

## Table of Contents

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
Primary Dept. Chair/Program Coordinator's Responsibility Checklist	2
Auxiliary Dept. Chair/Program Coordinator's Responsibility Checklist	5
Candidate's Responsibility Checklist	6
Notes on a Well Prepared Tenure/Promotion Case	8
Guidelines for the Peer Review of Courses	11
Guidelines for a Consensus Letter	13
Instructions for Solicitation of Student Letters	14
Sample Letter for Students who Majored in the Discipline	15
Sample Letter for Former Students	16
Sample Letter for External Review Candidates	17
Form for Soliciting Student Letters	19
Form for the Peer Review of Courses	21
Form for Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation	23

**CHECKLIST FOR MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED IN A  
CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER FOR TENURE**

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S RESPONSIBILITY OR PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S  
RESPONSIBILITY (FOR THOSE APPOINTED IN A PROGRAM)**

**Fall 2009:**

- Assemble a committee to do the Peer Review of Courses (which is described in more detail on page 11). The committee should begin to visit the candidate's courses.
  
- Inform the candidate and the Dean of Academic Affairs of the department's deadline for when the candidate's file must be completed and submitted to the department for review. You may find it helpful to have multiple due dates. For example, you could require the teaching aspects of the dossier to be completed by an earlier date to inform the peer review of courses, and require the remainder of the dossier to be due later.

**By November 6, 2009:**

- Fill out and return the "Soliciting Student Letters" form to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.
  
- Forward to the Dean of Academic Affairs a list of names (including full title) and contact information (office address, office phone, and e-mail address) of persons to be solicited for external review of the candidate's scholarly activity. The candidate and the department chairperson should agree on a list of five experts, at least one of whom teaches at a liberal arts college, from whom evaluations might be requested. The list should be comprised of objective individuals and should not include collaborators. (Letters from collaborators should be requested by the Department Chair or Program Coordinator.) The list for the Dean should describe each expert's work in the candidate's field as well as indicate the expert's affiliation and familiarity with the candidate.

**By November 16, 2009:**

Remind the candidate to provide to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs a list of names of other students (those not included in the computer-generated list) from whom the candidate specifically requests that letters of evaluation be solicited.

**CHECKLIST FOR MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED IN A  
CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER FOR TENURE**

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S or PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S RESPONSIBILITY,**  
**cont.**

- Request aggregate course evaluations from Christine Zimmerman, Director of Institutional Research. These should be shared with the candidate as well as those reviewing the candidate's dossier, including the committee completing the peer review of courses.
  
- Request a grade summary from the registrar, Carolyn Filippi. These should be shared with the candidate as well as those reviewing the candidate's dossier, including the committee completing the peer review of courses.

**By January 25, 2010:**

- The Peer Review of Courses should be completed by now so that it can be used to inform the department's consensus letter.

**By February 1, 2010:**

- Prepare a consensus recommendation approved by a majority of the tenured members of the department. See Guidelines for Consensus Letter on page 13.
  
- Review the completed Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation Form with the tenured members of the department and the candidate.
  
- Remind all tenured members of the department to send individual letters assessing the candidate to the Professional Standards Committee through the Dean of Academic Affairs by Monday February 8, 2010. (This is mandatory for tenured members; non-tenured members should also be encouraged to send individual letters.)
  
- Forward to the Dean of Academic Affairs a list of the names of individuals (including title and contact information) from whom evaluative letters have been solicited by either the candidate or the department; copies of letters must be provided. (These are in addition to the student letters and the mandated external review letters solicited by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the Dean of Academic Affairs, respectively.)

**CHECKLIST FOR MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED IN A  
CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER FOR TENURE**

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S or PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S RESPONSIBILITY, cont.**

- Make sure the candidate's file includes course evaluations from all St. Lawrence courses taught by the candidate during the last five years. Send all parts of the evaluation form, all of the raw data upon which any summaries of open-ended questions are based, and a copy of the appropriate questionnaire.

**By February 8, 2010:**

As part of the candidate's completed dossier, forward to the Professional Standards Committee through the Dean of Academic Affairs, the following:

- A completed Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation Form
- A consensus recommendation approved by a majority of the tenured members of the department
- The Peer Review of Courses form and supporting materials submitted by the Peer Review Committee
- All mid-probationary review documents

**On night of PSC review of Candidate**

The Chair or program head acts as the presenter for the candidate's case. The presenter appears before PSC on the night the committee reviews the case, acting as resource person to answer questions or providing additional information relative to the department's or program's interactions with, and assessment of, the candidate.

