The Tenure and Promotion Process: An Overview
Presented by the FPC and Office of Faculty Affairs

2019-2020 Academic Year

This interactive workshop has been redefined to help you better understand the tenure and promotion process.

Handouts

1. FPC Evaluation Schedule
2. Evaluation Evidence *(from Section V of the Faculty Manual)*
3. File Preparation Guidelines
4. Most Frequently asked ePortfolio Questions (FAQs)
5. Tenure Track Expectations
6. External Reviewer Questions *(TT, Assistant to Associate with tenure, others available upon request)*
7. Identifying Questionable Publishers

Chapman University – 2019-2020
FPC Evaluation Schedule for Faculty Annual Reports & Peer Evaluations

Action	Critical Year Candidates	Tenure &/or Promotion Candidates	All Other Faculty (Annual report)
NOTICE OF INTENT to apply for **Tenure and/or Promotion** is submitted to Provost. (Email is acceptable with cc to Chair, Dean, & Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA).		March 1	
EXTERNAL REVIEWER NAMES T/P Candidates submit four names, CVs, and contact information of external reviewers to their Dean. (*Candidates must describe relationship, if any, to reviewer and provide documentation of reviewer's willingness to serve.)		March 15	
*Candidate's external reviewer materials and the Dean's external reviewer recommendations are submitted by the Dean's Office to OFA.		April 12	
T/P EXTERNAL REVIEW EPORTFOLIO T/P Candidate's ePortfolio will function as the External Reviewer ePortfolio. It will be closed out by the OFA and considered submitted as final at 4pm.		June 3	
EPORTFOLIO DOWNTIME & CLONING The system will be down for upgrades and the cloning process.		June 3-7	
T/P INTERNAL EPORTFOLIO T/P Candidate can begin to customize their cloned ePortfolio for their Internal Reviewers. (They will be editing what was submitted as their External Review ePortfolio on June 3rd.)		June 7	
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS will receive the ePortfolio from OFA.		June 14	
T/P INTERNAL REVIEW EPORTFOLIO T/P Candidate's Internal Review ePortfolio is closed out by the OFA and considered submitted as final at 4pm.		Tuesday, September 3	
CRITICAL YEAR EPORTFOLIO CY Candidate's ePortfolio is closed out by the OFA and considered submitted as final at 4pm.	Tuesday, September 3		
ANNUAL REPORTS – ONLINE *"Submit My Report"* and add all appropriate evaluators to your file (varies depending on school)			Tuesday, September 3
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS received and redacted letters will be added to the candidate's internal ePortfolio.		*September 6	
EVALUATIONS DUE External Reviewer evaluation due to Provost - *Redacted copies are added to the file after the internal file by OFA by 9/7*		August 1	
Chair evaluation due to Office of Faculty Affairs	October 4	October 11	October 18
FRC/FPRC evaluation due to Office of Faculty Affairs	October 4	October 25	
Dean evaluation due Office of Faculty Affairs	October 25	November 8	November 15
FPC Evaluation due to Office of Faculty Affairs	Feb. 3, 2020	Feb. 14, 2020	
Provost decision	Mar. 20, 2020	April 15, 2020	

Important Notes:
- **Section V** of the Faculty Manual details of the Faculty Evaluation process. A copy & other instructional materials are located on the OFA website.
- **Unit Criteria** are available in your Dean's Office.
- **All evaluations** that are part of the current evaluation process are copied to the candidate by the evaluator. The Internal ePortfolio will be updated with all approved materials and evaluations that come in during the evaluation period on the Post-Submission tab. Candidates may, if desired, respond in writing to any evaluation within 7 business days of the date the letter is received by the OFA or the above due date, whichever is greater. To do so, the response needs to be submitted to OFA within the set time frame. It will then be added to a candidate's file (ePortfolio) and becomes part of the permanent record.
- **Faculty in the evaluation process should monitor their ePortfolio to assure receipt and posting of materials.**
- **Workshops** are held on the process and faculty are highly encouraged to attend.

For questions regarding the process contact Eileen Besner, Director of Faculty Affairs at besner@chapman.edu

B. Evaluative Criteria for Full-Time Faculty Members

According to University Criteria, as a general principle, tenure and promotion require all candidates to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly or creative work, mentoring and advising and service. However, expectations in scholarly/creative activity shall be higher for those whose teaching loads have been reduced in exchange for increased scholarly/creative productivity. Evaluation of all faculty members shall be based on contractual obligations, annual reports, and published department or academic unit criteria (Unit Criteria). Faculty will be evaluated on the basis of the Unit Criteria in force when the initial tenure-track contract was signed or the current criteria if no Unit Criteria existed at the time of signing. If the structure of a faculty member's academic unit changes during the candidate's probationary period, the faculty member shall have the choice of being reviewed using the previous Unit Criteria or that developed by the new unit. All faculty who began a tenure-track faculty position in 2009-10 and after are required to submit their critical year and tenure and/or promotion materials electronically. If it is not feasible to submit certain materials electronically, faculty must indicate in their portfolio which material is available only in non-electronic form. Such materials will be held in the Office of Faculty Affairs.

1. University Criteria

The University Standards and expectations for excellence in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, advising/mentoring, and service are primarily set forth in sections a-c below. Unit Criteria shall be based on these University expectations and provide discipline-specific guidelines for faculty working to achieve excellence in these areas.

> a. Except in the School of Law, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are normally granted simultaneously, although individual situations may arise in which a faculty member is promoted to Associate Professor without the granting of tenure. Demonstrated excellence in teaching is necessary for promotion to this rank, as well as an established record of high quality scholarly/creative accomplishments that shows clear promise of continuation. In addition, candidates are expected to demonstrate a reasonable level of engagement in service, particularly at the departmental level.

