

College of Arts and Sciences

PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Guidelines and Templates for Assembly of Dossier

General Requirements

This guide is provided to assist in assembling the dossier for promotion and/or tenure. The dossier must contain all applicable information requested below, and it must be assembled in the order given below. **Dossiers not following these guidelines will be returned to the department.** Remove all unnecessary blank space between subsections within the same section. Therefore, information within the same section should flow from one subsection to the next without interruption. All subsections within Sections A – D should be accounted for in the dossier. If information is not available or applicable for a particular subsection, please put N/A or Not Applicable.

Do not submit dossiers in notebooks, binders, or folders and do not include dividers between the sections of the dossier. Title pages and table of contents pages should not be included either.

***PROMOTION ONLY DOSSIERS** should only contain information regarding teaching, research, service, and evaluations (SECTIONS B-G) **SINCE THE CANDIDATE RECEIVED TENURE.** (i.e. If the candidate was tenured in 2012, information should be dated 2012 to present only.)

Page Numbering: Each section of the dossier must be assigned the appropriate letter, and pages within each section must be numbered sequentially (e.g. A-1, A-2; B-1, B-2, B-3, etc.) at the bottom center of each page. **Do not use subsection designations (e.g., B1a1, etc.) when numbering the dossier. Use main section letter (A through G) and numbers only.**

Template charts/tables are included as an aid to the candidate for organizing and displaying particular kinds of information. The College asks that the candidates **use** these **templates** as **provided** to keep information presentation consistent for all dossiers. This assists the various reviewing committees in locating and analyzing the candidate's information and streamlines the review of large numbers of dossiers. For those sections where templates are not provided, it is strongly recommended that the candidate and/or department head arrive at a clear and concise way to present the required information. **Form-fillable PDF versions of all accompanying charts/tables can be found on the Promotion & Tenure page of the Arts & Sciences website (<http://artsci.utk.edu/faculty-staff-resources/promotion-tenure/>), under the Faculty section P&T Form-fillable Charts/Tables. ***ALL TABLES IN THE DOSSIER MUST TO BE PRESENTED IN PORTRAIT LAYOUT ON THE PAGE. LANDSCAPE LAYOUT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.****

Supplemental material may be **submitted in electronic form (links to websites or as PDF files) to Marla Roberts (mrober56@utk.edu)**. This allows the materials to be posted for the College P&T committee and deans, along with the electronic dossier, for viewing convenience. Supplemental materials are not forwarded to the Provost.

***If supplemental materials are submitted, the department head is required to recommend 1-2 key pieces of supplemental material that stand out in the candidate's body of research/creative activity.** The recommended material should be emailed by the department head to mrober56@utk.edu, in either PDF format or as links, at the time the dossier is submitted.

Checklist: At the end of this document is a checklist, which is meant to help with the final review of the order of presentation and completeness of the dossier. Please complete the checklist with page numbers (or page number range, i.e. B3-B12), and **not checkmarks**. This will assist in the verification of the presence of each document during the review process. The checklist will not become part of the dossier. It is for use by and in the College office only and should be sent in a separate pdf document.

Submission Instructions

- A digital copy of the dossier and CV, in one file, with the CV at the end of the dossier. A true searchable pdf (**not just a scan**) must be emailed to mrober56@utk.edu.
- A digital copy of the checklist as a separate pdf file must be emailed to Marla Roberts at mrober56@utk.edu.

Direct inquiries to Marla Roberts (mrober56@utk.edu) or Andrew Kramer (akramer@utk.edu).

See 2019 Faculty Handbook (*FH19*), pp. 131-136, and Remaining Portions of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation 2019 (*MFE19*), pp. 8-20, for an additional description of the elements listed below. *FH19* is available at the following link: <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/82/2019/08/Faculty-Handbook-2019.pdf>. *MFE19* is available at the following link: <https://provost.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2019/09/Remaining-Portions-of-the-Manual-for-Faculty-Evaluation-2019.pdf>.

