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Overview of the Neag School of Education

The Neag School of Education (NSOE), the professional school of education at the University of Connecticut, is comprised of four departments: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Kinesiology. These departments are responsible for fulfilling the goals of the Neag School of Education and that of the University of Connecticut. As such, the NSOE faculty has diverse responsibilities that include preparing leaders in the field of education, providing service to practitioners, providing service to clients, and conducting research to inform policy and practice. Meeting these responsibilities requires differentiated faculty, including both tenure-track and non-tenure track appointments. Although there is expectation for high achievement and excellence across all appointments within the NSOE, it is acknowledged that the very nature of these appointments precludes the application of a uniform set of rules for reappointment and promotion. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members who hold tenure-track appointments in the Neag School of Education.

Introduction to PTR Procedures

The Neag School of Education endorses the general university criteria of teaching, scholarship, and research as stated in the University Policy on faculty professional responsibilities. According to University policy:

“The University serves as a center for research, dedicated to excellence in higher education, and fulfillment of its land grant status. The University is committed to meeting the educational needs of its undergraduate, graduate, professional and continuing education students, and gives its faculty the means to employ and develop their intellectual
capacity through teaching, research, and interaction with society. Through the integration of teaching, research, and service, the faculty provides an outstanding educational experience for each student. The University serves the state and its citizens in a manner that enhances the social, cultural, and economic well being of its communities. It gives leadership in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge to all its constituents, recognizing that the continual creation and transmission of knowledge and lifelong learning are essential to Connecticut’s future in a global context.” (University Policy: Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities, preamble, introduction, effective 1/2/2004, available at http://www.policy.uconn.edu/)

The policies and guidelines developed by the NSOE and detailed in this document reflect this University policy.

I. Re-appointment, Tenure, Promotion

In accordance with University of Connecticut policy, the granting of tenure and the promotion of a professor in rank are based in part on an individual’s scholarly distinction and promise. Therefore, the evaluation process must confirm that the faculty member has established, and is likely to maintain, a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation of the candidate’s national and/or international reputation. It is also expected that the candidate will have distinguished him/herself in teaching and in service to the University, the School, the Department, and the profession.

Evaluations of faculty members at all levels are judged on their merit and in relation to School and University expectations and not in comparison to others in the Department or School with tenure. Within the criteria for earning tenure is recognition of the diverse contexts and disciplines within which scholars in the Neag School are establishing their reputations. It is further noted that: “Specific evidence of superior performance in scholarship and in teaching is of primary importance. As a minimum standard for tenure and/or promotion, there must be
evidence of strong performance in both scholarship and teaching and superior achievement in at least one of these areas. In addition, other contributions to the University will be considered. In individual cases where it is demonstrated that there has been meritorious professional service through which the faculty member has achieved distinction in the profession, such service may also received significant weight” (University Bylaws, 2011, p. 30). Distinguished service, although an important and required component, will not result in promotion and tenure without the expected performance in teaching and scholarship.

A. Tenure with Promotion to Associate Professor

To be considered for tenure with promotion in rank, a faculty member must have demonstrated research ability through scholarly accomplishments and commitment to ongoing research, have a strong teaching record, and be recognized as a helpful and valued colleague who has conscientiously performed needed service within the academic and professional communities. Only those persons showing promise of continuing achievement in all three areas of research, teaching, and service will be tenured.

Tenure for a new hire in the Neag School of Education with no prior credit in rank is expected to become effective in the fall of the seventh year, and the specific date is indicated in the candidate’s offer letter. The granting of tenure follows the evaluation of the candidate’s application for tenure conducted during the sixth year of service at the University. Therefore, the evaluation process for the tenure decision is initiated at the beginning of the candidate’s sixth year.

For a new hire with no prior credit in rank, promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor occurs concurrently with the awarding of tenure.

For a new hire with prior service in a tenure track position, the probationary period, and therefore the timing of tenure and promotion, is determined with the Dean at the time of hiring and may be as much as a full probationary period of six years. The probationary period determined and specified in the candidate’s offer letter will be considered the tenure track period.

B. Promotion to Professor

The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must have a scholarly record of national/international distinction and a commitment to ongoing research in his/her field. In
addition, he/she must be an effective teacher and advisor and have a record of continuous service to the University, the School, and the profession as a mature scholar. Ordinarily, promotion to the rank of Professor follows a minimum of five years of service in the rank of Associate at this university or elsewhere. The application for promotion to the rank of Full Professor may be submitted in either the fifth year as an Associate or in a subsequent year as determined by the candidate in consultation with the Department Head.