> b. Except in the School of Law, consideration for promotion to Professor normally occurs during the seventh year in rank as Associate Professor. Promotion to Professor comes after demonstrated excellence in teaching and prolonged active and respected participation in one's professional field and in the life of the University. Additionally, the candidate must demonstrate an exemplary record of achievement through scholarly/creative work such as publications, performances, exhibitions, or other forms of peer-reviewed scholarly/creative materials.

> c. A faculty member who wishes to be reconsidered for promotion as permitted under the provisions of this Manual must prepare a new promotion file. This file must include evidence of work completed since the last consideration, as well as the relevant materials used in previous considerations. The file may include the names and rationales for new letters of evaluation from outside reviewers.

2. Unit Criteria

The department or academic unit shall develop written general guidelines and Unit Criteria for evaluation, which must be reviewed every five years and updated if necessary. Unit Criteria shall be approved

by the Faculty Personnel Council and the Provost. Unit Criteria may not conflict with the criteria for evaluation described elsewhere in this Manual as University Criteria. Non-tenure-track faculty will be evaluated on the basis of specific criteria defined in writing by the Faculty Manual, Unit Criteria, and their Faculty Agreement.

Each unit shall develop two sets of evaluative criteria, one specifying guidelines for tenure candidates and one for faculty seeking promotion to full professor. Both sets of criteria shall be as specific as possible, making sure to provide appropriate guidelines for each of the following categories, as well as any additional areas pertinent to the discipline. These guidelines may be further specified at the department or program level to include, for example, lists of discipline-specific peer-reviewed journals, presses, or creative venues.

a. Teaching -- Candidates for tenure and promotion must possess a consistent history of demonstrated excellence in teaching and the potential for sustained excellence in the future. Teaching shall be interpreted to include appropriate work and involvement with students beyond as well as within the classroom and may include mentoring and advising. Unit Criteria shall specify the nature and extent of mentoring and advising activity that is expected of candidates. Unit criteria shall also outline what constitutes appropriate evidence of excellence in teaching, including a description of the unit's peer review process.

b. Scholarly/creative activity -- Unit Criteria shall specify the number and/or type of publications, presentations, exhibitions, shows, or performances that are expected of candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. Unit Criteria shall also describe how candidates may offer concrete evidence regarding the ways their scholarly/creative work has contributed to their field.

c. Service -- Unit Criteria shall specify the amount and nature of service activities expected of candidates for tenure and/or promotion at the unit and university level. In general, tenure candidates shall not be required to engage in extensive service activity during their probationary period, but may limit their participation to the department or academic unit level. Promotion candidates shall be required to provide evidence of substantial participation in the life of the university at all levels of service.

3. Distribution and Use of Unit Criteria

a. The Dean shall provide a copy of the Unit Criteria to each faculty member at the time of appointment, and shall also provide a copy to the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Faculty Personnel Council.

b. The Office of Faculty Affairs and the Faculty Personnel Council shall maintain a complete file of Unit Criteria for each unit, including all previously approved versions, in order to provide an historical record.

c. These criteria shall be used by all evaluators when reviewing the faculty member's annual reports, critical year reviews, tenure, and promotion files.

C. Evaluation Evidence (as listed)

As a general principle, tenure and promotion require all candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, mentoring and advising, scholarly or creative work, and service. Annual Reports demonstrate faculty accomplishments in these areas during the previous academic year.

1. Annual Report Contents

In their Annual Reports, faculty members should list courses taught during the previous academic year. Faculty members should also provide brief descriptions of the following:

a) Scholarly/creative work completed and/or in progress

b) New or revised courses, as well as new pedagogical approaches undertaken

c) Responses to or explanations of student evaluation scores or comments, if the faculty member deems it appropriate.

d) Mentoring/advising activities, including number of advisees (graduate and undergraduate), description of advising sessions, attendance at mentoring/advising workshops, etc.

e) Specific accomplishments in the area of service to the academic unit, university, or community

2. Critical Year, Tenure, and Promotion Portfolio Contents

Faculty in critical years and faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion shall submit electronic portfolios for this purpose. The Office of Academic Technology and Digital Media is available for training faculty in the creation of electronic portfolios. New faculty are advised to begin collecting (preferably electronically) the evidence indicated below during their first semester at Chapman and to update these files yearly to facilitate timely completion of critical year, tenure, and promotion portfolios.

a. Curriculum Vitae -- A current copy of the candidate's CV

b. Executive Summary -- A summary of the candidate's preparation and readiness for tenure and/or promotion and an overview of his or her teaching, scholarly, creative activities, advising/mentoring, service, and administrative activities (if applicable). In addition, the summary should specify any special contractual provisions about which reviewers should be aware. The Executive Summary should typically be no longer than one single-spaced page in length.

c. Unit Criteria -- The version of Unit Criteria for tenure and/or promotion by which the candidate is to be evaluated.

d. Teaching Personal Statement -- A description of the candidate's teaching philosophy and pedagogical practices, as well as successes achieved and challenges faced. This statement should typically be no longer than three pages in length.

e. Teaching Portfolio -- A compilation of materials providing multifaceted evidence of excellent teaching. In preparing their Teaching Portfolio, candidates should bear in mind that teaching includes appropriate work and involvement within and beyond the classroom. Candidates should consult section IV.A of the Faculty Manual and their Unit Criteria for general and specific expectations of faculty in the area of teaching. The sections of the Teaching Portfolio are as follows:

> i. Teaching Portfolio: Student Evaluations -- The candidate should include all student evaluations from each class taught at Chapman, placing these in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

ii. Teaching Portfolio: Grade Distributions -- The candidate should upload the grade distribution data for his or her classes that are prepared by the Provost's Office and sent to faculty members at the end of each academic year. These grade distributions should be placed in descending chronological order, with the most recent data placed first. The candidate should explain high grade distributions or lack of variety in grade distributions.