A. Summary

- 1) Summary Sheet: Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure. (**Please use the latest version, which includes signature lines for the department head and Dean and ensure all fields are completed. The most current summary sheet can be found here:** <https://provost.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2017/10/Summary-Sheet-Tenure-Track-Faculty.pdf>.) – If the recommendation for tenure comes earlier or later than that specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment (or for promotion after fewer than the normal number of years in rank), a **copy of the approval** must be attached behind the summary sheet.
- 2) Educational history and employment history (See *MFE19*, p. 10)
- 3) Statement of responsibilities: These responsibilities will be determined in consultation between the faculty member and department head with their nature, status, and progress as documented on the Annual Retention Review Forms and/or the Faculty Annual Review Forms for the faculty member, which become part of the dossier. These responsibilities should be catered to the candidate and not a general description.
- 4) Departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion (from the department's bylaws)
- 5) "College criteria for promotion & tenure" (<https://artsci.utk.edu/faculty-staff-resources/policy-procedures/promotion-tenure/criteria-for-promotion-tenure/>)
- 6) Certification of competence to communicate in English (for all candidates) (See *MFE19*, p. 11).

B. Teaching Ability and Effectiveness

1) Required Statements, Information, and Reports

- a) Candidate's statement of teaching philosophy and description of its implementation
 - b) List of courses taught in chronological order, beginning with earliest and ending with latest
 - Include semester and year, department and course number, short title, credit hours, 14-day (official) enrollment figures, % of instructional responsibility by candidate, lecture or lab, number of GTAs assisting, honors. (See *accompanying template* (<http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Teaching-Assignments-6-24-13.pdf>) which has columns for all requested information)
 - Zero-teaching semesters and leaves must be noted and explained briefly (fellowship, family care policy, etc.)
- i) Honors courses should be identified separately
 - ii) List clinical assignments in a separate table
 - iii) List advising responsibilities for the period

- c) SAIS & TN Voice Reports (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest in tables.)
- For before Fall 2016: Present first four items in SAIS reports (Course Overall, Course Content, Instructor Contribution, and Teaching Effectiveness) in a table. Since Fall 2016: Present Q1-Q8 from TN Voice reports in a table. Explain any missing SAIS or TN Voice scores. These tables also list the course enrollment and number of respondents to the survey for a given course. (See accompanying template (<http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Teaching-Assignments-6-24-13.pdf>) which has columns for all requested information).
 - Include number of undergraduate advisees in this table.
 - In cases where the candidate believes a low score is due to an artifact (i.e. illness, new class format, etc.), the candidate is encouraged to include an explanation below the table.
- d) Peer evaluation of teaching reports and other statements on teaching effectiveness
- For tenure cases, at least **two** peer-review reports required. It is recommended that “Normally, a peer evaluation will be conducted within a year of the faculty member’s initial appointment and repeated after a period of several years but prior to review for tenure and/or promotion according to departmental bylaws.” At least **one** peer-review is needed for promotion only cases.
 - If desired, statements may be included from other colleagues who have visited the classroom or who are in good position to evaluate fairly and effectively clinical or field assignments or advising. Any such statements or letters should clearly indicate that they are **not** official peer-review reports.
- e) A selection of representative student comments taken from a complete set of written evaluations provided to the department head by the candidate. **The department head selects representative comments from the student narrative evaluations and organizes them according to the major themes that arise.** Selected comments should include positive and negative perspectives as appropriate for each **theme**. (Themes might include teaching style, assignments and exams, use of technology, student relations, etc.). Please ensure that no student identifiers are included with the comments.
- 2) **Other Indicators of Quality** (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.)
- a) Any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness
 - b) Other documentation or evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses, fellowships or prizes awarded to students, other appropriate evidence of outcomes from instruction and advising)
 - c) Any honors and awards received for teaching and advising
 - d) Graduate supervision: List doctoral dissertations first (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Graduate-Dissertation-Supervision-Doctoral-6-19-13.pdf>), followed by master’s theses (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Graduate-Thesis-Supervision-Masters-6-19-13.pdf>.) Include date of graduation, fellowships or awards received by the student (if any), and title of dissertation / thesis. Provide placement information when known. If placement information is unknown, so indicate.
 - e) Undergraduate honors theses / research supervision: List name of student, title of thesis / project, placement (if applicable), year(s) under your supervision, and home institution of student while under your supervision. (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Undergraduate-Research-Supervision.pdf>.)

