and examples are included via web links. Please review and use these as guidelines in preparing the teaching portfolio.
  - [http://www.wsu.edu/provost/teaching.htm](http://www.wsu.edu/provost/teaching.htm)
  - [http://ucat.osu.edu/read/teaching-portfolio](http://ucat.osu.edu/read/teaching-portfolio)
  - [http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/resources/DocumentingYourTeaching/TeachingPortfolios/TeachingPortfolios.pdf](http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/resources/DocumentingYourTeaching/TeachingPortfolios/TeachingPortfolios.pdf)
- If advising and/or service have been assigned, performance outcomes should be included in the application.
- External letters are not required or necessary.
- The Department Head may want to supplement the material(s) assembled by the faculty member with information obtained from other sources.

12.7 Timeline and Review process for Rank Adjustment to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer

- **By October 5.** The faculty member wishing to be considered for a change of rank shall submit an intent to apply for rank adjustment to the immediate supervisor. (This can be as simple as an e-mail or a letter).
- **By February 1.** The teaching portfolio/document submitted.

The Department Head will form a review panel of 2-3 faculty members from the department, or use department tenure and promotion committee to review the candidates’ application to assure they are meeting performance standards at the desired rank. This panel will prepare a recommendation to the Department Head.

The Department Head will consult the faculty panel recommendations in making an independent judgment.

- **March 1.** The documentation and recommendations of the department head will be submitted to the Dean who will make an independent recommendation to the Provost.
- **March 15.** Dean submits all dossiers and recommendations to the Provost.
• **No later than April 1.** The faculty unit member will be notified no later than April 1 by the President of the decision. If the decision is to deny rank adjustment, the faculty member may request reasons for the denial no later than April 15 and these reasons will be provided within 15 working days.

• **June 1.** The entire process will be completed. Term contract rank increases do not move forward to the BOR.

*Salary Increase Associated with Lecturer Term Contract Rank Increases*

A faculty unit member who is to be granted a change in rank will receive a salary increment to their base salary as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Change</th>
<th>Salary Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor to Lecturer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer to Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This incremental adjustment will be made outside of the salary policy exercise and these funds do not come from the salary policy pool.

### 12.8 Rank Adjustment for Librarian Rank

Those on the librarian ladder (Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian) are issued annual contracts; therefore it is possible to change rank when a new contract is issued. Term faculty should not be confused with tenure-track or tenured employees nor make it appear as if these are one and the same. Review by peers occurs and a recommendation is made to the appropriate administrator as to which rank is most appropriate. This process is distinct from the tenure and promotion process for tenure-track/tenured faculty. Changes in term rank are a university decision and do not go the Board of Regents for final approval.

• Assistant Librarian rank requires an earned master’s degree in library or information science from a program accredited by the American Library Association or other degrees or qualifications recognized under academic program or discipline accreditation standards.

• Associate Librarian rank requires an earned master, specialist or doctoral degree, in addition to the master’s degree in library or information science; and ten (10) years of experience as a professional librarian or three (3) years in rank as an Assistant Librarian at SDSU.

• Librarian rank requires an earned master, specialist or doctoral degree, in addition to the master’s degree in library or information science; and fifteen (15) years of experience as a professional librarian or five (5) years in rank as an Associate Librarian at SDSU.

### 12.9 Timeline and Review process for Librarian Rank Adjustment

• **By October 5.** The faculty member wishing to be considered for a change of rank shall submit a written application to the immediate supervisor.
  o The application will include documentation to establish performance commensurate with the award of the associate librarian or librarian rank.
  o At SDSU, the format will include documentation for assigned specific service and general service similar to that required in the Tenure and Promotion dossier.
  o The immediate supervisor, or any other supervisor who reviews the file may supplement the material assembled by the faculty member with information obtained from other sources. The supervisor(s) may base their recommendations upon the additional information provided that such additional information is included in the file together with the materials assembled by the unit faculty member.
The documentation and recommendations of the department head will be submitted to the Chief University Librarian who will make an independent recommendation to the Provost.

If the request for change in rank is granted, it will become effective with the next annual appointment notice.

- **By March 15.** The Dean submits all dossiers and recommendations to the Provost.

- **No later than April 1.** The faculty unit member will be notified no later than April 1 of the year in which the faculty unit member is being considered for change in rank, of whether the president will accept the recommendation for change in rank. If the president intends to reject a recommended change in rank, the president will, upon receipt prior to April 15 of a written request, within fifteen (15) working days of the request provide reasons in writing for the decision.

- **June 1.** The entire process will be completed. Term contract rank increases do not move forward to the BOR.

### Salary Increase Associated with Librarian Term Contract Rank Increases

A faculty unit member who is to be granted a change in rank will receive a salary increment to their base salary as follows:

- Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian: 8%
- Associate Librarian to Librarian: 10%

This incremental adjustment will be made outside of the salary policy exercise, and these funds do not come from the salary policy pool.

### 12.10 Rank Adjustment for Non-unit Professorial Faculty

Non-unit professorial faculty members are primarily those in a clinical or research appointment. Given the close parallel of these positions to professorial faculty, the process and timeline for rank adjustment will utilize the dossier format, external review of application, peer committee review, and on or about the same timeline as promotion. Recommendations will flow through department to dean, Provost, and President. Please see tenure and promotion guidelines for more information.

