APPENDIX B: Dean’s Outline for Tenure, Promotion and Third-year Review Statements

Evaluation by the academic dean should not just repeat the chair’s summary. Instead, the dean’s summary should be a detailed and interpretive analysis of the case. The dean’s analysis should include a clear statement of the faculty member’s responsibilities over the course of the evaluation period. The dean should outline the process used during the college-level review. In cases where time to tenure/promotion credit has been given for service at another institution, indicate how much credit was allowed. The recommendation of college-level advisory committees should be reported as part of the dean’s analysis and recommendation. The formation of the advisory council is left to the discretion of the dean; however, the dean must take care to ensure that the composition of the group is fair to all candidates. Department chairs (who have their own opportunity to comment) on college committees should recuse themselves from discussion or voting on any cases from their own department. Similarly, any member of a college-level committee should recuse themselves from discussion and voting on candidates from their own unit.

The description of the chair’s statement can also be used for the dean’s statement both for purposes of oversight on content and for supplementation of the chair’s statement if relevant issues were not addressed. The dean need not repeat information that is clear in the chair’s statement. Therefore, the content of the dean’s statement will depend on the adequacy of the chair’s statement.

- If the chair’s statement is incomplete, please discuss any omitted information.
- Once the appropriate information is discussed:
  - Do you agree with the chair’s analysis?
    - If so, what are the most salient points that convince you of their analysis?
    - If not, what are the points of disagreement?
  - Do you have anything to add based on an evaluation of the work relative to the college standards?
- Please summarize the case.
  - If the case is for tenure and/or promotion, please recommend either for or against. There is no other option.
  - If the case is for third-year review, please recommend:
    - Progress satisfactory
    - Some improvement required
    - Substantial improvement required
    - Unsatisfactory.
  - Please justify your recommendation by comparing the candidate’s performance in each of the relevant areas of job performance to the standards of the college and university.
  - If the case is of a third-year review that will not result in termination, please recommend the actions required for addressing deficiencies in performance, either underscoring the chair’s recommendations as appropriate, or supplementing the chair’s recommendations if needed.