- f) Membership on graduate committees: List name of student, department, degree, project title or exam option, and date completed. (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Membership-on-Graduate-Committees-6-19-13.pdf>.)
- g) Post-doctoral supervision: List name of individual being supervised and year(s) under your supervision. (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Summary-of-Post-doctoral-Supervision.pdf>.)
- h) Any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities

C. Research, Creative Achievement, and Scholarship

1) Candidate's research segment of dossier

- a) **Candidate's Non-technical research/scholarship/creative activity summary.** This summary (one-page maximum) should be written in non-technical (jargon-free) language describing the candidate's scholarly program and its significance. This summary is intended for non-disciplinary audiences including the College's Deans, its Promotion & Tenure Committee, and the UTK Central Administration.
- b) **Candidate's statement on research/scholarship/creative activity.** This statement (no page limit) should describe activity as clearly as possible and is primarily intended for external reviewers and internal disciplinary audiences. Be sure to discuss work in all stages, as follows:
 - Work completed during review period
 - Work in-progress (indicate current state of work)
 - Plans for future work

2) Research and/or scholarly publications:

- **Norms for authorship statement. Include an opening statement to this subsection that explains norms for authorship in the field.** This should include an explanation of author order or the importance of single vs. multiple author publications. For example, in some fields, primary authors are listed first, in others they are listed last, while in still others, all authors are listed alphabetically. Also, include in this opening section an explanation of what descriptors such as "under contract", "preprint", "in press" or "to appear", connote in the given field of research. (Such terms have different meanings in different disciplines.)
 - For publications with multiple authors, explicitly indicate the candidate's role (e.g. "principal author", "supervisor of principal author", "contributing author", etc.) and the candidate's contribution(s) (e.g. "project conception", "project design", "data collection", "data analyses", etc.). Indicate graduate student or undergraduate authors under supervision of the candidate.
 - Include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages for each publication, where appropriate.

List publications in standard bibliographic form, earliest date first, in the order listed below.

- a) Articles published in refereed journals
- b) Books
- c) Scholarly and/or creative activity published through a refereed electronic venue
- d) Contributions to edited volumes
- e) Papers published in refereed conference proceedings
- f) Papers or extended abstracts published in conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract)
- g) Articles published in popular press
- h) Articles appearing in in-house publications

- i) Research reports submitted to sponsors
- j) Articles published in non-refereed journals
- k) Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted and status of submission)
 - **If the work has been accepted, include editor's letter of acceptance**
 - *If a submitted manuscript constitutes a significant part of the evidence for the P&T case, provide ALL available supporting documentation, including letters from editors, peer reviews, publication timetable, etc. **A copy of the complete, submitted manuscript should be included in the supplemental materials.***
 - The candidate may wish to include copies of any unpublished manuscripts that have been listed in §2K in the supplemental materials.

3) Creative activity

List exhibitions, installations, productions, or publications of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art. Performance of original dance, literary, musical visual arts, or theatrical works, or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts should be chronicled with critiques.

- Provide dates and venues for exhibitions, performances, etc., with earliest exhibitions, performances listed first.
- Indicate in each case whether exhibits, productions or publications of original works were juried or curated.

4) Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts. Give date, title, agency, amount, direct costs, fraction of direct costs allocated to candidate, and nature of involvement [PI, co-PI, etc.]. Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest. Clearly identify status of the projects, and list them in the following order:

- a) Completed
- b) Funded and in progress
- c) Under review
- d) Submitted but not funded

5) Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments

Identify patents, new products, new art forms, new computer software programs, etc. (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.)

6) Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops

Provide short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsor, etc.; indicate role in seminar or workshop (e.g., student, invited participant, etc.) (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.)

7) Papers presented at technical and professional meetings

Provide meeting and paper titles, listed earliest first in standard bibliographic form. Indicate whether the candidate was the presenter, whether the paper was refereed, and whether the paper was invited.

8) List of honors or awards for research/scholarship/creative achievement

(Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.)

9) List of grants and contracts for instruction or for training programs, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts. (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.)