II. Annual Re-Appointment Review

A. Years 1 – 5, Annual, One-Year Reappointments - Prior to Applying for Tenure and Promotion in Rank

The annual, re-appointment review of non-tenured faculty in a tenure track position provides indication of the candidate’s progress in meeting expectations for tenure with promotion at the University of Connecticut. The goal of the annual review is to facilitate faculty development and progress, and the content of the PTR forms are cumulative and submitted during the fall semester of each pre-tenure year. During the first, second, fourth, and fifth years, the annual review is conducted within the Neag School of Education. The reviews conducted during the third and sixth years are conducted at both the School and Provost’s levels.

For the third year review, in addition to completing the PTR form, candidates will prepare a dossier, or portfolio, that contains the PTR form and a file presenting all supporting documentation organized to reflect the content of the form in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Department Heads will provide specific directions for compiling this file so that it reflects the form and content of the dossier required for the sixth year review (detailed on page 18).

For the sixth year review, candidates must prepare a dossier that contains the completed PTR form and a file containing relevant documentation of the content of the candidate’s form in all areas, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. (See page 18 for specific details.)
III. General Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

The criteria for earning tenure and promotion are based on understandings of the different contexts and disciplines within which NSOE scholars are establishing their reputations. The criteria for evaluation detailed in this document are offered as guidelines only; each case is considered individually.

Presented below is an overview, or general discussion, of expectations in relation to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Following this overview are more specific details of the criteria and evidence required for tenure and promotion reviews.

A. Teaching and Advisement

1. Effective Teaching and Advisement. Effective teaching and advising are fundamental responsibilities of each faculty member. Effective teaching involves a number of dimensions, including designing challenging courses, stimulating intellectual curiosity and a sense of inquiry in students, and motivating learners. Important factors for teaching in a research university are the integration of research and teaching, the inclusion of the latest research findings, and the ability to balance theoretical aspects with practical applications.

2. Indicators/ Evidence Effectiveness. Superior teaching and academic advisement at all instructional levels are essential criteria in tenure and promotion decisions. The general assessment to be applied is that the faculty member is engaged regularly and effectively in teaching and advisement activities of high quality and significance. The responsibility for the evaluation of teaching performance rests on the academic department of the faculty member. The evaluation of teaching and advising should include formal university evaluations completed by students and evaluations of the Department Head and/or other supervisors or peers who observe the faculty member’s teaching and interactions with students and provide written comments following class observations.
B. Scholarship

The University of Connecticut is a research university, and consequently, scholarship is a highly valued factor in awarding tenure and promotion. Scholarship and research are defined as creating and disseminating new knowledge. High quality scholarship makes a significant contribution to the knowledge base that informs policy, practice, teaching, and/or research in a field of study. Faculty members are expected to produce a body of work that reflects a defined and coherent research focus, and it should reflect the candidate’s unique contributions. In addition, because of the importance of external funding in promoting research in the School, efforts and success in securing grants, and/or other forms of external funding, are also considered highly important. If funding sources in a given area are limited, it is anticipated that the faculty member will seek collaborative opportunities for grant funding.

1. Scholarly activities may vary across the disciplines represented in the Neag School, i.e., Music Education faculty may differ in scholarly accomplishments from faculty in Educational Psychology; however, peer-reviewed publications appropriate for the candidate’s field represent the most important indicators of scholarship. The nature and importance of the candidate’s scholarship are considered from both a qualitative and quantitative perspective. Likewise, securing external funding/grants is considered in the context of the candidate’s discipline and available opportunities.

2. Indicators/Evidence of Research and Scholarship. The primary indicators of scholarly products include publications of books, monographs, book chapters, textbooks, edited books, papers in scholarly, refereed, professional journals of high quality, peer reviewed conference publications; the development of software, products, or electronically published material reflecting quality scholarship; and distinguished performances in the creative arts. Research grants/external funds solicited and those awarded on the basis of scholarly merit are also considered indications of scholarship.
a. The quality and influence of a candidates’ scholarship is of utmost importance in assessing scholarly potential. The academic reputation of the journal (or other dissemination outlet) is a key indicator of quality and influence, and specific indicators of demonstrable influence may be found in sources such as Scopus, Google Scholar, the Social Sciences Citation Index, PubMed. The assessments of scholarship completed by external reviewers are also important evaluations.