### Salary Increase Associated with Non-unit Professorial Contract Rank Increases

A faculty unit member who is to be granted a change in rank will receive a salary increment to their base salary as follows:

- Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: 8%
- Associate Professor to Professor: 10%

This incremental adjustment will be made outside of the salary policy exercise and these funds do not come from the salary policy pool.

### 12.11 Composition and Role of the Tenure and Promotion Committees

**Department Tenure and Promotion Committee**

Departments or other appropriate administrative unit’s by-laws may establish a Tenure and Promotion Committee. The department head and COHE leadership determine membership using the same
procedures used to elect faculty members to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Faculty members in the appropriate unit participate in the election. Only those faculty who themselves have been granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor or Professor should be elected or appointed to a Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Department level Tenure and Promotion Committees make their recommendations to the administrator of the applicable department or unit. Administrators consider the recommendations of their departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee in formulating their recommendations to the next level of the process.

**College Tenure and Promotion Committee**

All colleges have college level Tenure and Promotion Committees. Membership on the college Tenure and Promotion Committee is determined using the same procedures used to elect faculty to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Only faculty who are tenured will serve on a College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

College level Tenure and Promotion Committees make their recommendations to the dean or administrator of the applicable unit. Deans will consider the recommendations of their College Tenure and Promotion Committee in formulating their recommendations to the next level of the process.

**University Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of elected members of the faculty and appointed faculty/administration. The composition of the committee is 50% tenured faculty elected by COHE, and 50% faculty or administrators appointed by the President. The faculty elected by COHE need not be COHE members; however, they must be faculty unit members. The President determines the total number of members. SDSU has historically had an 8-member committee.

The faculty representatives on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee are elected by the faculty as soon as practical after the commencement of school activities in the fall. Membership terms are for three (3) years and are staggered.

Vacancies are filled according to procedures established for the original appointment. Election procedures are determined by BOR/COHE and the election is to be conducted under its auspices. Election procedures must provide all tenure-track or tenured faculty unit members with equal opportunities to nominate candidates for committee membership, to be nominated for committee membership, and to elect committee members. Alternates should be selected in the same manner.

The parties recognize that the integrity of the tenure and promotion review process requires not only that it be fair, but also that it be regarded as fair. Therefore, individual committee members are encouraged to excuse themselves whenever they feel that their ability to make a disinterested judgment might be called into question by a candidate or by other members of the university community.

Faculty unit members, who themselves are to be considered for tenure or promotion are not eligible for membership on Tenure and Promotion Committees at any level during the academic year in which their tenure or promotion is being considered. If such a faculty unit member is denied tenure or promotion, the individual’s term on the committee will be deemed to have expired.

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee is staffed and chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (who is non-voting). The committee convenes in early February to
complete its work. The order of colleges is rotated so candidates are not always taken in the same college order. Each applicant is reviewed individually. Confidential minutes are kept for each meeting. Absolute confidentiality must be maintained. This means:

- Anonymous written ballots are used;
- Ballots are retained one year and then destroyed;
- Committee members do not interpret any results to candidates, department heads, or deans;
- Minutes are not distributed; they are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs;
- No candidate is discussed outside the committee;
- No inquiries outside of the workings of the committee are made by committee members regarding candidates.

The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet with persons, on request, to explain process/procedure and to provide feedback about decisions. Work materials are shredded after review.

When committee members feel they have a conflict of interest on a given candidate, they must recuse themselves from the review of that specific candidate. The committee members also have the option to abstain in the voting if conflict of interest might affect their vote.

### 12.12 Preparation of Materials for Tenure and Promotion for Professorial Faculty

The purpose of this section is to guide faculty in the preparation of an effective tenure and promotion dossier in an orderly and efficient manner. All unit and non-unit professorial faculty applying for promotion or rank reassignment will follow the guidelines and instructions listed below. To assure the work of each faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion is fully recognized, all candidates must provide accurate and complete materials. The tenure and promotion process begins when a faculty member is first appointed at SDSU.

**General Guidelines**

- Appendix A contains the Tenure and Promotion Cover Sheet to be initiated by the department head and completed by the dean and respective committees. The cover sheet shall be placed in the front of the tenure and promotion dossier.
- Consider the audience. SDSU faculty in your department and college, outside reviewers, the department head and dean, members of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Provost, and President will all review the dossier.
- **Design Layout/Formatting**
  - Bold headings
  - Maintain 1.25 inch left margins and 1 inch top, bottom and right margins
  - Organize dossier in 3-hole binder with cover sheet indicating the applicant’s name, department, college, and “dossier for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or dossier for promotion to full Professor.”
  - Pages must be numbered consecutively starting with 1
  - Single space dossier; print on one side only
  - Use “bullets” where appropriate
  - Use a “standard” font such as Arial, Times New Roman, Tahoma, or Garamond
  - Use 11-12 point font
- Develop a PDP with sufficiently high goals or outcomes using Departmental Standards Document as a reference. Assess progress each year using the FAR. Review tenure and promotion process and BOR/COHE Agreement as related to tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. Keep
records of all contributions from year to year, including an annually updated vita. Maintain good files beginning with the first year of employment. Keep paper or electronic copies of workload documents, annual reviews, publications, articles, etc. that may supplement the dossier.