D. Institutional, Disciplinary, and/or Professional Service

1) Candidate's statement on nature, extent, and appropriateness of service

2) Summary of service record, listed as follows (Please organize by date beginning with earliest and ending with latest.):

a) Institutional Service

- i) List of committee work at (1) department, (2) college, and (3) university levels, with dates of service and description of responsibilities
- ii) Participation in university-wide governance bodies and related activities, with dates of service and description of responsibilities
- iii) Record of contributions to the University's programs, at home and abroad, to enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity, with dates of service and description of responsibilities

b) Disciplinary Service

- i) Record of membership **and** active participation in professional and learned societies related to candidate's academic discipline
 - Offices held in professional societies
 - Service on professional society committees
- ii) Evaluation of peer research / scholarship / creative activity
 - Service as peer referee for professional journals and publishers
 - Service as reviewer of proposals for granting agencies
 - Service as external evaluator for promotion and tenure
- iii) List of honors or awards for service activity within your academic discipline
- iv) Other disciplinary service

c) Professional Service

- i) Service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses his/her professional expertise
- ii) Service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state and local levels
- iii) Service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting
- iv) Participation in community affairs as a University representative

E. Candidate's Signature Statement: By signing this statement, the candidate certifies that she or he has inspected the dossier for correctness and completeness. Upon signing, if anything is added or subtracted from sections A through D, the review process must start from the beginning. The form can be found on page 14 of MFE19.

F. External Letters of Assessment: See Provost's statement on external letters of assessment available here: <https://provost.utk.edu/tenure/external-assessment/>. **The department head or a designate must solicit at least ten letters of assessment.** The candidate can recommend no more than half of the total number of reviewers solicited. The candidate is permitted to submit a list of persons not to be contacted. External evaluators should be **full professors at peer or aspirational peer institutions**, but they must be at least at the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion. Every effort should be made to choose evaluators from AAU schools. External reviewers must be able to offer an "arms-length," objective assessment of the candidate.

1) External letters of assessment:

- The dossier must contain at least five letters arranged alphabetically by writer's last name

- It is **strongly recommended** that **at least half** the letters **received and inserted** into the dossier come from the department head's list. At the very least, a **minimum** of three letters received and inserted into the dossier **must** be from the Head's list.
 - All external letters must be **dated and on institutional letterhead with the external letter writer's signature**.
- 2) **Sample letter to external evaluators:** When letters are solicited, the request should be for letters of assessment rather than "recommendation" or "endorsement," and evaluators should be encouraged to concentrate on those aspects of the candidate's record, which are most important to the external visibility, and professional standing of the candidate. Letters to external evaluators should include the criteria for rank in the department, college, and university. See page 15 of the MFE19 for a sample letter.
- Language may be inserted into the external reviewers' solicitation letters after point #5 ("and whether s/he would be ranked among the most capable and promising scholars in her/his area.") if your faculty member standing for tenure was granted and used a tenure-clock extension due to family and/or medical leave:
 - Suggested language approved by the Provost's Office: Dr. X's period as a tenure-track assistant professor was extended as a result of the university's policy on family and medical leave. Please do not take the extension into account when you are assessing the work. The work should be evaluated on its merits alone, independent of the length of time in untenured status.
- 3) **Log of external letters of assessment:** A log of all persons contacted to submit letters must be kept by the head or his or her designate, regardless of whether a response was obtained from the potential evaluator. The log must state the date the contact was made, the response to the solicitation, the date the letter was received, the source of the evaluator (candidate's list or department head's list), and the relation to the candidate (i.e. none, professional acquaintance, etc.). Please list only those persons who are actually contacted. **The log should be organized alphabetically by the writer's last name, and the external letters should be inserted into the dossier in alphabetical order (according to the log) to ensure an organized presentation and ease of navigation by reviewers.** (Use accompanying template: <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Log-of-External-Letters.docx>.)
- 4) **Method of selection of external evaluators:** The head shall attach a description of the procedure used for selecting external evaluators. See page 17 of the MFE19 for an example.
- 5) **Qualifications of external evaluators:** The head shall attach a brief statement identifying those who have written the assessments, including evidence demonstrating the evaluator's qualification and standing in his/her discipline. If any of the letter writers are not from peer or aspirational peer institutions, the head is to explain the reasoning behind the choice of said evaluator. In cases of small or emerging fields of research, it is important to solicit evaluations from individuals who can provide an assessment and context within the broader discipline. See page 18 of the MFE19 for an example.
- Any external evaluators that are not at a peer or aspirational-peer university **must be preapproved by the College Academic Personnel office before** sending any requests to write letters to the external evaluators. To have such external evaluators approved, department heads should send an email to Marla Roberts (mrober56@utk.edu) with the **exact biographical statement that will be included in the dossier**. The blurb should include the following information:
 - The external evaluator's name
 - The external evaluator's institution
 - Qualifications of the reviewer's exemplary experience and standing in the candidate's field

