

Advisory Council Guidance for Candidates and Review Committees Updated Spring 2023

Contents:

- I. [Overview/Dates and Deadlines](#)
 - II. [Information Submitted to Dean's Office](#)
 - III. [Advice for Candidates](#)
 - A. General Advice
 - B. Dossier Materials Overview
 - C. Dossier Materials Detailed
 - IV. [Advice for Review Committees](#)
-

I. Overview/Dates and Deadlines

The Dean's Office, with the advice of Advisory Council, has prepared an updated set of guidelines for faculty candidates and review committees to assist in the preparation of:

Annual Reviews
Pre-tenure Reviews
Tenure Reviews
Associate Professor Reviews
Full Professor Promotion Reviews

The information in this document is gleaned from a close reading of the Faculty Handbook sections pertaining to Advisory Council reviews (III.B.), and incorporates specific guidance from Advisory Council members, compiled over several years.

Reviews follow a specific timetable, as listed in the Faculty Handbook. **See this [chart](#) for tasks, dates and deadlines associated with the various kinds of reviews.**

II. Information submitted to the Dean's Office

The information below pertains to all reviews, except otherwise noted.

Review Committee Membership: Review committees are composed of all tenured members of one's department and program (if applicable), and at least one tenured Occidental faculty member outside the department. If the department or program has fewer than 3 eligible members, additional Occidental tenured faculty from outside the department will be appointed for a minimum of four total members.

Colleague Names: Colleague letters speak to the candidate's observed teaching, and/or program of professional development, and service to the College. They are exclusively for consideration by Advisory Council, and in the case of grievance, the Hearing Board.

Student Letters: Provide a list of 20 students (with email addresses on an Excel or Google spreadsheet) who have been enrolled in one or more of the candidate's courses, or for whom the candidate served as an advisor, since appointment as a faculty member.

Review Committee Report (and candidate's optional response): The Review Committee report must be signed by all members of the review committee AND the candidate *by the deadline*. Candidates may submit to the Dean a confidential response to the review **within one week**. This letter is exclusively for consideration by the Advisory Council, and in the case of a grievance, the Hearing Board. The candidate's signature indicates that they have had the opportunity to read the document and have received a copy.

Tenure and Full Professor Promotion Reviews Only:

External Reviewer list: Both the candidate and review committee should provide a list of at least four external reviewers who may be qualified to evaluate one's professional work, and should consult with one another when preparing lists to avoid overlap. Include a short rationale for the choice of each reviewer, contact information, and a description of the candidate's relationship to each reviewer, if any. The candidate should also include a brief blurb describing their research focus, that the Dean can use when soliciting external reviewers.

External review materials: Candidates should compile a set of materials to be sent to external reviewers that demonstrate their professional, scholarly, and creative achievements. This includes publications, works in progress (at the candidate's discretion), policy reports, and other markers of professional achievement. Candidates are invited to include a cover letter to orient their reviewers to the materials included, and to explain the overall trajectory and direction of the research program. Candidates are also welcome to provide any additional context for the external reviewers, including impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on research plans, and other aspects of your profile that may not be discernible from the CV. Candidates are not expected to include a discussion of teaching and service in this document. Note: Virginia Lora will provide 5 external USB drives to each candidate. The candidate is responsible for uploading the relevant materials to each and returning them to the Dean's Office.

III. Advice for Candidates

A. General Advice

Candidates are advised to meet with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (Salvador Fernandez, fernande@oxy.edu) prior to preparing their files to ensure they understand the guidance contained herein.

Candidates should review the sections of the Faculty Handbook that describe the criteria for effective teaching, and demonstrated success in professional achievement and service prior to preparing their narrative as described in this document and in the Faculty Handbook Section III.B. At the time of the promotion to Full Professor review, “demonstrated success” also includes professional growth and progress since the tenure review in all domains of evaluation.

Candidates will learn the outcome of the review after the Board of Trustees has ratified the decision, typically, following the April Board meeting.