- The tenure and promotion dossier has a 35 page limit. The tenure and promotion dossier “makes the case” for the rank sought and the awarding of tenure. Appendices may be used as evidence of the statements made in the dossier but should not present new information. There is no page limit for appendices. As noted in the BOR/COHE Agreement, faculty may submit all favorable documents which are appropriate and upon which the faculty member relies to establish well defined PDP’s. Be advised that an overly large amount of materials may prevent those reviewing the dossiers from thoroughly reading all materials, so use discretion in dossier preparation.

- Note that the guidelines included in this packet are representative of a faculty-unit member evaluation. Adherence to the variations of materials for the evaluation of librarians, assigned professional service faculty, and administrators must be followed.

- Schedule adequate time for the preparation of tenure and promotion materials. Be sure to review the dossier and make corrections as needed. Also, ask the assigned faculty mentor or a colleague to assist by reviewing materials.

- The original dossier will be returned by the Office of Academic Affairs for placement in the official files held by HR. A copy of the dossier must be maintained with the faculty member’s personnel file in the Department. External review letters are considered CONFIDENTIAL to the candidate and not part of the personnel file. These will be removed from the final dossier and held in a separate file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

**Instructions for Preparing and Assembling the Dossier**

The dossier must be assembled in this order and format. Any deviation will result in a dossier returned to the department/candidate for further work.

1. Cover Sheet (see Appendix A)

   **Divider with tab labeled “Personal History and Professional Experience”**

2. Background Information:
   a. Candidate’s name
   b. Candidate’s department and college
   c. Candidate’s academic rank and date granted
   d. Current date
   e. Purpose of the evaluation. Indicate whether tenure, promotion, or tenure and promotion.
   f. Evaluation time period (Note: this is the six-year period [for tenure] or the five + year period [for promotion]. When assembling the dossier, only this time period should be reported).

3. Distribution of assignment across all roles for each semester/year (taken directly from workload documents and averaged across all semesters to be evaluated):
4. Professional History and Experience:
   a. Educational Background - begin with highest degree; provide the name of the institution, degree, field of study, and date of degree.
   b. List of Academic Positions since final degree - in reverse chronological order from present to past. For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each.
   c. Other Professional Employment - previous and current, in reverse chronological order from present to past. For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each.
   d. Honors, Recognitions, and Outstanding Achievements - fellowships, prizes, etc. in reverse chronological order from present to past. Indicate national and international stature in scholarship and engagement appropriate to rank sought.

Divider with tab labeled “Teaching and Advising”

5. Teaching:
   a. Candidate's statement of his/her approach to teaching and learning specifically addressing how the level of student learning is gauged. In three (3) pages or less, include a personal statement of teaching assignment, philosophy, methods, strengths, problems/challenges, goals, and other material in a manner that will present colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information.
   b. Summary of courses taught - provide information for undergraduate and graduate courses, both on and off campus and via distance education, since the last promotion. For each semester under review, provide a list of courses taught, credits or for labs/studios/clinical, the number of contact hours, and the number of students in the courses. (See sample table in Appendix C).
   c. Summary of IDEA teaching evaluations. (See sample table in Appendix D).
   d. Additional sources of teaching evidence will be provided by the candidate and used by supervisor or others to evaluate teaching performance.
   e. Other contributions to teaching and instructional programs - significant accomplishments can include teaching an honor's section or honor's colloquium, curriculum alignment to accreditation standards, accreditation self-studies, development of course materials used by other instructors, training and supervising graduate assistants, SGR or IGR review, adding globalization to the curriculum, extensive independent study or informal interactions with students, instructional improvement projects or activities such as leadership in a significant curricular change, or new course developed.

6. Academic Advising
   a. List number of undergraduate advisees (per year or an average), evaluation data if available, significant accomplishments, impact, etc.
   b. List of number of graduate advisees (list doctoral and master’s student separately and by name), completion date if completed or anticipated completion date, evaluation data, significant accomplishments, impact, etc.
c. Describe any other special advising-related assignments, either in unit or in campus-wide programs.

7. Departmental evaluation of teaching and advising will be inserted into the dossier following the presentation of teaching and advising material. The evaluation may be completed by the department head or a senior faculty member. The name of the person who developed the evaluation for this component and their signature will be provided. Note: the evaluation of roles is NOT included in the external review dossier. The evaluation component should be added before departmental/college/university review begins.

Divider with tab labeled “Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity”

8. Candidate’s Statement of Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity Goals and Accomplishments.

The candidate will provide (in three [3] pages or less) a statement of research/scholarship/creative activity goals and accomplishments. In the statement, provide an assessment of the intellectual merit, disciplinary contributions, and impact of scholarship/creative activity. Specifically identify which publications/funded research/creative work/disclosed intellectual property provided the greatest impact on the field and why. The statement should tie together past research/scholarship/creative activity and how it relates to future research/scholarship/creative activity plans and to teaching and assigned professional and general service duties. If scholarship is directly tied to one’s primary role of teaching or assigned professional service (e.g. the scholarship of teaching and learning or the scholarship of engagement), the statement must reflect how the two are related or integrated.

9. Publications and Creative Works
   a. Summary of scholarly publications, presentations, exhibits, performances or other scholarly work. Please use the tables found in Appendix E and insert in the dossier prior to the presentation of individual scholarly work.
   b. Present each individual scholarly work as a citation. Suggested content for each citation is noted below and highly encouraged. It is very important to categorize your publication and creative works according to these groupings and label clearly. Please do not mix various types of scholarly work.

   • Abstracts (in print or accepted) - include these only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in the field. List in reverse chronological order (present to past). Provide inclusive page numbers for abstracts.
   • Articles in peer-reviewed journals (in print or accepted).
   • Book Reviews (in print or accepted) - include these only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in the field. List in reverse chronological order from present to past. Provide inclusive page numbers for book reviews.
   • Books Authored or Co-Authored (in print or accepted).
   • Books Edited or Co-Edited (in print or accepted).
   • Bulletins, Reports, or Conference Proceedings (in print or accepted)-include these only if these items are normally considered an important part of the publication record of a scholar or artist in the field. List in reverse chronological order from present to past. Provide inclusive page numbers for bulletins, report or conference proceedings.
   • Chapters in Books (in print or accepted).
• Creative Works (Exhibitions, Commissions, Competitions, Performances, Designs, Art or Architecture Executed).
• Disclosure of Intellectual Properties (considered peer reviewed by a group of experts for merit).
• Doctoral and Master’s thesis title.
• Monographs (in print or accepted)-items longer than an article, but shorter than a book. Provide inclusive page numbers for monographs.
• Patent (note: a provisional patent is not considered peer-reviewed; rather, it is a protection or “place holder” while a more extensive review is being conducted. However, a patent is a record of scholarship and should be considered fully in the T&P process).
• Other (specify type)

10. When preparing citation information, use the following standards:
   a. Within each category, place items in reverse chronological order (present to past), and number each publication.
   b. Note any publication or work that is not blind peer reviewed and if not blind reviewed, please note the type of peer critique used.
   c. List all authors in the same order as on the original publication. For those publications with multiple authors, please indicate the role you played as first/lead author, corresponding author, contributing or co-author, the percentage of contribution or percentage of time and effort devoted to this publication. Also, note if the co-author is graduate student.
   d. Interdisciplinary research/scholarship is highly valued, critical to many disciplines, and should not be penalized or downgraded in the evaluation process. Multi-investigators or authors should not be disadvantaged, even given a relatively small percentage of contributions to a project/publication. Importantly is the need to establish the critical component the candidate provided to an interdisciplinary project/publication/grant.
   e. The phrase “accepted for publication” should be used only where a written commitment to publish has been received from a publisher, subject only to final technical editing. The phrase “in press” may be used when final technical editing has been completed and the paper has been scheduled for publication, but page numbers are not yet known.
   f. Provide inclusive page numbers for publications in journals.
   g. List all publications and creative works since appointment or last promotion.
   h. Optional additional information may be included such as acceptance rate, citation level, or impact factor. Note: Briggs Library can assist in locating other types of indicators. Please see http://libguides.sdstate.edu/ScholarlyResearchEvidence

11. Invited Lectures and Invited Conference Presentations since last promotion. Please describe the significance of regional/national recognition this invitation conveys. List in reverse chronological order from present to past within evaluation period.

12. Conference Papers since last promotion. List in reverse chronological order.
   a. Refereed Conference Papers
   b. Non-refereed/non-competitive Conference Papers

13. Grants – Insert grant summary chart found in Appendix E, prior to presentation of individual grants and contracts. List principal investigator first, co-principal investigators, granting agency, award start and end dates, and total project funding awarded. For research grants, list the amount of the total project funding (dollar and percent of total) for which the applicant had spending authority. For instrumentation, education/outreach, and other types of grants, list the percent of the overall project effort contributed by the applicant. In this section we
encourage you to include grant application pending or those submitted but not funded. Please include the same information as for funded grants, but clearly indicate that the grant is either pending or was not funded.

14. Supervision of Graduate Student Thesis or Dissertation (if applicable)
   a. List doctoral and master’s students separately.
   b. For each graduate student supervised, provide the student’s name, dates work was supervised, current status if not completed, thesis title if completed, and the student’s placement (example: Roberts, Elizabeth, Ph.D. 1998, “Analysis of Correlations between…..”, now at U.S. Census Bureau).
   c. Clearly distinguish whether the faculty member’s role was as major adviser, committee member, or graduate representative. List participation on examining committees separately from the supervision of a dissertation, thesis, or research paper.

15. Departmental Evaluation of Research Accomplishments and Future Potential - department head or designee will evaluate not merely the quantity of scholarly accomplishments but also the quality of research as defined by significance of topic, impact on the field, and success in execution of a scholarly program. In conducting the evaluation, the evaluator should emphasize 1 or 2 publications or other scholarly works of most significance. In addition, the evaluation should include the candidate’s future plans for scholarly work and potential to reach full Professor. The name of the person who developed the evaluation of this component of the evaluation and their signature will be provided. Note: the evaluation of roles is NOT included in the external review dossier. The evaluation component should be added before departmental/college/university review begins.

Divider with tab labeled “Service (Assigned Professional and General)”

16. When assigned professional service (i.e., extension, service/diagnostic laboratory work, departmental specific professional/administrative duties, librarianship, work affiliated with a specific practice site for the clinical sciences, or academic program coordination) is a major portion of one’s role (e.g., more than 10%), include a context statement of three (3) pages or less, similar to the research statement of goals and accomplishments.
   a. If assigned professional service is the primary criterion for tenure and promotion and has been so specified at the time of employment (i.e., extension), procedures of the same rigor as those used for evaluating research and teaching should be used for its review.
   b. The candidate will provide (in three [3] pages or less) a statement of outreach philosophy, goals and accomplishments since the time of appointment to Assistant Professor or since last promotion. The statement should tie together past outreach and how it related to future plans and to other duties (research, scholarship, and teaching). The statement should provide evidence that outreach activities or programs have had a significant impact on and been of mutual benefit to SDSU and to the stakeholders. How the activity or program is sustained over time should be included.

17. General Service applies to all faculty and can include service to the university (program, department, college, and university), service to one’s profession, and service to the broader community through outreach. Professional service implies the use of one’s expertise to serve the broader community and refers to work that draws upon one’s professional expertise and is an outgrowth of one’s academic discipline. The candidate will provide (in three [3] pages or less) a statement of service goals, accomplishments, and impacts. Following the narrative statement, please list service activities using the following categories:

b. Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations. *Membership and offices held in Professional Societies. Participation in regional research coordinating meetings.*

c. Editorships of Journals or Other Learned Publications. *Discuss the impact of your service. Provide evidence of major contributions which affected the societies/associations beyond routine committee and officer service; include recognition and honors.*

d. Service to Funding Agencies as Panel Reviewer on Grant Proposals. *Indicate the impact of service to funding agency including potential to impact field/body of knowledge.*

e. Outreach and Service to Community.

18. Evaluation of Assigned Professional Service or General Service - department head or designee will evaluate service and insert into dossier as follows:

a. Assigned Professional Service - Provide the name of the evaluator with signature. This evaluation is based on peer observation, evaluation metrics with clients, evaluation interviews or focus groups with clients, or letters of evaluation from qualified authorities. Evidence of excellence and impact will be evaluated as demonstrated by (for example) change in individual or organizational practices/behavior, economic benefit, improvements in learning, the human condition or organizational practices. A portion of this evaluation should address future potential in terms of likeliness of maintaining or improving quality and contributions into the future. Note: the evaluation of roles is NOT included in the external review dossier. The evaluation component should be added before departmental/college/university review begins.

b. General Service - major contributions and accomplishments to the discipline or professional societies/associations, university service, college/department service, or broader community service. The name of the person who developed this component of the evaluation and their signature will be provided. Note: the evaluation of roles is NOT included in the external review dossier. The evaluation component should be added before departmental/college/university review begins.

**Divider with tab labeled “External Letters”**

19. Department head will prepare a summary page of those external peer reviewers selected and invited to review the dossier (See Appendix B). Include name, rank, department, and university affiliation. Please provide a brief statement of explanation as to why this institution/individual was chosen and beside each name, indicate if the reviewer was “chosen by the candidate” or “chosen by the department”.

20. A minimum of four (4) and maximum of six (6) letters inserted by department head. Letters are confidential and available only to Tenure and Promotion Committees and the department head, dean, Provost, and President. These letters should be kept in the same order as listed on the Description of External Peer Reviewers Table.

**Divider with tab labeled “Comments from Supervisors”**

21. Comments from Supervisors (to be inserted by department head). *Please see Appendix F.*

a. Supervisor comments should be the last item in the dossier with the exception of the appendix of required documents. The immediate supervisor/department head should provide the most substantive comments and it is critical to address any negative aspects of the dossier, either by external peer reviewers or internal evaluations of the teaching, scholarship, assigned professional service or general service roles. The department head
should address why granting tenure (including promotion to Associate Professor) or promoting to full Professor is in the best interest of SDSU and the department.

22. Comments from Dean
   a. The dean shall provide explanation on the merits of the candidate and address strengths and weaknesses. The dean’s comments are important if significant questions have been raised in the review process by any reviewer, internal or external, or if there has been a split college vote.

23. Minutes from Department and College Tenure and Promotion Committee(s). Insert minutes from each level deliberation here.

**Divider with tab labeled “Required Documents”**

24. Appendix with the Following Required Documents:
   a. Workload Documents for each semester/year under review (must be signed)
   b. Faculty Annual Review (Part B only) (must be signed)
   c. Professional Development Plan(s) (must be signed)
   d. Department Standards Document

**Divider with tab labeled “Optional Supplemental Materials”**

25. Optional Supplemental Materials (Supplemental material may or may not be thoroughly reviewed by the committee members therefore it is recommended that, if included, they be limited to a maximum of 1-2 representative example[s]).
   a. Copies of funded grants;
   b. Copies of publications (or title page) including journal articles, books, book chapters, manuals, etc.;
   c. Course syllabi and instructional materials;
   d. Patents and copyrights;
   e. Peer observation(s) of teaching and creative activities;
   f. Verifications of creative performances/exhibits;
   g. Works of art, including photos, videos, DVDs and CDs;
   h. Other.

### 12.13 Preparation of Materials for Rank Adjustment for Instructor/Lecture Appointments

The purpose of this section is to guide faculty in the preparation of an effective rank adjustment dossier in an orderly and efficient manner. To assure the work of each faculty member is fully recognized, all candidates are encouraged to be accurate and thorough in the preparation of their materials. The rank adjustment process from Instructor to Lecturer should cover the last 3 to 6 years of the faculty member’s service to SDSU. The promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer should cover the period since the last promotion, or no more than the last 3 to 6 years. Faculty members may include achievements that precede the evaluation period only when their inclusion is relevant.

**General Guidelines**

- Appendix G contains the Rank Adjustment Cover Sheet to be initiated by the department head and completed by the dean and respective committees. The cover sheet shall be placed in the front of the rank adjustment dossier.
Consider the audience. Make sure your dossier is comprehensible for the reviewers of your materials who are not familiar with your field of expertise. Spell out what acronyms stand for and provide sufficient information so a lay person can understand the significance of your achievements.

Design Layout/Formatting
- Bold headings
- Maintain 1.25 inch left margins and 1 inch top, bottom and right margins
- Organize dossier in 3-hole binder with cover sheet indicating the applicant’s name, department, college, and “Dossier for Rank Adjustment to Lecturer or to Senior Lecturer” as appropriate.
- Pages must be numbered consecutively starting with 1
- Single space dossier; print on one side only
- Use “bullets” where appropriate
- Use a “standard” font such as Arial, Times New Roman, Tahoma, or Garamond
- Use 11-12 point font

Keep records of all of contributions from year to year, including an annually updated vita. Maintain good files beginning with the first year of employment. Keep paper or electronic copies of materials that may supplement the dossier.

Make the body (i.e., the part prepared by the faculty member) of the rank adjustment dossier no more than 15 pages in length. The dossier “makes the case” for the rank sought. Appendices may be used as evidence of the statements made in the dossier but should not present new information. There is no page limit for appendices. Be advised that an overly large amount of materials may prevent those reviewing the dossiers from thoroughly reading all materials, so use discretion in dossier preparation.

Note that the guidelines included in this packet include different types of assignments. Each faculty member should include in the dossier only the areas of performance in which the faculty member has assigned responsibilities. The percentage of workload devoted to each of these areas should be reflected in the way those responsibilities are addressed in the dossier. For example, a faculty member with a teaching responsibility of 80% or more should clearly emphasize his/her excellence in that area of performance, since it will have the most weight on the reviewers’ decision.

Schedule adequate time for the preparation of materials. Be sure to review the dossier and make corrections as needed. Also, ask a faculty mentor or a colleague to assist by reviewing materials.

The original dossier will be returned by the Office of Academic Affairs for placement in the official files held by HR. A copy of the dossier must be maintained with the faculty member’s personnel file in the Department.

**Instructions for Preparing and Assembling the Dossier**
The dossier must be assembled in this order and format. Any deviation will result in a dossier returned to the department/candidate for further work.

1. Cover Sheet (see Appendix G)

**Divider with tab labeled “Personal History and Professional Experience”**

2. Background Information
   a. Candidate’s name
   b. Candidate’s department and college
   c. Candidate’s academic rank and date granted
   d. Current date
e. Purpose of the evaluation. Indicate the rank adjustment requested.
f. Evaluation time period. When assembling the dossier, only this time period should be reported.

3. Distribution of assignment across all roles for each semester/year: (taken directly from workload documents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Fall 011</th>
<th>Spring 12</th>
<th>Fall 12</th>
<th>Spring 13</th>
<th>Fall 13</th>
<th>Spring 14</th>
<th>Fall 14</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Professional Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Professional History and Experience:
   a. Educational Background - begin with highest degree; provide the name of the institution, degree, field of study, and date of degree.
   b. List of Academic Positions since final degree - in reverse chronological order from present to past. For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each.
   c. Other Professional Employment - previous and current, in reverse chronological order from present to past. For each position held, list inclusive dates, title, and location for each.
   d. Honors, Recognitions, and Outstanding Achievements - fellowships, prizes, etc. in reverse chronological order from present to past.

Divider with tab labeled “Teaching and Advising”

5. Teaching
   a. Candidate’s statement of his/her approach to teaching and learning specifically addressing how the level of student learning is gauged. In three (3) pages or less, include a personal statement of teaching assignment, philosophy, methods, strengths, problems/challenges, goals, and other material in a manner that will present colleagues with a context for interpreting other evaluative information.
   b. At least two other sources of teaching evidence will be provided by the candidate and used by supervisor or others to evaluate teaching performance.
      • Please note: a. and b. on this section should include key components of typical teaching portfolios and examples are included via web links. Please review and use these as guidelines in preparing the teaching portfolio. Suggested length is 5-10 pages, but it can include appendices. Some useful sites on the creation of teaching portfolios are:
         o http://www.wsu.edu/provost/teaching.htm
         o http://ucat.osu.edu/read/teaching-portfolio
         o http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/resources/DocumentingYourTeaching/TeachingPortfolios/TeachingPortfolios.pdf
   c. Summary of courses taught - provide information for undergraduate and graduate courses both on and off campus and via distance education. For each semester under review provide a list of courses taught, credits or for labs/studios/clinical the number of weekly contact hours, and the number of students in the courses. (See sample table in Appendix C).
   d. Summary of IDEA teaching evaluations. (See sample table in Appendix D).
6. Other contributions to teaching and instructional programs - significant accomplishments can include teaching an honor’s section or honor’s colloquium, curriculum alignment to accreditation standards, accreditation self-studies, development of course materials used by other instructors, training and supervising graduate assistants, SGR or IGR review, adding globalization to the curriculum, extensive independent study or informal interactions with students, instructional improvement projects or activities such as leadership in a significant curricular change, or new course developed.

7. Academic Advising (if relevant)
   a. List number of undergraduate advisees (per year or an average), evaluation data if available, significant accomplishments, impact, etc.
   b. List of number of graduate advisees (list doctoral and master’s students separately and by name), completion date if completed or anticipated completion date, evaluation data, significant accomplishments, impact, etc.
   c. Describe any other special advising-related assignments, either in unit or in campus-wide programs.