- Explanation of the reasons for the choice of the evaluator including one of the following statements in each bio blurb: “Even though X is not a professor at a peer or aspirational-peer university, s/he is qualified to evaluate (faculty member’s name) because...” OR “Despite the fact that X is not a peer or aspirational-peer university, (evaluator’s name) is qualified to be an external reviewer because...”
 - Please note that this statement should not just be a “copy and paste” selection from the evaluator’s website.
- There is not a formal deadline for sending this information to the College since departments send requests out at different times. However, the bio statements (only for evaluators at non-peer or non-aspirational-peer institutions) **MUST be approved before** being sent to the external evaluators in question.

G. Evaluative Recommendations, Reports, and Statements:

1) Annual Performance and Retention Reviews – (Faculty Seeking Tenure and Promotion or Tenure Only)

- a. **Annual Recommendation on Retention: All Retention Review Report Forms completed during the probationary period** – arranged earliest date first – should be the fully executed copy with all required signatures
- b. **Annual Performance Evaluation: All Annual Performance Review Report Forms completed during the probationary period** – arranged earliest date first – should be the fully executed copy with all required signatures
- c. **All evaluative documents filed with the retention and/or annual review should be placed directly behind each corresponding year’s review sheet, including, but not limited to, the following:**
 - i. Faculty narrative from retention and/or annual review
 - ii. Department Head or Director narrative from retention and/or performance review
 - iii. Candidate’s responses to any official review narrative
 - iv. Dissenting statements from faculty

2) Annual Performance Review Forms (Faculty Seeking Promotion Only)

- a. **Annual Performance Evaluation: All Annual Performance Review Report Forms completed since last promotion** - arranged earliest date first and only include evaluations since promotion – should be the fully executed copy with all required signatures
- b. **All evaluative documents filed with the annual performance review should be placed directly behind each corresponding year’s review sheet, including, but not limited to, the following:**
 - i. Department Head or Director narrative from performance review
 - ii. Candidate’s responses to any official review narrative
 - iii. Dissenting statements from faculty

- 3) **Department head's recommendation letter** – The department head should provide a recommendation on promotion and/or tenure, with a thorough and detailed discussion of strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity and service. This letter is critical for providing the context for any special circumstances that should be considered in evaluation of the dossier. For example, in the area of research/scholarship/ creative activity, helpful comments can clarify concerns regarding the pace and future trajectory of scholarship, the quality and reputation of presses and journals in a particular discipline, or lack of consensus among external reviewers. In the area of teaching, factors that should be discussed by the department head include anomalous SAIS scores and responsiveness of the candidate to peer evaluations. Any negative votes or areas of concern cited in previous retention reviews/annual reviews or in the

faculty discussion regarding promotion and/or tenure should be addressed properly to draw a clear and consistent picture of the candidate's overall performance. **Names of external reviewers should not be included in the department head's recommendation letter.** This letter should be **dated and on department letterhead with the department head's original signature.** *This letter should be viewed by the candidate prior to the submission of the dossier to the College, with appropriate time (two weeks) allowed for candidate to respond if they so desire.