b. The scholarship must cohere around a distinct area, or related areas, of study, and this work should reflect the candidate’s unique contributions. This coherence will be described in the candidate’s discussion of scholarly goals and activities (PTR form).

c. Other evidence of research and scholarship include, but are not limited to: presentations and papers delivered at academic meetings, published conference proceedings, invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters or similar contributions, publications in non-refereed sources serving significant audiences, special awards, or recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

d. The candidate’s report of external funding (proposed and/or secured) will be considered in the context of the candidate’s discipline and available opportunities. Grants and external funding resulting from individual and/or collaborative efforts are desired and valued activities.

e. The cumulative scholarly work should provide evidence that the faculty member is a scholar in his/her field gaining national and/or international recognition. Therefore, the Department Review Committee, the Department Head, the Dean’s Advisory Review Committee and the Dean should base their annual reappointment feedback and decision on evidence that the faculty member’s scholarly productivity is on a trajectory to attain national prominence within the five year probationary period. This record also serves as evidence of ongoing, probable future scholarly accomplishments.
C. **Service**

Faculty members who are candidates for promotion should have an established record of commitment to the University, the School, the Department, the profession, and the field through participation in service activities.

1. **Service Activities**
   a. Service to the University, the School, and the Department is deemed essential to develop and maintain a high quality professional school and premier university. Hence, all faculty members are expected to share responsibilities and perform competently in such functions.

   b. Professional service refers to the contributions that faculty members make to the functions of the professional societies to which they belong and to the profession more broadly. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies, contributions to the organization and presentation of professional conferences, editorships and the review of manuscripts for an association’s publications, review of grant applications, memberships on panels, or the elected member of committees. Service activities that enhance the candidate’s national reputation in scholarship include editorial boards and grant review panels.

   c. Service to the field and society involves the application of professional skills and knowledge to benefit communities, schools, related educational agencies, and the public. Relevant public service activities include, but are not limited to: presentations/workshops for educators and related service providers; participation on advisory boards; presentations/workshops for parents or community groups; consultation and technical assistance, performance of clinical activities in related settings (e.g., hospitals and clinics).
2. Indicators/Evidence of Service Contributions.
   a. Every faculty member is expected to participate in the conduct of his/her department, the Neag School, and the University; in appropriate professional organizations in his/her academic field; and in professional service to schools and other agencies of the community. Evidence of a faculty member’s productivity is manifested by the extent to which he/she participates on standing committees at the department, college, and university levels; contributions to professional associations; provides service to the broader field and society.
   b. The level, frequency and stature of participation will be considered.
   c. Meritorious professional service through which the candidate has achieved distinction in the profession will serve as evidence of a significant service contribution.

IV. Criteria Applied for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure Review

A. Teaching

1. Criteria
   (a) High quality teaching as evidenced on university-administered student evaluations of teaching and/or direct observations of instruction by administrators or peers.
   Student ratings are expected to meet, or exceed, the criteria established for the Neag School of Education faculty (8+ on the current system; benchmarks will be establish for the new system once it is operational and results can be reviewed). The judgment of teaching performance may be flexible and take into account such factors as the type of course and the number of class participants. For example, university studies have revealed that lower evaluations may be expected from large, undergraduate classes (Institute for Teaching and Learning). In the case of a history of low teaching
evaluations, the faculty member should present documentation of steps taken to improve his/her teaching (e.g., working with the Teaching and Learning Center) and show improvement in student ratings over time.

(b) Student Advisement. Faculty members are expected to advise students at all levels. Effectiveness involves the ability of the faculty member to develop collaborative relationships with students, respond to questions and provide information, and help students with a range of academic issues such as developing a plan of study, selecting an advisory committee, negotiating the degree completion process, or applying for an academic job. Faculty members are also expected to chair and direct committees as appropriate for their program (e.g., doctoral, master’s, honor’s). Department Heads provide evidence of effectiveness in academic advising by seeking feedback from students and by asking faculty members to describe the academic advising they provide students.

(c) Teaching Innovation and/or Curriculum Development activities as appropriate, e.g., original and/or unique innovations to enhance teaching and content in an existing course, the enhanced use of technology, development of new courses, or contributions to the revision of programs (including clinical/patient activities) and related curricula. Evidence of quality in curriculum innovation and development is shown by program or department review of course syllabi and external reviews of programs by experts in the field (e.g., an accrediting body).