Divider with tab labeled “General Service” (if relevant)

8. General Service applies to nearly all faculty and can include service to the university (program, department, college, and university), service to one’s profession, and service to the broader community through outreach. Professional service implies the use of one’s expertise to serve the broader community and refers to work that draws upon one’s professional expertise or is an outgrowth of one’s academic discipline. Discuss the impact of your service. Provide evidence of major contributions which affected the societies/associations beyond routine committee and officer service; include recognition and honors. The candidate will provide (in three [3] pages or less) a statement of service goals, accomplishments and impacts. Following the narrative statement, please list service activities using the following categories. Include only the categories that apply to the specific faculty member:
   b. Service to Disciplinary and Professional Societies or Associations. Membership and offices held in Professional Societies. Participation in regional research coordinating meetings.
   c. Outreach and Service to Community.

Divider with tab labeled “Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity”

Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity is not expected within the rank of instructor/lecturer/senior lecturer. However, if the faculty member is involved in scholarship, a section on research may be included using the applicable sections and format in the guidelines for tenure and promotion.

Divider with tab labeled “Comments from Committee and Supervisors”

9. Comments from Supervisors (to be inserted by department head). Please see Appendix H.
   a. The departmental review committee comments should be inserted here and should address all the areas appropriate of the assignment of the faculty member being evaluated, as well as their recommendation regarding rank adjustment.
b. The immediate supervisor/department head should provide the most substantive comments using Appendix H, and it is critical to address any negative aspects of the dossier on any role.

10. Comments from Dean
   a. The dean shall provide explanation on the merits of the candidate and address strengths and weaknesses in Appendix H. The dean’s comments are important if significant questions have been raised in the review process by any reviewer, internal or external, or if there has been a split college vote.

Divider with tab labeled “Required Documents”

11. Appendix with the Following Required Documents (including only the years under review):
   a. Workload Document for each semester/year under review (must be signed)
   b. Professional Staff Evaluations/FAR (Part B only) (must be signed)
   c. Student Opinion Survey summaries prepared by the department head
   d. Department Standards Document

Divider with tab labeled “Optional Supplemental Materials”

12. Optional Supplemental Materials (Supplemental material may or may not be thoroughly reviewed by the committee members therefore it is recommended that, if included, they be limited to a maximum of 1-2 representative example(s) in each category). Supplemental materials may include:
   a. Course syllabi and instructional materials;
   b. Evidence of student learning outcomes;
   c. Peer observation(s) of teaching and creative activities;
   d. Other

If multiple materials are included, it is highly recommended that a contents page be included at the beginning of this section indicating the materials available, the pages in which each of those materials begins, and when appropriate for clarity the category to which each sample applies (for example, teaching, outreach, etc.). Remember these materials should reinforce and corroborate information already included in your dossier, not provide new information that reviewers may miss.
Appendix A
Tenure and Promotion Cover Sheet

| Section 12: Page 28 |

| College: | | | | | |
| Department: | | | | | |
| Name: | | | | | |
| Current Academic Rank: | | | | | |
| Rank Sought: | | | | | |
| Highest Degree: | | Date Awarded: | | | |
| Institution: | | Field: | | | |
| Date appointed or promoted to current rank: | | | | | |
| Date of Initial Appointment at SDSU: | | | | | |
| Has advanced credit toward tenure or promotion been approved by the Board of Regents? | yes | no |
| If yes, how many years? | | Date approved by BOR | | | |
| Is this request an exception to the minimum eligibility for tenure/promotion? | | | | | |
| Department Tenure and Promotion Committee's Recommendation: | | | | | |
| For Tenure | Vote: | # Yes | | No | | Abstain | | |
| For Promotion | Vote: | # Yes | | No | | Abstain | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |
| Department Head's Recommendation: | | | | | |
| For Tenure | | Yes | | No | | |
| For Promotion | | Yes | | No | | |
| Department Head's Signature | | Date | | | |
| College Tenure and Promotion Committee's Recommendation: | | | | | |
| For Tenure | Vote: | # Yes | | No | | Abstain | | |
| For Promotion | Vote: | # Yes | | No | | Abstain | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |
| College Dean's Recommendation: | | | | | |
| For Tenure | | Yes | | No | | |
| For Promotion | | Yes | | No | | |
| Dean's Signature | | Date | | | |
Appendix B

*Guidelines, Example Letter and Form for External Peer Review*

The external review dossier is identical to the tenure and promotion dossier except it does not include a cover sheet, the table of external reviewers, or any evaluation components for teaching, research/scholarship, and professional/general service developed by the department head, designee, or dean. The materials submitted to an external reviewer should include departmental information and may include a curriculum vita or examples of applicant's work, if helpful.

The external review dossier may be a preliminary document, recognizing that final changes/addition/formatting may still be necessary with the tenure and promotion dossier. All materials prepared and sent to the external reviewers should be assembled using the format outlined for a dossier and should be placed in a 3-ring binder with overall thickness of no more than one inch. The external review dossier will include the following required and optional components:

**Required:**
1. The tenure and/or promotion dossier except those items noted above.
2. Department Standards Document, or appropriate section(s)
3. A selected publication or other scholarly material of greatest significance for tenure or promotion.