iii. Teaching Portfolio: Selected Course Materials -- The candidate should select representative samples of materials that demonstrate his or her excellence as a teacher. Documentation may include but is not limited to:

- Course outlines
- Course handouts
- Electronic teaching links (e.g., Blackboard) and/or copy of link page
- Examinations
- Syllabi from new courses developed
- Syllabi from courses substantially revised

iv. Teaching: Additional Documentation -- Additional documentation may be included, as applicable, including:

- Teaching awards
- Testimonials from students or colleagues
- Evidence of teacher training (e.g., such as certificates of attendance at teaching workshops)
- Video demonstrations of teaching
- Other evidence that attests to teaching excellence

f. Scholarly/Creative: Personal Statement -- A description of the nature and scope of the candidate's scholarly/creative activity, providing details that will inform an audience unfamiliar with this particular discipline. In addition, the statement should include an explanation of the impact the candidate's research or creative work. This statement should typically be no longer than three pages in length.

g. Scholarly/Creative: Documentation -- A compilation of materials providing evidence of excellence in scholarly and creative activity. In compiling these materials, candidates should consult Section IV.G of the Faculty Manual and their Unit Criteria for general and specific expectations of faculty in the area of scholarly/creative activity. The candidate should provide examples of his or her best work, as well as any data concerning the originality and significance of this work. Documentation may include but is not limited to:

- Copies of and/or links to published books, articles, chapters, papers, published music, reports, slides, videotapes, CDs, or DVDs. Evidence which by its nature cannot be inserted in the file (e.g., large art works, musical performances) should be noted in writing with an indication of where the work is located or was performed.
- Representative reviews of scholarly work in professional journals and reviews of performances should be included when appropriate.
- Evidence of grants or awards received (e.g., copies of acceptance letters)
- Evidence of presentation of scholarly/creative work to peers

h. Service: Personal Statement -- A description of the candidate's service, including his or her service philosophy and approach, as well as specific successes achieved and challenges faced. The statement should note how this service activity contributes to the university, the discipline or profession, and/or the community. This Statement should typically be no longer than two pages in length.

i. Service: Documentation -- A compilation of materials providing evidence of excellent service activity. In compiling these materials, candidates should consult Section IV.C of the Faculty Manual and their Unit Criteria for general and specific expectations of faculty in the area of service. Candidate should bear in mind that service includes service to the university, to the field or profession, and to the community (local, national, international). Service to the university includes but is not limited to serving on department, college or university committees and faculty governance; participating in or helping to organize student-sponsored events; and participating in or helping to organize department, college or university events. Service to the field or profession includes but is not limited to membership/leadership in professional organizations and participation in professional organization events. Service to the community includes but is not limited to membership/leadership in community organizations and volunteer activities. Documentation may include but is not limited to:

- E-mails, letters from committee chairs/members, and other correspondence attesting to the service rendered
- Certificates of appreciation
- Awards
- Descriptions of events and written testimonials of event participants

j. Advising/Mentoring: Documentation -- A compilation of materials providing evidence of excellent advising/mentoring activity. In compiling these materials, candidates should consult Section IV.B of the Faculty Manual and their Unit Criteria for general and specific expectations of faculty in the area of advising/mentoring. Differences in approaches between undergraduate and graduate mentoring should be described as well as the various types of advisees (if relevant) such as Freshmen Foundations and undeclared. Documentation may include but is not limited to:

- Number of advisees, undergraduate and graduate.
- Number of recommendations provided for students (written letters, phone conversations, emails)
- Additional mentoring and advising activities (participation in mentoring and advising workshops, speaking to students during Orientation or Discover Chapman Day, advising student organizations, etc.)

k. Administrative: Personal Statement (if applicable) -- A description of the candidate's administrative duties, including title, number of people supervised, and specific responsibilities. The candidate's administrative and/or managerial philosophy and approach should be included, as well as specific successes achieved and challenges faced. In addition, the statement should explain how this administrative position affects the teaching, scholarly/creative, and service expectations outlined for faculty in the Unit Criteria.

l. Administrative: Documentation (if applicable) -- A compilation of materials providing evidence of excellence in administrative activity. Documentation may include but is not limited to:

- Samples of non-confidential reports or documents that you produced that highlight your administrative achievements
- Copies of letters or emails that attest to the candidate's successful handling of an administrative issue

- Letters from the candidate's supervisor or person(s) supervised that provide an evaluation of the candidate's performance
- Any other pertinent evidence that shows the successful completion of assigned responsibilities

m. Annual Reports/Critical Year Reviews -- The candidate should include copies of all annual reports/critical year reviews generated during the tenure or promotion period, placing them in descending chronological order, with the most recent annual reports/critical year reviews placed first.

n. External Reviewer Evaluations *(Tenure and Promotion Only)* -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload redacted letters submitted by external reviewers.

o. Department Chair Evaluations (if applicable) -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload the current evaluation letter from the Department Chair (in units with departments) or the individual serving in this role (in units without departments that assign this evaluative capacity to another faculty member). The candidate should include all Department Chair evaluations from previous years, placing these in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

p. Dean Evaluations -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload the current evaluation from the Dean. The candidate
should upload Dean evaluations from previous years, placing these in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

q. FRC Evaluations (if applicable) -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload the current evaluation from the FRC. The candidate should include all FRC evaluations from previous years, placing evaluations in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

r. FPRC Evaluation (if applicable) -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload the current evaluation from the FPRC (if applicable).

s. FPC Evaluations (if applicable) -- The Office of Faculty Affairs will upload the current evaluation from the FPC.
The candidate should upload all FPC evaluations from previous years, placing these in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

t. Peer Evaluations -- Faculty are required to arrange periodic peer reviews of their teaching (see Unit Criteria for specifics). The candidate should place all peer teaching evaluations in descending chronological order, with the most recent evaluations placed first.

u. Faculty Response (if applicable) -- Candidates may submit responses to internal (e.g., Dean, FRC) and/or external review letters by the published deadlines, if they feel these are warranted.

v. Other (Optional) -- Candidates may include additional documentation as applicable. This section may include legacy materials for faculty who have been granted time toward tenure.