2. Candidate’s Documentation of Teaching and Advising Performance

Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include the following.

(a) The University’s formal evaluations of teaching collected over time and presented chronologically.

(b) Written statement of philosophy of teaching and goals relative to instructional responsibilities with reference to course development and instructional activities, including independent studies, as appropriate (presented in the Provost’s PTR form).

(c) Description of any activities undertaken to enhance instruction.

(d) Description of any original and/or unique innovations developed to enhance
the delivery, the content, or the evaluation of an existing course; or description of the development of new courses designed to meet the demands in the field or contribute to the revision of programs or curricula.

(e) Course syllabi with indication of innovations/curricula enhancements, etc.

(f) Written summaries of observations of teaching conducted by administrators, supervisors, or peers.

(g) Published materials related to instruction, e.g., instructional strategies, course design, curricula.

(h) Evidence of special recognition from within or beyond the University for teaching.

(i) Counts of advisees as indicated on the PTR form; evidence of successful mentoring and advising of advisees, including participation on doctoral committees as the major advisor.

(j) Evidence of special recognition from the University for outstanding advisement activities.

B. Scholarship

1. Criteria

The primary criterion for assessing scholarship is the contribution made by the candidate to his/her discipline and the development of an emerging national reputation.

(a) Publications. Peer-reviewed publications appropriate for the candidate’s discipline are the most important indicators of scholarship. Such publications may include a range of reputable journals or books in the candidate’s field. Normal expectations for a faculty member are to produce, on average, two refereed journal articles per year published, or verified in-press, when reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (in the sixth year for those hired with no prior service). Co-authored work is valued, and yet, evidence that the candidate is a scholar in his/her own right is important. Such evidence may include single-authored works in highly respected, peer-reviewed sources and/or indication of the candidate’s contributions to co-authored research. Faculty research will be evaluated on its quality as well as its quantity. The quality of the journal will be confirmed at the department/program
level with appropriate indicators identified (Scopus, Google Scholar, the Social Sciences Citation indices, PubMed). The assessment of quality and value of the candidate’s scholarship completed by the external reviewers will also be highly regarded indicators.

(b) **Coherent Focus.** The scholarship must cohere around a distinct area, or related areas, of study and reflect the candidate’s unique contributions.

(c) **National Prominence/Scholarly Influence.** Total number of publications notwithstanding, the quality and influence of a candidate’s scholarship are of utmost importance in assessing scholarly potential. The academic reputation of the journal, or other dissemination outlet, is a key indicator of quality and impact. In addition, publications (e.g., books, edited books, chapters in influential books, articles in non-refereed sources, etc.) that have documented and significant impact on policy and practice and presentations at reputed national or international conferences constitute evidence of scholarship as well as evidence of both an emerging national reputation and a probable future of scholarly accomplishments.

(d) **External Funding.** Research grants/external funds solicited (individually and/or collaboratively), and those awarded on the basis of scholarly merit will also be considered indication of scholarship. The candidate’s record of external funding will be considered in the context of the candidate’s discipline and available opportunities.

(e) **Other.** Other evidence of scholarship includes presentations and papers delivered at academic meetings (refereed), published conference proceedings (refereed) invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters, and special awards or special recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

(f) **External Review.** The written evaluations secured by the Department Head from recognized scholars in the field are critical in the assessment of scholarship and national reputation. (Procedures for securing these external reviewers are detailed below.)

2. **Candidate’s Documentation of Scholarship**

(a) Suggested types of evidence the candidate may present include all categories of Scholarship and Creative Accomplishments included on the Provost’s PTR form,
entered in reverse chronological order.
(b) When compiling a file of scholarship, include one copy of each entry, or publication, organized by category.

C. Service

1. Criteria

Faculty members are expected to engage in service to the Department, the School, and the University, and the profession.

(a) Service to the University. Evaluation of service to the Department, School, and University will include the type of committee, role of the candidate, amount of time serving, and the quality of contributions. Evidence of a faculty member’s productivity is manifested by the extent to which he/she participates on standing committees (e.g., the Curriculum Committee) at the department, college, and university levels. The level, frequency and stature of participation will be considered.

(b) Service to the Profession. Evaluation of service to the profession will take into account the type of work, level of commitment, time requirements, and role of the individual. In some cases, service to the profession may be viewed as evidence of an emerging national reputation (e.g., being appointed as an editor or associate editor of a prominent journal).