**Optional:**
1. Curriculum vita (CV).

Note: Prior to sending the letter of instructions and dossier, it is highly suggested that the department head email or call each reviewer and obtain their consent to serve as an external reviewer. This eliminates unnecessary mailing of materials and/or a non-response to the request.
Sample Letter to External Reviewer

Date

Peer Reviewer, PhD
University
City, State

Dear [Evaluator’s Name]:

Assistant Professor [faculty member’s name] is being considered for tenure with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at South Dakota State University. (Alternative: Associate Professor [name] is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.) External evaluations from at least four appropriately credential reviewers are critically important for the assessment of [faculty member's name] record. I am writing to ask that you submit your independent evaluation of [name]'s professional achievements and contributions in a letter addressed to me. Specifically, please provide your professional evaluation of:

- the candidate's research activities and the significance of the candidate's scholarly accomplishments and contributions;
- the candidate’s promise of becoming a leading scholar (for promotion to full Professor the candidate needs to have become a leading recognized scholar);
- the candidate’s accomplishments and contributions to teaching;
- the candidate’s professional and public service activities;
- the candidate’s standing in relation to others at a comparable or higher career level whom you regard as potential leaders in this field;
- factors that you think may be of importance to us in evaluating the candidate’s capabilities, accomplishments, and potential reputation.

I am enclosing materials to assist with your evaluation. The overarching criteria for tenure with promotion are the demonstration by the candidate of significant accomplishments and the promise of becoming a master teacher, recognized scholar, and/or exemplary provider of service. Mastery is evidenced when the candidate has made significant contributions in the quality and quantity of research, teaching and service, and shows likelihood of sustaining these contributions to the discipline.

Assistant Professor [name]’s professional responsibilities are __% teaching, __% research scholarship, and __% specific professional service, and __% general service

(For promotion from associate to full Professor use the following): The overarching criterion for promotion to full Professor is that the candidate has clearly demonstrated leadership through significant accomplishments and contributions to their discipline. The candidate must be an accomplished, respected leading scholar and teacher or provider of public service. Associate Professor [name]'s professional responsibilities are __% teaching, __% research scholarship, and __% specific professional service, and __% general service.)

In your letter please disclose if you know the candidate and if so, how you came to know the candidate and the nature of your relationship with the candidate.

The policy at South Dakota State is to hold in confidence all letters of evaluation from external reviewers. Only the committees and administrative officers directly responsible for the decision will have access to your letter. Your letter of evaluation will not be provided to the candidate.

In order to be most effective, we need to have your letter by [date]. Should this time frame be a problem or should you have questions or need additional materials, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Please accept our sincere thanks for your time and effort. You are providing a valuable professional service and we are indebted to you for your thorough evaluation and honest forthright critique.

Sincerely,

Head of Department
Appendix B

Description of External Peer Reviewers for the Tenure or Promotion of ________________

(Table to be completed by department head and inserted prior to the external letters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Reviewer</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Chosen by Department Head or Candidate</th>
<th>Rational for selecting this individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please place letters in the order listed on this table.*

Appendix C

*Tabular Summary of Courses Taught During Evaluation Period by Year and Term*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits or Workload Units</th>
<th>Percent (%) Responsibility</th>
<th>Number of students enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Tabular Summary of Teaching Evaluations for Courses Taught During Evaluation Period

(Format for IDEA Instrument)

List in reverse chronological order by year – present to past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Progress on Relevant Obj*</th>
<th>Overall rating Teacher*</th>
<th>Overall rating Course*</th>
<th>Summary Score*</th>
<th>Number of Evaluators/ Enrolled</th>
<th>Benchmark Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report only highest score
Appendix E

Summary Tables for Scholarly Work and Grants
Please insert at the appropriate place in the Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities Section
Use as Appropriate to your Dossier

Publications, Presentations, Exhibit, Performance
(Please enter number of works under appropriate categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarship</th>
<th>First, lead or corresponding author</th>
<th>Co-author</th>
<th>International or National in Scope</th>
<th>Regional in Scope</th>
<th>State or local in scope</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Percent Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter in Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Activity
(Please enter number of grants and total amount ($) of grants under appropriate categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of grant</th>
<th>Principal Investigator (PI)</th>
<th>Co-PI</th>
<th>Technical assistance but not at PI/Co-PI level</th>
<th>Other contribution (please describe)</th>
<th>Percent Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationally competitive/peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally competitive/peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State competitive/peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal to SDSU/peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Tenure and/or Promotion

Department Head and Dean Response Form

Written Comments by Department Head:

__________________________________________________________
Department Head Date

__________________________________________________________
Written Comments by Dean:

__________________________________________________________
Dean Date
Appendix G

Rank Adjustment Cover Sheet

College: ____________________________________________
Department: ________________________________________
Name: _____________________________________________
Current Academic Rank: ______________________________
Rank Sought: _______________________________________
Highest Degree: __________________ Date Awarded: ________
Institution: __________________ Field: __________________
Date appointed or promoted to current rank: _____________
Date of Initial Appointment at SDSU: __________________
Is this request an exception to the minimum eligibility for rank adjustment?

No ___ Yes ____ in what way
Lacks ______ years of service
Lacks ______ terminal degree.

Department Committee's Recommendation:

Vote: # Yes ________ # No ________ # Abstain ________

Comments:

Department Head's Recommendation:

_________________________ Yes ________ No ________
Department Head's Signature Date

College Dean's Recommendation:

_________________________ Yes ________ No ________
Dean's Signature Date