Every personnel case is voted on twice, and the second vote is the official recommendation. **In the event of a negative first vote, the Dean will reach out to the candidate and will share Advisory Council’s concerns.** Candidates are given an opportunity to respond in writing to Advisory Council.

B. Dossier Materials Overview

All materials are to be submitted *electronically*. The Dean’s Office will contact each candidate when their Moodle page is available (Moodle is used for all reviews except annual reviews).

The Moodle page will have the following headings, each of which **the candidate is responsible for** populating with the relevant materials. Note that for annual reviews, the candidate will provide materials directly to the Review Committee chair, not via Moodle. Follow the links for more detailed information about each element of the file.

- [Narrative](#) (not necessary for Annual Reviews)
- [CV](#)
- [Annual Reports](#)
- [Review Committee Reports](#) (from prior reviews, and AC developmental letters, if available)
- [Teaching Materials](#)
- [Student Course Evaluations](#)
- [Peer Teaching Evaluations](#)
- [Grade Comparison Reports](#)
- [Summary Grade Report](#)
- [Evidence of Scholarly and/or Artistic Achievement](#)
- [Miscellaneous](#)

In addition to these materials provided by the candidate, the portfolio for AC reviews (pre-tenure, tenure, Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor) will include:

- The Review Committee’s current review report (provided by the candidate’s Review Committee).
- Colleague letters solicited by the Dean’s Office from the list provided by the

Review Committee.

- Student letters solicited by the Dean's Office from the 20 students identified by the candidate, and an additional 20 students selected randomly from those enrolled in courses since appointment as a regular faculty member. The letters are provided to Advisory Council by the Dean's Office. (Student letters not required for Associate Professor reviews)
- At least four confidential letters from persons in the faculty member's field regarding his or her professional work. These letters may or may not be solicited from the individuals suggested by the candidate or by the department (provided to Advisory Council by the Dean's Office).
- Any confidential communications from untenured faculty members in one's department to the Dean regarding reappointment recommendations (provided to Advisory Council by the Dean's Office).

a. Dossier Materials Detailed:

Narrative: The narrative contextualizes the evidence in all three criteria for review.

The narrative for tenure and promotion is a synthesis of evidence in the three criteria for review: teaching, professional achievement, and service to the College. The narrative should be informative, reflective, and supported by specific examples of the candidate's teaching, professional, and service experiences. Narratives are a MAXIMUM of 10 pages, single-spaced (no smaller than 12-point font). We recommend that you share a draft of your narrative with your faculty mentor and/or review committee Chair (or other trusted colleague) to get their feedback before the final deadline

The sections below provide guidelines for writing a pre-tenure, tenure, 5th year Associate Professor, or promotion narrative. **It is not expected that every candidate will address each of these bullet points (SEE ABOVE RE: 10 PAGE LIMIT), and there is no expectation regarding the order in which they are addressed.** AC's strong advice is that the narrative should be a holistic, reflective synthesis of your work. Refrain from providing course-by-course descriptions, and duplicating information that is contained within the annual reports (you may refer to those reports for additional detail, since your review committee and AC will have access to them). Candidates for tenure and promotion to Full Professor should refer to their pre-tenure or 5th Year Associate Professor letters from Advisory Council to address feedback provided therein.

Opening

The opening paragraph should provide a broad overview of the context for your tenure or promotion file or developmental review.

Teaching

- Provide a succinct explanation of your primary learning objectives and some illustrative pedagogical practices you employ to achieve those objectives.
- Discuss the courses you taught during the review period, noting enrollments, Core requirements, cross listing, etc.
- Discuss your development of your courses in relation to the departmental mission and curriculum and the mission of the College.
- Discuss key factors/questions/issues in which you have excelled or which have been challenging for you over the review period time.
- Advisory Council has access to your annual reports. In your narrative, you are encouraged to take a holistic approach to describing your pedagogical objectives and the strategies or practices you use to achieve those objectives. Listed below are pointers to help you think about how to provide that holistic reflection.
 - Refer to specific teaching materials, syllabi, examinations, etc. to explain or demonstrate your claims.
 - Refer to trends in your teaching evaluations. Discuss any significant outlier ratings/comments. Please refrain from pulling direct quotes from your course evaluations, AC will have access to these.
 - Briefly discuss how you plan to address the challenges you have identified and/or your plans for future improvement in your teaching.
 - Discuss your responsiveness to, and success teaching, our diverse student body, including how you create an inclusive learning environment that is responsive to, and promotes the success of, students with varied learning needs.
- Advisory Council considers the challenge and rigor of courses as a marker of teaching effectiveness. Reflect on the grades you have given, the hours students report spending outside of class, and/or other specific measures of student engagement you find valuable in assessing your success in challenging your students.
- Discuss the ways you have grown as a teacher and the resources you employed in your development (e.g. Faculty Learning Communities, or working with the CTE and how these have influenced your teaching style, approach, and techniques).
- Discuss both your *formal* academic advising and mentoring and *informal* advising and activities, including how these are informed by the mission of the College.

Professional Achievement

- Write an overall statement evaluating the scholarly/creative and professional trajectory of your research.
- Contextualize and position your work with respect to your field by explaining how it contributes to important questions, problems, or discussions in that field. Explain the work in a way that an audience of non-experts can understand the significance and overall context of the work.

- Discuss the nature of each of your scholarly or creative submissions or productions, including any emerging methodologies that you employ in your work. In doing so, discuss:
 - the current stage of the product (e.g. – work in progress, submitted paper, revise and resubmit, accepted paper, published paper, provisional book contract, contract to publish a book, published book, contributions to collaborative work, etc.)
 - the nature and quality of the journals or venues for publication or exhibition, referring (as appropriate) to quality of presses, impact factors, acceptance rates, etc.
 - your specific role in collaborative projects, including work with student co-authors
 - the level of the peer-review the product underwent, and
 - the impact of the product on the field.
 - **Note that the CV you include with your file should include annotations related to the above matters. AC requests that candidates make a clear distinction in the CV among works that are published, those that are in the publication/review process, and those that are not yet complete. (see section below on the presentation of scholarly works)**
- Discuss your engagement with the larger scholarly/creative community in your field, including any service to your field of study (e.g. presentations at conferences; invitations to give talks at other institutions; service on editorial boards; associate editor or editor of a journal; catalogs or notices of exhibits or commissions of works of art; performed music; cinematic or dramatic productions, etc.).
- Discuss your contributions to proposals for external funding, including collaborative endeavors.
- Discuss the pace and productivity of your scholarly work, and your plans for future scholarly work.
- In cases of Promotion to Full Professor, make clear what progress has been made since the tenure review. Discuss the status of works that were in progress during the tenure review, but not yet published.

Service

- Throughout, take into consideration and discuss both *formal* and *informal* service you have done during the review period.
- Discuss both the quality and range of service you provided to the College, and contextualize this work with respect to the mission of the College.
- Discuss both the quality and range of service provided to your department, and contextualize this work with respect to the mission of the department and the mission of the College.
- If not already covered above, discuss your service contributions to student life, and contextualize this work with respect to the mission of the department and the mission of the College.
- Discuss any exceptional circumstances which led to your being called upon by the department or the College to provide an extraordinary amount of service.

Closing

The closing paragraph should summarize your accomplishments.

CV: The CV should be specially prepared for the review, as it may contain information that would not be included in a standard CV. Advisory Council suggests that CVs include (at least) the following headings or sections:

- Education (including institutions, degrees, dates awarded)
- Appointments (including position titles, institutions, dates)
- Grants, Awards, Fellowships (if applicable)
- Scholarly products organized under appropriate subheadings, e.g., publications, working papers, posters, conference presentations, exhibitions, etc. ***see section on PRESENTATION OF SCHOLARLY WORK for clarifying information**
 - For each product, clearly indicate:
 - the current status of the product (e.g., forthcoming, work in progress, published)
 - a complete citation, as appropriate, and an indication of the level of peer review (e.g., blind, double blind, editor review, etc.; invited, refereed, etc.).
 - If relevant, indicate:
 - the level and kind of contribution made to products with multiple authors,
 - undergraduate student co-authorship.
- Courses Taught
- Service
 - to the College (including one's department)
 - to one's Field

Annual Reports

All annual reports for the period under review must be included. They should be clearly labeled to indicate the relevant academic year.

- Ex: Annual Report 2019-2020

Review Committee Reports

The candidate should upload to this section the following reports:

Pre-tenure reviews: First year review, any other annual review completed before the pre-tenure review

Tenure reviews: All prior annual reviews, pre-tenure review report, AC developmental pre-tenure review letter

Associate Professor reviews: Tenure review report

Full Professor Promotion Review: Tenure review report, Associate Professor

Review Report, AC developmental Associate Professor review letter.

Candidates should have received (and signed) a copy of each of these reports, and the Review Committee Chair and/or Department Chair should also have retained copies.

Teaching Materials

Teaching materials aid the Review Committee and Advisory Council in holistically assessing one's effectiveness as a teacher. The Faculty Handbook explicitly lists relevant syllabi and exams, as well as "related materials." We recommend candidates include one representative syllabus for each course taught during the period under review (note: if you have taught the same course more than once, the most recent syllabus is sufficient). Beyond relevant syllabi, candidates should determine which additional materials provide the best insight into their teaching practices, and evidence of their teaching effectiveness.

Materials are most helpful when they are clearly labeled and contextualized. Documents should follow a standard naming convention that indicates what kind of material it is (i.e., syllabus, handout, exam, etc.), the course it was developed in or used for (i.e., BIO 101), and the semester/year it was used.

- Ex: PHIL 101 Syllabus (F21)
- Ex: ECON 333 Final Paper Assignment (S19)

Student Evaluations

Complete student course evaluations for every course taught during the period under review must be included.

Course evaluations can be found in my.oxy.edu. To access and download the course evaluations, select: "Course Evaluations - EVALKIT" on the "Faculty" tab, under the "Forms & Policies for Faculty" heading. Within EvalKit, the required evaluations are named: *Detailed Report + Comments*.

The course evaluations should be clearly labeled and organized chronologically. They should follow a standard naming convention that indicates the following information (when applicable): Department, Course #, Lab, Semester/Year.

- Ex: POLS 101_2 F20
- Ex: CHEM 120L_7 S22

Peer Teaching Evaluations: Peer evaluation of each tenure-track faculty member based on classroom visitations must occur for at least one course in the candidate's first two terms of teaching, at least one more course before the candidate's pre-tenure review, and at least one

more course between the candidate's pre-tenure review and the tenure review (VII.I. Faculty Handbook)

Grade Comparison Reports

The grade comparison reports can be found on my.oxy.edu. They are labeled “Grade Comparison Reports” on the “Faculty” tab, under the “Forms & Policies for Faculty” heading. The documents should follow a standard naming convention that indicates the appropriate Semester/Year, and should follow the chronological organization of the student course evaluations.

- Ex: F22 (PSYC 101, PSYC 256)

Summary Grade Report

This document can be obtained from the Dean’s Office. Please provide the academic years needed to generate the report for your review to Virginia Lora. Early in the summer, Virginia will email this document to you.

Evidence of Scholarly and/or Artistic Achievement

This can include publications, manuscripts, or any other documentation that evidences one’s professional, scholarly achievement. The documents should be clearly labeled and consistent with the information provided in the CV and narrative.

Miscellaneous

This field is optional, as stated in the handbook, it includes any other documentary evidence that might assist in evaluation.

PRESENTATION OF SCHOLARLY WORK

Advisory Council draws your attention to some commonly used terms in academic publishing, and describes how we understand these terms. Note that if you use the term “forthcoming” to describe a paper, chapter, or book that has not yet been accepted for publication, AC will consider that to be a misrepresentation of the scholarly record.