(c) Service to the Field and Society. Evaluation of service to the field and/or society will account for the type of contribution, time commitments, and contributions resulting from engagement in service activities benefitting entities beyond the university.

2. Candidate’s Documentation of Service Contributions

Expected evidence of quality service contributions will include the following.

(a) Participation as requested on committees at the Department, School, and University levels.

(b) Contributions to the professional community as evidenced by committee work, conference contributions, editing work, and/or elected offices as appropriate for an individual’s professional affiliations.
(c) Contributions to the professional and public communities beyond the University reflecting the individual’s professional expertise.

D. Significant/Diverse Roles

Decisions about promotion to Associate Professor should take into account any special circumstances that may result from the faculty member’s role(s) as an administrator/manager of programs in his/her academic area and the demands of these programs. However, this work alone (e.g., administrative responsibilities) will not qualify a faculty member for promotion in the absence of substantial accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service as discussed above.

V. Criteria Applied to the Review for Promotion to Professor

In general, promotion to the rank of Professor requires consistent, high levels of performance and productivity in the key areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as outlined above. The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor is expected to present evidence that he/she has gained national/international visibility and respect for excellence in scholarship. This will result from a sustained body of scholarly accomplishments and ongoing contributions to the profession.

A. Teaching

Maintain superior teaching and academic advising.

(a) High quality teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses, seminars, or practicums as evidenced on university-administered student evaluations of teaching and/or direct observations of instruction by administrators or peers. Student ratings are expected to consistently meet, or exceed, the criteria established for the Neag School of Education faculty (8+ on the current system; benchmarks will be establish for the new system once it is operational and results can be reviewed).

(b) Student advisement that is responsive to and supportive of students at all academic levels will be demonstrated by the Department Head’s documentation of feedback from
students as well as from the candidate’s description of advising activities. Ordinarily, an additional expectation will be the completion of doctoral students as the major advisor while at this university.

(c) **Teaching Innovation and/or Curriculum Design** demonstrating commitment to developing current and relevant courses informed by the literature and meeting the needs of the profession. Evidence may include visionary contributions that involve the design of new courses or series of courses, development of on-line courses or programs, or innovations that enhance academic programs.

### B. Scholarship
Engaged continually and effectively in scholarly and/or creative activities of distinction, the candidate will be expected to present a body of scholarly accomplishments that represent the achievement of an upward trajectory built upon and extending early career accomplishments. As a result the candidate will have garnered a substantial, respected national/international reputation.

(a) **Publications.** Scholarly products that are published following rigorous peer-review processes are the most highly valued forms of scholarship in the promotion review process. As a guideline, candidates are expected to publish, on average, two peer-reviewed articles in premier journals, or books in their field, including several that are recognized to have been major contributions to the literature in the candidate’s field. The indicators of productivity must provide evidence of the candidate’s reputation as an influential, contributing scholar in his/her discipline. Appropriate evidence may include single-authored works in premier outlets and/or indication of his/her unique contributions to collaborative projects.

(b) **Scholarly Influence.** The scholarly influence of the candidate will be confirmed by written evaluations of scholarship secured by the Department Head from recognized scholars in the candidate’s field.

(c) **External Funding.** The candidate will have secured grant funding and/or external support for research and projects. The candidate’s record of external funding will be considered in the context of the candidate’s discipline and available opportunities.

(d) **Other.** Other evidence of scholarship may include presentations and papers delivered at
academic meetings (refereed), published conference proceedings (refereed) invited presentations for academic audiences, invited book chapters, and special awards or special recognition for scholarship or creative productions.

C. Service
Faculty members are expected to have established records of sustained, important service to the Department, the School, the University, the profession, and society. At this level, candidates will be expected to have been actively engaged in a wide range of service activities with more prominent leadership roles in all undertakings (University, School, Department, state, national, international, professional, field based).

D. Significant/Diverse Roles
Decisions about promotion to Professor should take into account any special circumstances that may result from the faculty member’s role(s) as an administrator/manager of programs in his/her academic area and the demands of these programs. However, this work alone (e.g., administrative responsibilities) will not qualify a faculty member for promotion to Professor in the absence of substantial accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service as discussed above.

Preparation for Review

The preparation for promotion and tenure is described in University Policy: Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities and the Provost’s Office guidelines Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR).

Materials for the progress toward tenure are cumulative and submitted yearly in all pre-tenure years.

