Tenure and/or Promotion

Chair’s or Dean’s Letter of Evaluation

**Candidate Name**

**Department**

**Current Rank**

**School**

**Campus**

**Candidate for** (check one or both):  **Tenure**  **Promotion to the rank of** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*(double click on the box to be able to check the box)*

**This evaluation is made by:**  Department Chair or Program Director

School/College Dean

**Dear CDFTP Members,**

For the past \_\_\_\_\_ years, the candidate’s average faculty assignment has been **\_\_\_** % in teaching, \_\_\_% in scholarship, and \_\_\_% in service.

***Optional****:* Comment on the nature of the candidate’s assignment of responsibility:

**Teaching**

*Address the essential elements: Description of Teaching Responsibilities; Effectiveness of Course Delivery (citing course evaluations and peer observations); Quality of Course Content; optional other Elements such as Quality of Course/Curriculum Development; Effectiveness in Mentoring Students; Recognition of Teaching; Use of Research and Original Creative Work and/or Service to Enhance Teaching:*

**Summary Evaluative Statement about Teaching**. *For example: Dr…has clearly excelled in teaching. There is ample evidence that s/he is an effective instructor and curriculum designer. OR While Dr...has worked diligently, his/her teaching effectiveness has not measurably improved, as shown in his/her teaching ratings and classroom observations by several faculty members in his/her department or from other departments.*

**Scholarship**

*Address the essential elements: Description of applicant’s program of Scholarly Work; Quality of Scholarly and Original Creative Work (Provide an assessment of the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of scholarship work, such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance, including the quality of electronic publications. This assessment is required. The quality and stature detailed in the assessment may be reflected by acceptance rates, the nature of peer review, the quality of the reviewing agency/organization, or other measures; whenever possible, these indices should be cited.); Productivity/Scholarly Accomplishments; Trajectory or Sustainability of Scholarly Work; and optional other Elements such as Recognition of Scholarly Work; Use of Teaching and/or Service to Enhance Research and Original Creative Work:*

**Summary Evaluation Statement about Scholarship**. *For example: Dr… has clearly excelled in research. There is ample evidence that s/he has a well-established program of research and a strong national reputation as shown in his/her outside letters. OR Dr… has not yet established him/herself as a researcher. Both his/her CV and his/her outside letters show limited productivity as a scholar and an inconsistent program of research.*

**Service**

*Address the essential elements: Service to the Institution (University, College, Department, and Program); Service to the Profession; and optional other Elements such as Recognition of Service; Use of Service to Enhance Scholarly Work and/or Teaching; Service as a Faculty Mentor to Tenure-Earning Faculty; Service to Society:*

**Summary Evaluative Statement about Service**. *For example. The service tasks that Dr… has been assigned, or volunteered for, have been completed in an effective and timely manner. OR Dr… has completed a variety of service activities as part of his/her assignment of responsibility. However, his/her performance has not involved the leadership activities we would expect for a Pace faculty member at the rank of [assistant / associate] professor.*

**Conclusion: Overall Evaluative Summary**

*For example: Considering Dr…’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, I support his/her promotion to \_\_\_ professor and/or tenure at Pace. My judgment is based on Dr…’s [excellence] in teaching, [transformative] scholarly work, and [significant] service. OR Considering Dr…’s performance in teaching, scholarly work, and service, I am not able to recommend his/her promotion to \_\_\_ professor and tenure at Pace. My judgment is based on DR…’s [ineffective] teaching, [thin body of] scholarly work, and [limited] service.*

**Indicate agreement or disagreement with departmental/school TAP committee recommendation**. *Note: if you are the Department Chair/Program Director and there is no Department TAP Committee (usually CHP and SOE) please ignore this question.*

*For example. My judgment is consistent with the judgment of faculty on our departmental TAP committee. This consistency in evaluation clearly supports granting [promotion and/or tenure] to Dr… OR While I respect the judgment of the faculty on our departmental TAP committee, I do not concur with their majority vote to grant [promotion to associate professor and/or tenure] for Dr…*

**Before signing, please review your letter for these Characteristics of Effective Promotion and Tenure Letters:** *(double click on the box to be able to check the box)*

Articulates a **clear analysis of the candidate’s performance** in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Presents the **most relevant elements** of the candidate’s work to highlight his/her performance.

**Comments on any change in** **direction** in candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service.

**Explains any unusual circumstances** related to the candidate’s work that has had an impact on his/her performance.

Comments on the extent of a **candidate’s success in completing any performance improvement plans** resulting from prior annual, third-year, or teaching evaluations.

**Incorporates information from internal and external evaluators.**

**Complements information presented in the candidate’s personal statements** for teaching, scholarship, and service.

**Print Name**:

**Date**: