

CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION  
2011-12 ANNUAL REPORT

Summary of Dossier Activities

Total Number of Dossiers Reviewed: 61

<u>Decisions</u>	Yes	No
Reappointment	37	0
Continuing Appointment	18	0
Promotion to Assoc. Professor/Libr.	17	1
Promotion to Full Professor	5	0

Analysis

In the evaluation of the dossiers, there was a remarkable degree of consistency at all levels. In only one case did the RTP Committee diverge from the recommendations it received, and in only one case did the Provost and President diverge from the RTP Committee.

Other

In 2011-12, the RTP Committee routinely requested from candidates documents that were missing from the dossier (such as Annual Reports and SEIs for the full time period specified in the guidelines).

Other Activities

Guideline Revision Recommendations

In the RTP annual report for 2010-11, I noted that in May 2011, the RTP Committee drew up a list of recommendations for revising the “Guidelines for the Preparation of Dossiers” and other documents pertaining to RTP dossiers. In most instances, the purpose was to clarify the guidelines, and in some instances, to assist readers of the dossier at each stage in the review process. In Fall 2011, the recommendations were submitted to Interim Provost Torsney. As no action was taken, in May 2012, the 2011-12 RTP Committee refined further this list of recommendations. I submitted this revised document to Provost Mauceri in mid-August 2012. His office currently is in the process of making the requested revisions, and it is anticipated that these will be put into place for the benefit of faculty who are being reviewed in Spring 2013. The Committee’s list of recommended revisions is attached as an addendum to this document. In summary, the suggested revisions include:

- ✓ Listing of scholarly publications separately from other kinds of publications in the Curriculum Vitae;
- ✓ Recommending that the Personal Narrative be no longer than six double-spaced pages;

- ✓ Requiring that sample syllabi be included in the dossier;
- ✓ Requiring that the SEI numerical summary forms be placed together in chronological order within the dossier;
- ✓ Emphasizing the importance of including full documentation regarding the date, place, and significance of the venue for all creative work;
- ✓ Requiring that service be concretely and substantively documented in the dossier;
- ✓ Emphasizing the importance of structuring the dossier into five sections that follow the five criteria of the SUNY Board of Trustees;
- ✓ The creation of a dossier checklist that would assist candidates in constructing complete and properly organized dossiers;
- ✓ Avoiding the use of “sleeves” whenever possible;
- ✓ Offering constructive criticisms in Sub-Committee, Chair, and Dean letters that may assist candidates for reappointment in areas in need of improvement;
- ✓ Instituting a consistent practice for recording sub-committee votes and, in the letters of the Deans, of providing appointment review facts.

### Promotion Guidelines

Interim Provost Torsney sent a working draft of guidelines for promotion to full professor to RTP Committee members in Spring 2012. The RTP Committee members submitted feedback on both the document and the process for soliciting comments about this document.

### Committee Membership (Fall and Spring, unless otherwise specified)

#### School of Business

Surinder Tikoo (Fall 2011)

Kimberly Lukaszewski (Spring 2012)

#### School of Education

Aaron Isabelle

Robin Smith

#### School of Fine and Performing Arts

Anita Gonzalez

Reva Wolf (Chair)

#### School of Science and Engineering

Stanley Hayes (Fall 2011)

Lawrence Fialkow (Spring 2012)

#### College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Sunita Bose (Spring 2012)

Giordana Grossi

Anne Roschelle (Fall 2011)

Jason Wrench

#### Sojourner Truth Library

Valerie Mittenberg

Respectfully submitted,  
Reva Wolf

## **APPENDIX: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISING RTP GUIDELINES**

### **Guideline Revisions Recommended by the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee**

May 22, 2012 revision of May 10, 2011 recommendations

#### I. Guidelines for the Preparation of Dossiers

##### Curriculum Vitae

We recommend that the guidelines for the CV be revised so that candidates be required to list peer reviewed and other scholarly publications separately from such items as interviews, newsletter items, or other kinds of work that are not scholarship.

##### Personal Narrative

We recommend that the guidelines for the narrative specify that the narrative be no longer than six double-spaced pages. A limit to the length of the narrative would encourage concision and help to ensure that RTP Committee members, given the time constraints of their reviews, will read each narrative thoroughly.

##### Teaching

We recommend that the wording of the guidelines change to require the inclusion of sample syllabi in the dossier for reappointment, tenure, and promotion dossiers.

We recommend that it be required that the SEI numerical summary forms be placed together in chronological order within the dossier. When candidates scatter these among syllabi, written comments, and other teaching materials, or organize them by course rather than by date, it is difficult to get a clear picture of the SEIs.

##### Scholarship

We recommend that the guidelines emphasize the importance of documenting fully the details of creative work such as performances and exhibitions: when and where did these occur and what is the significance of the venue? Completed creative work should be dated, just as completed scholarly work is required to be dated.

##### Service

Currently, documentation of service is not required; some candidates document their service extensively while others provide only a list of service activities. We recommend that documentation of service be

required. In any case, we believe the dossiers need to be more consistent in this area. In past years, School of Business candidates usually have included no evidence in the service section of the dossier, while candidates from other schools usually have included such evidence. This evidence might consist of items such as thank you letters, meeting minutes, programs and posters for relevant events, and other similar forms of evidence.

### Continuing Growth

We recommend that candidates be instructed to include clear evidence of continuing growth in a section of the dossier called "Continuing Growth." Since this area represents the fifth criterion of the Board of Trustees, it should come in the fifth section of the dossier.

### General

We recommend that it be made extra clear to candidates that the dossier consists of five sections that reflect the five criteria of the SUNY Board of Trustees, in the order outlined in the current dossier guidelines. We recommend considering the creation of a checklist to assist candidates in constructing dossiers that are complete and properly organized.

We recommend that multi-page documents such as vitae, syllabi, and publications be inserted un-sleeved in the binder. The sleeves add bulk and slow down reading of the documents. The documents can be separated with a staple, paper clip, or colored paper.

## II. Departmental Sub-Committee Letters

We recommend that a consistent practice in recording the vote be instituted by departmental sub-committees and committees of the whole. We believe the vote of these committees should be clearly recorded. Constructive criticisms that can assist the candidate in areas in need improvement should also be included when warranted.

## III. Dean Letters

We recommend that the dean include in her or his letter the following facts concerning each candidate: which appointment review this is (first, second, etc.); the number of years for which the reappointment may be (one or two years, or one year, continuing appointment); years of service credit received; any unusual circumstances (such as qualified rank). The RTP Committee found it to be most helpful when a dean's letter contained this information.