Advisory Council recognizes that there are different naming conventions in different fields for presenting, describing, and disseminating scholarly/creative works at various stages of completion. However, the CV must clearly separate works that are published and/or accepted for publication from those that are not. Works that are *submitted*, *under review*, *R&R*, *etc.* should NOT be described as publications. In general, AC would prefer that the CV contains reference to only **completed** works

(i.e., not those that are “in preparation”), and if a completed work is not yet published, it should be distinguished on the CV in a clearly marked section.

The description of a monograph’s progress can be complicated since manuscripts often go through several rounds of review--in some cases at the prospectus stage, sometimes an outline and chapters. The narrative is an opportunity to clearly communicate to AC the status of a book that is in the sometimes-protracted process of publication. However, unless a monograph is complete and is past all necessary stages of the review/acceptance process it should not be listed in the “publications” section of the CV. Like other works that are in the various stages of the publication process (submitted, under review, R&R, etc.), this should be included in a section clearly labeled “in progress/process” (if included at all).

If you are making a case for tenure or promotion on the basis of a monograph that is not yet accepted, you should also include external verification of its status (i.e., contract, editorial correspondence, reviewer reports, etc.) in the Miscellaneous section of the tp Moodle site.

The examples below represent scenarios that can provide guidance for certain common publication situations. If you have any questions, please consult with the Dean’s Office.

Where/How do I list?

- a) A new idea I have for my next project, or an article that I am working on? **Only in the narrative** (*it is AC’s perspective that a “Works in preparation” section should not appear at all on the CV*).
- b) A completed manuscript that is submitted to a journal or press for peer review? **“Works in process/progress” section of the CV (if included, otherwise only in narrative) with the status clearly designated as Submitted/Under Review/Revise and Resubmit. Note:** if you are including works with this status on the CV, indicate dates of submission, and the journal/press to which it has been submitted. See above for additional material related to monographs in process/progress.
- c) A completed manuscript that has been accepted for publication following peer review? **In the publication section of the CV, designated as “In press” or “Forthcoming” (include the publication venue and expected publication date in as much detail as possible).**
- d) A book project that has an initial “advance” contract? **“Works in process/progress”** (if listed on the CV, you should include a notation regarding the materials submitted to receive the advanced contract [proposal, sample chapters, etc.] and the nature of peer review, if any, that those materials underwent before receiving the advanced contract).

IV. Advice for Review Committees

Review Committees are encouraged to review the guidance above for candidates to ensure that candidates are providing the Committee and Advisory Council with the necessary materials.

The review committee's primary responsibility for all reviews is to prepare a thorough report for Advisory Council's consideration (in the case of Annual Reviews, the report is shared with the candidate and the Dean's Office, which the Dean and candidate discuss). See [below](#) for detailed guidance on the report's content.

The review committee must review and assess the evidence provided by the candidate in teaching, professional achievement, and service in accordance with the criteria listed in section III.B of the faculty handbook, to decide whether to recommend contract renewal (pre-tenure reviews), tenure and promotion to associate professor (tenure reviews), an accelerated promotion review (Associate Professor reviews), or promotion to full professor (Full Professor promotion reviews). The report must explicitly indicate the Review Committee's recommendation with respect to reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. The report written for annual reviews should provide an honest assessment of the candidate's strengths and areas where improvement is expected. It is expected that concerns about a faculty member's performance noted in an Advisory Council review would have been raised previously in an annual review report and/or discussed with the dean (unless the concern is a recent development).

The review must be signed by all members of the Review Committee, and may include signed statements of dissenting views. Since the candidate must sign the document before it is submitted, indicating that they have had an opportunity to read the document and have received a copy, the committee must be sure to leave sufficient time for this step before submitting the report to the Dean's Office.

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The Review Committee Reports for tenure and promotion provide Advisory Council with disciplinary-specific analysis of a candidate's work at the College. The reports should be both analytical and respectfully evaluative, and claims should be supported by specific examples from the candidate's portfolio. The report must not merely summarize or directly reproduce what the candidate has provided the department and the Council, but should supplement the candidate's application with contextual information and evaluation. Review Committee Reports should provide direction to Advisory Council about how to understand, interpret, or balance the three areas of evaluation, and should highlight any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that are relevant to the evaluation in any of the areas. The review should also directly address the candidate's contributions to the mission of the College through teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

Reminder: The Review Committee Report is part of a confidential personnel proceeding, and all review committee members are expected to uphold the standards of confidentiality.