FILE PREPARTION GUIDELINES (all faculty appointments)
CRITICAL YEAR /TENURE / PROMOTION FILES
2019-2020

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Faculty Manual (FM) - Read section V of the FM on the evaluation process. The Faculty Manual (FM) explains the process in detail. Be sure to read it carefully. You can find it on the Portal as well as the Faculty website, under the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA). Your evaluation is informed based on the University Criteria as well as your Unit Criteria.

Unit Criteria - Review your unit's Unit Criteria which informs your process and standards for evaluation for promotion and or tenure. Unit Criteria exists for tenure track, tenured, and non-tenure track faculty. The expectations vary. The areas include: teaching, scholarly/creative and service.

Office of Faculty Affairs – OFA is available to support all questions related to the evaluation process. They are a resource and can help with items including the location of documents, your evaluation schedule, questions on content, ePortfolio example files, and one on one support. Technical questions will be directed to Academic Technology. OFA works closely with the evaluators and the faculty alike.

Workshop Support – A series of three workshops exist for support in this process. They include an overview, *Nuts and Bolts Workshop*, a conversation with the Provost in *What is Excellence in the Tenure and Promotion Process?* and technical *"How To" Workshops*, provided by Educational Technology Services. You are encouraged to attend.

Request an ePortfolio - Each full time faculty member should request an ePortfolio if they are tenure track, tenured or non-tenure track and will be seeking a promotion. You can request one through OFA. We can send you the link.

Start building an ePortfolio Now – all faculty including tenure track faculty, tenured faculty, and non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion and or tenure are required to build an ePortfolio highlighting their teaching, scholarly/creative works, and service. If you are new or won't consider going up for promotion for a few years, you are encouraged to start building your file now. The files are available year round.

UNDERSTANDING THE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Faculty Evaluation Schedule - Each year the FPC sets the Evaluation Calendar schedule which closely follows the time frames noted in Section V of the FM. The schedule gives a break out on due dates for those faculty categorizes as: Critical Year Candidates, Tenure /Promotion, or All Other Faculty. (Other faculty are faculty in regular review year who are required to complete an online Annual Report – which is not part of the discussion of this document.)

Maintenance Window and ePortfolio Cloning - The ePortfolio is unavailable for platform upgrades and maintenance for a few days each year in early June. Going forward, the file will be cloned / copied on the date which corresponds with the External ePortfolio due date.

IMPORTANT FOR FACULTY IN THE TENURE/PROMOTION PROCESS & POST CY
The original file (the one that was being designed PRIOR to the cloning date) *will be submitted to the candidate's External Reviewers* by OFA. The copy of that file, will then be available for the faculty who are in the Tenure/Promotion cycle to craft for their Internal Reviewers, due in the Fall.

Evaluations & Faculty Response - The schedule includes due dates of evaluation letters. Each evaluator or evaluative committee is required to provide the candidate with a copy of their written evaluation allowing faculty a limited time to respond, as noted on the schedule. Pay close attention to the schedule. If you have not received an evaluation expected by your due date, contact OFA to check.

CANDIDATE TYPES
Critical Year Tenure Track Candidates - CY candidates have historically & generally been tenure track faculty who are being reviewed in the beginning of their second and fourth years at Chapman. (If you are unsure of your CY schedule, check with your Dean's Office or OFA for assistance.)

Non-Tenure Track Promotion Candidates - NTT promotion candidates who have met the requirement for promotion consideration also need to build an ePortfolio. Some NTT faculty have also asked requested to partake in a CY review as well, to assure they are on track for future promotion consideration. NTT faculty seeking promotion are not required to use external reviewers.

Tenure and Promotion Candidates – Faculty seeking tenure and promotion generally begin the process in the fall following their 6th year. Tenured faculty seeking promotion may seek it after the completion of six years at their current faculty rank. (These are general guidelines and may vary. The FM provides for earlier evaluation if supported.)

MAJOR TABS IN THE EPORTFOLIO
The major tab include:

> ➤ Home - General introduction page.

> ➤ Profile - Contains CV, Executive Summary, Notice of Intent (T&P only), Unit Criteria, Annual Reports, Prior Evaluations, Unsolicited Letters of Support.

> ➤ Teaching - Contains *Personal Statement/Teaching Philosophy, Introduction, Course Evaluations, Grade Distributions, Selected Course Materials, Peer Evaluations, Additional Documentation.

> ➤ Scholarly/Creative Activity - Contains *Personal Statement and Documentation.

> ➤ Service - Contains *Personal Statement, Documentation, Student Advising, Administrative (if applicable).

> ➤ Evaluation - Maintained by OFA, this section contains historical evaluations by Chairs /Associate Deans, FRC/FPRC, Dean, FPC, Provost as applicable.

➢ Post Submission Tab – Maintained by OFA, this section includes ALL materials that come in after your file is closed out, including evaluations during the current cycle)

* Evaluators have asked that we remind candidates, as indicated in the FM, teaching, scholarly / creative and service statements should be 2-3 pages.

INTERNAL REVIEW FILE PREPARATION
All candidates – CY, Tenure, or Promotion Seeking Faculty

Internal Review File – ePortfolio Suggestions for preparing this portion of your portfolio from our Faculty Personnel Council are included below. Internal files will vary in size be it a CY or Promotion to Full Professor file.