- 4) **Statements of evaluation by department. (Summary of the Faculty Discussion Regarding the Candidate's Promotion and/or Tenure.)** The faculty vote regarding the candidate's promotion and/or tenure case must be recorded in this document. A faculty designate (not the department head) shall have the responsibility of summarizing the discussion of the faculty regarding the candidate's dossier and case for promotion and/or tenure. This summary should be presented in letter or memo format and should reflect the main points in the discussion regarding the candidate's teaching, research, service, visibility in their field, and their collegiality within and contribution to their department. This should not be a transcript or minutes of the meeting, but instead should be organized to summarize strengths and weaknesses in the case and should present important issues discussed. Any negative votes or abstentions should be addressed in the document. **Names of external reviewers should not be included in the department head's recommendation letter.** This letter should be **dated and on department letterhead with the signature(s) of the letter writer(s).** *This letter should also be viewed by the candidate prior to the submission of the dossier to the College, with appropriate time (two weeks) allowed for candidate to respond if they so desire. This section can also include a written summary from the tenure sub-committee in the department, if such a committee is commissioned within the bylaws of the department. The sub-committee report may serve as a recommendation to the senior faculty in the department, but it **cannot replace the mandatory record of the faculty discussion/evaluation.**
- 5) **Dissenting reports**
- 6) **Candidate's response.** Written responses to the departmental decision must be generated within two weeks after the candidate has been presented with these recommendations and should be added to the dossier prior to submission to the College.
- 7) **Candidate Notification Statement.** Both the department head recommendation letter and the summary of the faculty discussion must be presented to the candidate prior to submission of the dossier to the College. **By signing this statement, the candidate certifies that he or she has received notification of the decision at each of the levels of review and understands that he or she has the right to respond at each stage of the process.** The form can be found on page 12 of this document and online at <http://artsci.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Candidate-Notification-Statement.pdf>.

B1b. Summary of Teaching Assignments for Review Period

Sem	Dept. Course #	Course Title	Credit Hours	14-day enrlmnt	% Respon*	Lec (L) and / or Lab (B)	# GTAs assisting	Honors Y/N
Fall 2007	Psych 110	General Psychology	3	110	100%	L	3	N
Fall 2007	Psych 360	Social Psychology	3	60	100%	L/B	0	N
Spring 2008	None	Research leave						
Spring 2008	None	Research leave						
Fall 2008	etc.							

Account for all semesters under review. Note zero-teaching semesters, leaves, etc.

*% Responsibility for course. If a course is co-taught with other instructors, please list the percentage of the course for which this individual is responsible.

B1c. SAIS & TN Voice Reports

B.1.c. Teaching Evaluation Summary: SAIS & TN Voice Reports

(add and delete rows as needed)

Details								SAIS scores (pre-Fall 2016)								Course Average	# of UG Advisees per Year
Term	Year	Subject Code	Course #	Section #	# of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4						
EXAMPLE 1					30	19	63.3%	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.5					4.3	
EXAMPLE 2					257	185	72.0%	3.6	3.2	4.0	4.1					3.7	
							#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!	
							#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!	
					287	204	71.1%	3.9	3.6	4.2	4.3					4.0	

SAIS Core Evaluation Questions:

Q1 - The course as a whole was...

Q2 - The course content was...

Q3 - The instructor's contribution to the course was...

Q4 - The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was...

Details								NVoice scores (Fall 2016 - present)								Course Average	# of UG Advisees per Year	
Term	Year	Subject Code	Course #	Section #	# of Students	# of Responses	Response Rate	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8			
EXAMPLE 1					25	22	88.0%	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.6		4.5	
EXAMPLE 2					162	123	75.9%	4.0	3.6	4.2	4.1	3.8	4.2	3.6	4.4		4.0	
							#DIV/0!										#DIV/0!	
							#DIV/0!										#DIV/0!	
					187	145	77.5%	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.8	4.5		4.2	

TN Voice Core Evaluation Questions:

Q1 - The instructor contributed to your understanding of course content.

Q2 - The instructor created an atmosphere that invited you to seek additional help.

Q3 - The instructor responded to your inquiries about the course (e.g., emails, texts, phone calls) within a reasonable timeframe (i.e., 48-72

Q4 - The instructor created a respectful and positive learning environment.

Q5 - The instructor provided useful feedback on course assignments.

Q6 - The course challenged you to learn something new.

Q7 - The class sessions were well organized.

Q8 - The course materials (readings, homework, laboratories, etc.) enhanced your learning in this course.