The sections below outline some important considerations for each section of the Review Committee Report. It is not expected that every review will address each of these bullet points, and there is no expectation regarding the order in which they are addressed. **Reports should not exceed 10 pages of narrative text (excluding charts, tables, signature page, or**

attachments)

Opening

The first paragraph should give an overall assessment of the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and should include a clear statement of the review committee's recommendation regarding the candidate's overall file.

Teaching suggested topics (you do not need to address all topics):

- Discuss the range of courses the candidate taught during the review period, including: courses at different levels, on different topics, and of different sizes, as well as the candidate's contributions to CSP/FYS, the Core Program, or other departments and programs at the College.
- Discuss the candidate's development of courses in relation to the departmental curriculum and the department's/College's mission.
- Discuss key factors/questions/issues in which the candidate has excelled or with which the candidate has struggled over the review period time.
- Analyze the candidate's teaching evaluations using both qualitative and quantitative measures, as appropriate. **Do not pull direct quotes from course evaluations, AC will have access to these.**
 - Discuss any significant outlier ratings/results/issues.
- Reflect on the grades the candidate has given, the amount of work required of students, and other specific measures of challenge and course rigor (especially if the candidate uses a grading or pedagogical scheme that makes it difficult to assess rigor on the basis of grades assigned).
- Analyze the teaching materials, including syllabi, provided by the candidate and the candidate's approach to engaging students in the classroom.
- Analyze the candidate's assessment strategies.
- Discuss any teaching-related professional development activities the candidate engaged in during the review period.
- Analyze the candidate's mentoring and advising activities and advocacy, or informal advising beyond their official roles, including with respect to the mission of the College.
- Respond to the candidate's reflections and self-assessments regarding their development as a teacher, and indicate if this reflection should be more robust moving forward.

Professional Achievement

- Provide an overall evaluation of the scholarly/creative and professional trajectory of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work.
- Assess and interpret the quality of *each* of the candidate's scholarly or creative submissions or productions. In doing so, contextualize each product by discussing:
 - the current stage of the product (e.g. – work in progress, submitted paper, revise and resubmit, accepted paper, published paper, provisional book contract, contract to publish a book, published book, contributions to collaborative work,

- etc.)
 - the nature and quality of the journals or venues for publication or exhibition, with respect to disciplinary standards
 - the level of the peer-review the product underwent,
 - and the contribution the product makes to the candidate's field of inquiry/study.
- Discuss the pace and productivity of the candidate's research, contextualize this in relation to other scholars of the same rank at liberal arts colleges.
- Discuss how the candidate engages the larger scholarly/creative community in their field, including any service to their field of study.
- Discuss the candidate's contributions to proposals for external funding, including collaborative endeavors.
- Discuss the candidate's plans for future scholarly work.

Service

- Throughout, take into consideration and discuss both *formal* and *informal* service the candidate has done during the review period.
- Discuss both the quality and range of service the candidate provided to the College, contextualize with respect to the mission of the College, and with respect to the contributions made by other faculty of the same rank.
- Discuss both the quality and range of service provided to the department, contextualize with respect to the mission of the department and the mission of the College, and with respect to the contributions made by other department members.
- If not already covered above, discuss the candidate's service contributions to student life, contextualize with respect to the mission of the department and the mission of the College, and with respect to the contributions made by other faculty members.
- Discuss any exceptional circumstances which led to the candidate being called upon by the department or the College to provide an extraordinary amount of service.

Closing

The closing paragraph should restate the recommendation made by the Review Committee and reflect on how the accomplishments and performance of the candidate illustrates how they fit into the vision of the department moving forward. The closing paragraph could indicate the degrees of agreement amongst committee members about the opinions represented in the evaluation, as well as any dissenting opinions pertaining to the report.