➢ Due Date - The ePortfolio will be closed out at 4pm on the due date.

➢ Hard Copies - If you will have any additional materials for Internal Evaluators to review (books for example), they are due to OFA by 4pm on the published due date.

➢ Required File Contents - A summary of required file contents and their descriptions can be found in the Faculty Manual, at the end of Section V. Include ALL required materials.

➢ Landing Pages - You should include a general introduction to the file as well as prefatory remarks for each section of the file.

➢ Indicators of Publication Quality

➢ Speak to your Audience - Many of the Internal Reviewers who read critical year and tenure and promotion files are outside of a candidates' discipline. A document that presents information about the prestige, ranking, and/or quality of academic publication outlets is recommended.

Examples of this type of information include:

- o Basic descriptions of the publication outlet, including the primary discipline or educational association that they serve (or if they are interdisciplinary) and whether they are regional, national, or international in scope.

- o Acceptance rate (preferably during the editorship when the research was published)

- o Citation indices or impact factors (preferably during the year the research was published) if an academic journal or any other ranking information for a book (if available).

- o Number of times the research has been cited in by other published academic sources (this information can be obtained from Google Scholar or from an academic research database that focuses on the candidate's discipline).

- If a book, include copies of published reviews of the book if available.

- Anything else that the candidate believes represents substantive information about the quality of the publication outlet of their research.

➢ Post Submission Items - After the file is closed, no additional material may be added to the file except for letters of acceptance, etc. received for articles, etc. already submitted and which were listed in your file as being under consideration. Include all works in progress in your file so if something changes you can then update your file as needed.

➢ Strong File - You are responsible for building the strongest possible file. Include materials that are substantive and can speak to your record. Explain any issues or concerns that may be in your file.

➢ Judicious - In preparing your file, be judicious. It must be strong, but it should not appear to be padded. Do not include superfluous materials.

INTERNAL REVIEW FILE CONTENT (FM Section V)

Keep in mind your Unit Criteria should inform the development of your file. *If you are non-tenure track going up for promotion, your UC may not require scholarship. Therefore you won't have much or perhaps you won't have anything in that section. That is appropriate. However if you are tenure track going up for promotion, your UC will require scholarly/creative works.*

Evaluation Evidence: Teaching

➢ The Faculty Manual requires a "teaching portfolio" to be submitted as part of your promotion and/or tenure review. The Faculty Manual also outlines the necessary components of that portfolio. (See FM, Section V, Appendix Documentation.) Suggestions for preparing this portion of your portfolio from our Faculty Personnel Council are listed below. *Reference university and unit averages in your analysis where applicable.*

➢ Actions for Improvement - If there are areas of concern raised consistently in your student evaluations, these should be carefully and frankly addressed and/or explained. Discussing any corrective actions taken would be extremely helpful.

➢ Score Analysis - An analysis of the scores from your student evaluations is very helpful. Use student comments to illustrate your analysis.

➢ Grade distributions - Include and comment on or explain this information; this is especially important if there are any apparent anomalies, such as an unusually high number of very high grades.

➢ Peer Evaluations – They can be from colleagues of other institutions as well as on campus can provide an additional and valuable perspective about the quality of your teaching.

➢ Evidence - Any independent evidence of the quality and rigor of your teaching should be included; for example, if you teach a prerequisite or foundation course, written comments from faculty members who teach advanced courses attesting to the readiness of your students for these courses could be helpful.

➢ Advising / Mentoring - Describe any advising/mentoring you do. Include a statement of your philosophy as well as any materials you utilize, information or frequency of meetings, mentoring concerning major or graduate school, etc. You may wish to use case studies to illustrate. If you do not have any official advisees, provide an explanation.

Evaluation Evidence: Service

➢ Major Areas - Provide a clear and complete picture of your major contributions, especially as related to faculty governance, participation in core courses or interdisciplinary courses, and university-wide initiatives, such as WASC committees, special task forces, etc. Discuss service activities within your school or department as well as the University. Include information on any community service.

➢ Release time? - If you have received release time for administrative duties, they need to be defined and discussed. Evaluative materials concerning your performance should also be provided.

Evaluation Evidence: Scholarly/Creative Activity

➢ Provide a contextual framework for your scholarly/creative work, such as information concerning the selectivity of journals and publications, or of the venues showing your art exhibits, performances, screenings, etc., because evidence of peer review is of critical importance. Include such information about conference presentations. For example, were the papers reviewed for acceptance, is it a national conference, etc.

➢ Include information about editing journals or other learned publications or serving as a consultant for exhibitions or performances.

➢ If your scholarly/creative work does not have a clear focus, it is very important that you explain how the work is related to your teaching or other elements of your scholarly/creative agenda.

➢ Include information about any joint student faculty scholarly/creative activities, especially those that have resulted in presentations/papers.

➢ Discussion of your future scholarly/creative activities should be included.

Evaluation Evidence: Other
The faculty manual outlines other materials as well which include as applicable: Annual Reports with evaluations, Critical Year Evaluations, CV, Executive Summary, Unit Criteria, and Advising/Mentoring.

Post Submissions (Internal Review ePortfolio)

ALL items added during the current evaluation cycle will be placed here by OFA. This includes all evaluations, any approved updates to the candidate's file as well as any candidate responses, to any evaluations.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER FILE PREPARATION
Tenure/Promotion candidates who are using External Reviewers

External Reviewer Candidate Submissions - Submit four names and contact information of four prospective reviewers, with CVs, to your Dean by the published deadline, which is generally the second week of March.

> ➢ Willingness - Include confirmation of their willingness to participate. _(Be sure that your external reviewers know in advance that your submission will be electronic. OFA is unable to provide a paper copy of an ePortfolio.)_

> ➢ Deadline - Make sure your proposed evaluators are aware of the deadline which is August 1.