B2d. Summary of Graduate Dissertation (Doctoral) Supervision
List students who have completed work and whose work is in progress

<i>Name</i>	<i>Graduation Year</i>	<i>Fellowships/Awards</i>	<i>Dissertation Title</i>	<i>Placement</i>

B2d. Summary of Graduate Thesis (Masters) Supervision
List students who have completed work and whose work is in progress

<i>Name</i>	<i>Graduation Year</i>	<i>Fellowships/Awards</i>	<i>Thesis Title</i>	<i>Placement</i>

B2e. Summary of Undergraduate Research/Thesis Supervision
*Include in this table supervision of “honors by contract” by giving the course number or N/A

<i>Name</i>	<i>Thesis / Research Project Title</i>	<i>Honors Thesis Option Yes/No</i>	<i>*Honors by Contract Course Number</i>	<i>Placement (if applicable)</i>	<i>Year(s) Supervised</i>	<i>Institution of Origin (UTK, University of ...)</i>

B2f. Membership on Graduate Committees

<i>Name</i>	<i>Dept.</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>Project Title if appropriate; if exam option, so note</i>	<i>Date Completed</i>

B2g. Summary of Post-doctoral Supervision

Name of Individual Supervised	Year(s) Supervised

F3. Log of External Letters of Assessment

Evaluator	Affiliation	Rank	Source of Suggestion	Relation to Candidate	Initial Contact	Acpt (Y/N)	Ltr Sent to eval.	Ltr rec'd	Ltr in dossier
Lee Hunt	U Florida	Full	Head	Professional colleague	7/25/09	N	----- --	----- ----	----- --
Joe Smith	U Georgia	Full	Candidate	None	5/23/09	Y	8/1/09	10/15/09	11/1/09
Sue Todd	Yale	Full	Department	Professional Acquaintance	6/15/09	Y	8/1/09	11/1/09	11/2/09

Candidate's Name (please print)

Candidate's Department

Candidate Notification Statement

I hereby attest that I have received notification of the decision at each of the levels of review outlined below. I understand that I have the right to respond at each stage of the process. I understand that if I choose to respond, a response must be received within two weeks of notification at each level. My signature below represents that I have received these notifications:

Stage of Review: Recommendation of Senior Faculty

Candidate's Signature

Date of Receipt

Stage of Review: Department Head/Director

Candidate's Signature

Date of Receipt

Stage of Review: College Dean

Candidate's Signature

Date of Receipt

Candidate's Name (please print)

Candidate's Department

Dossier Checklist: To be filled out, printed, and attached to the top of the original hardcopy dossier. Only one copy is needed. **Please note that item number is not to be confused with page number in the dossier. Pages are to be numbered sequentially by divisions (A, B, C, D, E, F, G), with each division starting again at 1.**

Dossier page (use N/A if not applicable)	Item number	Description
	A1	Summary sheet
	A2	Educational and employment history
	A3	Statement of responsibilities
	A4	Department criteria
	A5	College criteria
	A6	Certification of English competence
	B1a	Teaching statement
	B1b	List of courses taught
	B1c	SAIS & TN Voice Reports
	B1d	Peer review of teaching
	B1e	Summary of student comments
	B2a	Administrators' statements regarding teaching and advising
	B2b	Other documentation of teaching/advising effectiveness
	B2c	List of teaching and advising awards
	B2d	List of graduate students supervised
	B2e	Undergraduate honors theses and research projects
	B2f	Membership on graduate committees
	B2g	Post-doctoral supervision
	B2h	International/intercultural expertise
	C1a	Non-technical research/scholarship/creative activity summary
	C1b	Research/scholarship/creative activity statement
	C2	Norms for authorship statement
	C2a-j	Publications by venue
	C2k	Manuscripts submitted for publication
	C3	Creative activity
	C4a-d	Projects, grants, contracts
	C5	Other evidence of research / scholarship, creative activity
	C6	Participation in seminars and workshops
	C7	Papers presented
	C8	List of research awards
	C9	List of grants and contracts for instruction, etc.

	D1	Service Statement
	D2a	Institutional service
	D2b	Disciplinary service
	D2c	Professional service
	E	Candidate's signature statement
	F1	External letters
	F2	Sample letter to reviewers
	F3	Log of external letters
	F4	Method of selecting reviewers
	F5	Qualifications of reviewers
	G1	Faculty Retention and Annual Reviews (Promotion & Tenure Cases Only)
	G2	Faculty Annual Reviews (Promotion Cases Only)
	G3	Department Head's letter
	G4	Report of tenured-faculty review committee
	G5	Dissenting reports
	G6	Candidate's response
	G7	Candidate Notification Statement