The third year review is designed to provide a cumulative and comprehensive review of the
faculty member at the beginning of the third year as a way to monitor prospects for success with the tenure process. The primary focus of the third year review is the annual report completed by the faculty member presenting evidence confirming substantial progress in the evaluation criteria (Teaching, Scholarship, Service).

The sixth year review of tenure-track faculty is the tenure/promotion decision year.

The Formal Review Process

Following is an abstracted overview to inform faculty members of the steps and specific committees involved in the annual review process. For a more complete set of procedures and details of the process, see the Provost’s website for Promotion, Tenure & Reappointment Procedures (provost.uconn.edu/ptr).

- The candidate completes the University’s PTR form and submits this form with supporting documents by the published deadline (established annually by the Provost). These documents become the faculty member’s dossier. (See suggestions for this file of materials, below.)
  - The Department Head secures external references in accordance with the Provost’s instructions when this is appropriate (i.e., during the tenure and promotion decision year).
  - The faculty member creates a file to display a comprehensive set of materials supporting his/her tenure and/or promotion review. Contents are organized to reflect the faculty member’s evidence in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
  - The faculty member may add to his/her PTR file at any time during the reviews by the Department Committee and the Dean’s Advisory Committee by bringing materials to the Department Head who will inform the committees of new materials in writing; no materials may be removed from the file.
- The PTR form for each individual is reviewed by the Department PTR Advisory Committee, which advises the Department Head on promotion, tenure, and reappointment and submits a letter summarizing the Committee’s evaluation and vote on the faculty member’s candidacy (for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion).
• The Department Head completes his/her evaluation and submits the candidate’s PTR file and related materials to the Dean’s office.
• The Dean’s Advisory Council on PTR reviews the faculty member’s PTR file and appraises the performance and potential for teaching, scholarship, creative accomplishments, and service of the individual under consideration. The Council’s evaluation of each individual is summarized for the Dean in a written report that includes the Council’s vote.
• The Dean writes his/her evaluation and submits all necessary forms and supporting documents to the Provost for his/her consideration and final determination.
• The Provost’s decisions are communicated to and acted upon by the Board of Trustees annually.
• The University also has a Faculty Review Board that is asked by the Provost to consider individual, specific cases on PTR. The composition and work of the Faculty Review Board is detailed in the Provost’s document on PTR.
• The Provost determines specific timelines annually in accordance with the date of presentation to the Board of Trustees.
• Under Connecticut Freedom of Information statues, candidates have access to their files and to the recommendation letters.

External Letters
Per the Provost’s directions, a minimum of four external letters from individuals of national stature in the candidate’s area of expertise who do not have a conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., former mentor, frequent collaborators) are required for those pursuing tenure and/or promotion in rank at any level. The Neag School preference is six external letters.

These letters will be solicited by the Department Head and should be from individuals who hold professorial rank at or above that to which the candidate aspires. In no case should letters be sought from individuals who served as faculty advisors, teachers, or mentors during a candidate’s program of graduate or undergraduate study. Per direction from the Provost, the candidate and the Departmental PTR Advisory Committee should each provide the Department Head a list of potential outside reviewers, and the Department Head requests at least half of the
total number of letters from those listed by the candidate. The candidate should not contact potential reviewers directly and should not reveal to the potential reviewers that they have been recommended to the Department Head.

Dossier of Materials
The faculty member’s PTR dossier consists of his/her PTR form and all supporting documents. When a candidate prepares a file of supporting materials for the years when tenure and/or promotion decisions are considered, the content will ordinarily consist of documents related to the following:
  o Personal Information
    ▪ Candidate’s curriculum vita
    ▪ Candidate’s written statement
  o Teaching
    ▪ University student evaluation reports
    ▪ Special teaching awards
  o Scholarship
    ▪ Copies of all published materials listed on the form (books, book chapters, monographs, articles, curriculum materials, etc.)
    ▪ Manuscripts in-press
    ▪ Manuscripts submitted for review or in preparation
  o Service
    ▪ Special accomplishments
    ▪ Special projects

Special Policy
The University has an established policy of adjusting the tenure clock for individuals taking a leave for a FMLA-qualifying event (birth, adoption, foster placement of a child; a faculty member’s serious illness or injury; a serious illness or injury to the faculty member’s child, spouse, or parent). Detail of this policy and the current procedures are found at www.uconn.hr.edu. Candidates are advised to discuss these procedures and related issues with their Department Heads.