> ➢ Contact Information - Include name, address, email address and contact telephone number. Post Office boxes are _not_ acceptable if shipping of any materials are needed.

> ➢ Exceptional Reviewers - Select respected individuals in your field with very strong credentials because this will add to the credibility of their letters. It is generally advised not to include persons who may appear to be biased, such as a Ph.D. advisor or recent co-author, except in those cases where the nature of the discipline is so specialized that these reviewers are the only qualified persons available.

> ➢ Why A Top Selection? - It is helpful to include information as to why this person would be a good external reviewer, e.g., a brief list of the credentials of each individual, a summary of why he or she can attest to the value of your work to the discipline, etc.

> ➢ Dean - The Dean will select two reviewers from these names; the reviewers' knowledge of your scholarly/creative work and standing in the field will be considered.

> ➢ Provost - The final four external reviewers are confirmed by the Provost will remain confidential.

External Reviewer Communication - OFA will work closely with the External Reviewers chosen. They will send the materials to them via email by the published date, generally the third week of June and will be asked to submit their evaluation no later than August 1. Make sure your proposed evaluators are aware of the deadlines.

External Review File - ePortfolio - The ePortfolio that is being built following a candidate's final CY must be designed for the candidate's External Reviewer (if one will be needed in the future).

> ➢ Due Date - The ePortfolio will be closed out at 4pm on the due date.

> Shipping Materials - If you will have any additional materials shipped to your evaluators for consideration (books for example), you are responsible for preparing & delivering five sets of said materials to OFA by 4pm on the published due date, generally the first week of June. The OFA will ship them. *Make sure to retain an extra set of all materials you send to the external reviewers in case a reviewer is unable to complete their assignment.* The materials will be shipped out as received so make sure they are in final form, ready to be shipped.

> Invitation Letter - The Provost's letter inviting the External Reviewers to serve explains the nature of the institution, and expectations for tenure and / or promotion at Chapman University. A copy if available from OFA upon request.

> Unit Criteria - You must include the approved "Unit Criteria" in your materials for your External Reviewers.

> Teaching Materials – While External Reviewers may generally focus their evaluation on your scholarly/creative materials, they are asked to comment on your teaching. Therefore, it is advisable for you to include some teaching materials, such as syllabi and/or assignment sheets for courses you teach regularly as well as new courses you have developed.

> Landing Pages - It is highly recommended by evaluators that you include prefatory comments in each section of your file.

> Speak to your Audience - External Reviewers are experts in your field. Your language for them may differ than your language with your Internal Reviewers who may have little to no knowledge of your file.

OTHER IMPORTANT ITEMS

Internal vs. External Files – The Internal Review file must include all the required documents listed in the FM. The External Review file does not have specific requirements, though you should minimally make sure you supply all the needed materials for the evaluator to positively answer the questions posed to them in the invitation letter from the Provost. Keep in mind your audience is different in terms of their knowledge and expertise of your field. Many faculty use the same file for their Internal & External reviewers but change the language in the landing pages based on the audience.

All Materials Added by Faculty Member - You are solely responsible for the content in your file. *No materials are added prior to submission by OFA.* This includes things like annual reports, grade distributions, and student teaching evaluations.

Building Links – It is generally not allowed to link to *personal websites* you contract because the file would then not be static, as the submission should be. We realize that in certain circumstances this may put on undue burden on you. If you need to link to an external site that you control contact the Office of Faculty Affairs in <u>ADVANCE of the submission date</u> for permission to do so.

We also ask that you not build links in PDF documents as they will break in the Cloning process.

Faculty Response Time - Candidates have the right to respond in writing to evaluations submitted. As a candidate, you have 7 business days after the deadline of that document, or its receipt in OFA, (whichever is greater) to respond. It is your responsibility to follow the various deadlines for submissions of evaluations to your file and check your file periodically during this review period. This is particularly important if your evaluation letters are not in by the due date. Your time to respond is limited and is based on the date the letter was received in OFA, not the date you viewed the letter.

Please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs for support!

Eileen Besner	Justin Ringor	Angel Crockett
Director	Coordinator	Coordinator
Provost's Office	Provost's Office	Provost's Office
besner@chapman.edu	ringor@chapman.edu	acrockett@chapman.edu

You are welcome to stop by the Office of Faculty Affairs anytime. We are located in MH 212. Rinker Faculty - If you like us to visit the Rinker Campus, we are pleased to do so.

Frequently Asked Questions ~ ePortfolios

Who supports the e-Portfolios?
Who can help me?

Process or content questions?
Review your Faculty Manual and contact the **Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA)** for any assistance.
You are welcome to drop by the offices in Memorial Hall 212 anytime.

Eileen Besner, Director   besner@chapman.edu
Justin Ringor, Coordinator   ringor@chapman.edu
Angel Crockett, Coordinator acrockett@chapman.edu

Technical support questions?
Review the e-Portfolios documentation and contact **Educational Technology Services** at wpsupport@chapman.edu
- ✓ If you need an e-Portfolio please email them for assistance.
- ✓ Once you log into the system at https://portfolios-eval.chapman.edu/ you can download a Quick Start Guide for ePortfolios and detailed instructions about how to add content to your ePortfolio.

Who adds material to my portfolio?   You are responsible for placing all materials your portfolio prior to the due date. No documents are added by the Office of Faculty Affairs. After your submission, all documents that come in "post submission" are given to the Office of Faculty Affairs. They will load the approved documents to your file.

Where can I find what I need?
Where is the evaluation schedule?   When final, the FPC Faculty Evaluation schedule is posted on the faculty portal under the RESOURCES tab. If you are unable to locate it, contact the Office of Faculty Affairs.

What time am I locked out of my portfolio on the due date?   The portfolios will be closed out at 4pm on the due date.

Where do I get a copy of my Unit Criteria?   Check with your Dean's Office.

Where do I get my student evaluations?   They are sent to faculty via email when available. If you can't locate those you can check Class Climate directly. Class Climate is closed during grading periods throughout the year. Please plan ahead and upload when they are available. If they are not available, check with your Dean's office or IETL.

Where do I get my grade distributions?   They are sent late each summer to your Dean's Office to forward to you. Check there. If they are not available, check with the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Where is a list of what goes on each tab?   Section V of the Faculty Manual outlines the process as well as details. The FM can be found on the faculty portal under the RESOURCES tab or on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. For clarity ~
- o <u>Annual Reports</u> – All annual reports and the evaluations related to those reports are housed here
- o <u>Prior</u> - If you have any evaluations from previous critical year reviews, add them in this tab.
- o <u>Peer Evaluations</u> – add your peer teaching evaluations here.
- o <u>Other Evaluation Tabs</u> (Provost, Dean, FRC...) These tabs will be populated with evaluations by Faculty Affairs as they become available . Candidates cannot add content to these tabs.
- o <u>Candidate Response</u>: If a candidate submits a response to one of his/her evaluations, Faculty Affairs will add it under this tab.

- Post-Submission – Documents that come to the Office of Faculty Affairs after the file has been submitted are evaluated for acceptance according to the faculty manual. If approved, they are added here. This will also include any evaluations in the process. So for ease of use ALL documents will show here.

What if I can't find the documents I need or have questions? Feel free to contact Eileen Besner for any assistance besner@chapman.edu.

When will I be able to view my External Evaluation letters? When the file is closed out to further edits, the OFA will upload the redacted external letters. This generally happens the second week of September.

Are there materials on this process in one place? Yes, you can find helpful materials on the Office of Faculty Affairs website, "Resources for Faculty."

The Process

If you are up for tenure/promotion be aware the file you are creating is for your External Reviewers. Each year in early June your file will be closed out and submitted to your external reviewers. At that point, you will be given a link to a duplicate ePortfolio (cloned copy) that you will then craft for your internal reviewers, who are generally less versed in your discipline. For more information on this process contact OFA.

Attach as PDF or Type content into the Text Window? You can do either, typically typing works for smaller segments of text. (We do not recommend uploading Word documents.)

How can I create links to different tabs within my portfolio? This is done by following the instructions on the OFA webpage, and inside the ePortfolio itself. You should not link to an external site that you control. The submission should be static. However we do understand that sometimes there are unique situations. If you need to link to an external site you control, you need to submit a request in advance of your ePortfolio submission, to the Office of Faculty Affairs for approval of such an exception.

Can the portfolio be viewed from off-campus? The portfolio can be viewed from anywhere by a user with a login. We do, however, ask that viewers refrain from using a tablet at this time due to technological incompatibility.

Why can't I delete items from my Media Library? Candidates do not have permission to delete Media Library content. If you have accidentally uploaded the wrong document or media item, upload and link to the correct one.

Can I add extra tabs to my portfolio? The portfolio is designed to mirror the layout in the faculty manual. For ease of use of evaluators, we provide the same layout for all files.

How does a CY file vary from a Tenure & or Promotion file?
- CY faculty do not submit a letter of intent.
- They do not have to solicit external reviewers.
- Their internal portfolio has the same layout as a T/P candidate but the contents will vary based on one's years of experience.
- CY candidate in their second year will have a slight file while a CY candidate in year 5 will have more detail. A T/P candidate will have a detailed file and most tabs should have materials.

How does a NTT Promotion file differ?
Non tenure track faculty seeking promotion do need to submit a letter of intent in March, however, they are NOT required to use external reviewers for their promotion process. NTT faculty need to follow the guidelines for promotion set forth in their Unit Criteria designed for NTT faculty. If scholarly/creative works are not required then those sections of the ePortfolio should be noted as "intentionally left blank."

Design

Can I add... photos to my portfolio? Student work to my portfolio? Etc... The design of your portfolio should accurately reflect your academic record as one of excellence. How you do that is up to you. While there are basic requirements for certain content (see Faculty Manual Section V) it is not the purview of our offices to tell you how to make that presentation. We highly suggest you make an entry on each landing page and if it is intentionally left blank note that or reviewers may believe you forgot to add something.

Sample ePortfolios are available upon request & updated yearly. Contact Faculty Affairs.

Tenure Track Evaluation Overview

Chapman University's *Faculty Manual* describes the University's processes for faculty evaluations, including consideration for tenure. As a tenure track faculty member, you will undergo annual evaluations and if you are reappointed to complete the probationary period, you will be eligible to apply for promotion and tenure. If you have any questions on this topic you are encouraged to discuss them with your Dean, or the Provost if you still have questions following consultation with your Dean.

> ➤ Chapman University has high standards for the granting of tenure.

> ➤ We require that a candidate assemble a compelling record that demonstrates excellence in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service.

> ➤ We also require that a candidate's record shows the strong promise for continued excellent output in the future.

> ➤ Reduced teaching loads? Expectations in scholarly/creative work are higher for those whose teaching loads have been reduced in exchange for increased scholarly/creative productivity.

> ➤ In the area of scholarship/creative work, we look for high quality work that has a discernable impact on the candidate's field.

> ➤ This standard of "excellence" is not easily quantified. There is no formula, such as a certain number of papers or works during the probationary period that will assure the granting of tenure. Each candidate's body of work is evaluated independently against the "excellence" standard.

> ➤ While academic units within the University have "Unit Criteria" that provide guidance on evaluative criteria in specific disciplines, ultimately the decision to grant tenure and promotion is made by the Provost based upon University standards.

> ➤ It is solely your responsibility as a faculty member to take the steps necessary to compile the best possible record in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service.

> ➤ The University has detailed processes for providing evaluations and input on a faculty member's progress during the probationary period. At various times during your probationary period individual evaluators or committee might offer their opinions on the status of your record and your future prospects for tenure.

> ➤ The award of tenure requires a record of consistent output of excellent work and the prospect for continued excellence in all areas.

Questions Asked of External Reviewers
Tenure Track, Assistant Professor
Candidate for Tenure and Promotion

1. Please describe any previous relationship you have had with the candidate.

2. How would you characterize the candidate's scholarly and creative works and their place in the field within the context of current developments? Is the research agenda timely? How would this work compare to others in the field? Do you believe that the candidate will make contributions to the field in the future? Are the scholarly publications appearing in top tier scholarly outlets as recognized by the discipline? Are creative works appearing in nationally recognized venues? Does the candidate's output of scholarly or creative work show consistency across time and promise to continue?

3. What do the instructional materials indicate about the currency of the candidate's course content? Do the instructional materials and the faculty member's teaching philosophy reflect what is known about best practice and pedagogy in this field? Do their materials indicate an understanding of the major issues in the field and a firm grasp of its principles? Do the readings and assignments challenge students to learn?

4. How would you rate the candidate's contributions to professional organizations or the discipline in respect to service activities, leadership, and participation in meetings?

5. Based upon the unit criteria presented and your review of this portfolio, would you recommend CANDIDATE NAME for promotion to Associate Professor and the award of Tenure at Chapman University?

IDENTIFYING QUESTIONABLE PUBLISHERS

Kristin Laughtin-Dunker
Coordinator of Scholarly Communications & Electronic Resources
Leatherby Libraries
October 17, 2019
laughtin@chapman.edu

What is a questionable publisher?

- **Questionable publishers** (sometimes called "predatory" publishers) exploit the Gold model of open access publishing by charging publication fees to authors while simultaneously exploiting their work by offering low-quality publishing services, making false claims, and/or failing to live up to the expectations of a legitimate publisher.

- It is these latter behaviors that mark a publisher as questionable, not simply the fact that they are open access or charge publication fees.

- Many legitimate publishers provide open access publication services for a fee (i.e. the Gold model of OA publishing).

Identifying a questionable publisher

Here are some warning signs that a publisher may potentially be questionable. If you're still unsure, check out the links below for checklists and other tools to help determine if a publisher is legitimate:

1. Publication fees are not up-front and transparent. Some authors may not find out about publication fees until after their paper has been accepted, and/or the publisher may demand payment without any paperwork having been signed.

2. The journal/publisher is not a member of a recognized initiative such as the **Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)**, **Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)**, or **Open Access Scholarly Publishers' Association (OASPA)**, which all vet their members to ensure they are meeting academic and industry standards and providing legitimate publishing services.
   Tip: Check these listings to see if the journal/publisher is a member.

3. The submission and/or peer-review process is not clearly explained or is exceedingly fast.

4. The journal/publisher tries to affiliate itself with a more prestigious journal or brand, often by tacking an extra word onto the title of a more well-known journal (e.g. "_____ Reviews/Advances/Reports/Journal") or making some other small variation to a legitimate journal's title.
   Tip: Check the website of the more prestigious publisher to see if the questionable journal title is listed, and/or check a trusted source like the *DOAJ* or *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities* to see if the journal is legitimate.

5. The scope of the journal is overly broad or contains unrelated subjects alongside legitimate topics.

6. The journal falsely advertises that it is indexed in a prestigious service or boasts about bogus impact metrics (either falsifying legitimate metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor or made-up or misleading metrics such as the "Universal Impact Factor").
   Tip: *The Libraries subscribe to* *Web of Science* *and* *Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, so you can easily check indexing claims there. You can also visit the* *Metrics & Impact Factors research guide* *to learn more about legitimate metrics or check* *this list of possibly misleading metrics from the Stop Predatory Journals website* *to learn more.*

7. The editorial board and/or list of peer reviewers is falsified.
   Tip: *Googling names is a great way to discover whether the listed editors or peer reviewers are real people at all. Even if they are legitimate researchers, you can check their institutional profile or website to see if they mention their involvement with the questionable journal, or reach out to them for more information if needed.*

8. The journals are empty shells or filled with stolen, plagiarized, or low-quality articles.

9. Copyright and/or author's rights information is vague or nonexistent.

10. No archiving or preservation policy is mentioned to ensure long-time access to your work, and past issues may disappear from the site after a short time or without warning.

11. Contact information for the publisher is hard to find or is unprofessional/non-publisher affiliated (e.g. Yahoo email addresses, residential business addresses, etc.).

Evaluating OA publishers and journals

When it comes to evaluating journals and publishers, there is no single criterion that indicates whether or not a publication is reputable. Rather, look for a cumulative effect of more positives or negatives. You can use the journal evaluation tools below to help you assess the quality of a particular journal or publisher:

- Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities: https://chapman.libguides.com/cabell

- Think. Check. Submit.: http://thinkchecksubmit.org/

- Retraction Watch: http://retractiondatabase.org

- Open Access Journal Quality Indicators: http://www.gvsu.edu/library/sc/open-access-journal-quality-indicators-2.htm

- QOAM: Quality Open Access Market: http://www.qoam.eu/about

More information

The Open Access and Find a Place to Get Published Research Guides both have a page on "Evaluating Publishers and Journals" that provide more information on the topics and resources highlighted earlier:

Open Access Research Guide: https://chapman.libguides.com/open_access/

Find a Place to Get Published Guide: https://chapman.libguides.com/get_published

Or you can contact the Scholarly Communication librarian, Kristin Laughtin-Dunker, at laughtin@chapman.edu.