**CHECKLIST FOR MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED IN A  
CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER FOR TENURE**

**PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY (auxiliary affiliations)**

**By February 1, 2010:**

- Prepare a recommendation based on the candidate's participation in the program. See Guidelines for Consensus Letter.
  
- Review the recommendation with the candidate.
  
- Remind all faculty who have knowledge of the candidate's contribution to the program to send individual letters assessing the candidate to the Professional Standards Committee through the Dean of Academic Affairs by February 1, 2010.
  
- Forward to the Dean of Academic Affairs a list of the names of individuals (including titles and contact information) from whom evaluative letters have been solicited by either the candidate or the program; copies of letters must be provided. (These are in addition to the student letters and the mandated external review letters solicited by the Dean of Academic Affairs.)

**By February 8, 2010:**

As part of the candidate's completed dossier, forward to the Professional Standards Committee through the Dean of Academic Affairs, the following:

- A recommendation based on the candidate's participation in the program.

**CHECKLIST FOR MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED IN A  
CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION**

**REVIEW CANDIDATE'S RESPONSIBILITY**

**Fall 2009:**

Provide the Peer Review of Courses Committee with the information that they request before visiting classes.

**By November 6, 2009:**

- Send both hard copy and e-copy of an abbreviated curriculum vitae (no more than two pages) to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs; this will be sent out with letters soliciting student evaluations of the candidate.
- The candidate and the department chairperson should agree on a list of five experts, at least one of whom teaches at a liberal arts college, from whom evaluations might be requested. The list should be comprised of objective individuals and should not include collaborators. (Letters from collaborators should be requested by the Department Chair or Program Coordinator.) The list for the Dean should describe each expert's work in the candidate's field as well as indicate the expert's affiliation and familiarity with the candidate. This list is due in the Dean's office on this day.
- Send both hard copy and e-copy of a full curriculum vitae to the Dean of Academic Affairs; this will be sent to persons solicited for external review of the candidate as well as be placed on reserve in ODY Library and the Dean's Office for public review.
- The Chair of your department or your Program Coordinator should inform you of the deadline for the completion of your dossier of materials.

**By November 16, 2009:**

- Provide to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs a list of names of other students (those not included in the computer-generated list) from whom the candidate specifically requests that letters of evaluation be solicited. It is helpful to add the names of students that you have worked with on independent projects and research activities, if they do not appear on the computer-generated list of student names.
- Provide to the Dean of Academic Affairs **five packets** of a representative sample of your

work to send to the external reviewers. If you have two or more distinct areas of research and want one reviewer to get different material than another reviewer, then you should compile a different packet of material for each reviewer. In that case, you should provide a packet of material labeled with the name of the reviewer to whom the material should be sent. If you plan to send all the reviewers the same material, then you simply need to provide the Dean with five packets of the same material. The material should be enough to give the reviewer an idea of your work but not so much that you overwhelm him/her.

**By the deadline agreed upon with the Department Chair:**

As part of the candidate's completed dossier, forward to the department and/or program for review the following:

- A history of teaching assignments at St. Lawrence.
- A CV (e-copy and hard copy) that provides evidence of contributions and achievements under the headings of scholarship, teaching, and university service, including information about whether or not scholarly contributions have been refereed, juried, or invited for publication or presentation.
- A personal statement (e-copy and hard copy) of professional goals in scholarship, teaching, and university service to include:
  - the development of the candidate's research agenda since appointment to tenure track position
  - the candidate's change in practice, focus, and/or performance as a teacher since appointment to tenure track position
  - achievements in university service since appointment to tenure track position
- Other evaluative material including representative course syllabi, writing assignments, examinations, graded work, and information about independent and honors projects the candidate has directed.
- Course evaluations from all St. Lawrence courses taught by the candidate during the last five years. Send all parts of the evaluation form, all of the raw data upon which any summaries of open-ended questions are based, and a copy of the appropriate questionnaire.

**By February 8, 2010:**

Forward the materials listed above to the Professional Standards Committee through the Dean of Academic Affairs. **Be sure to send an e-copy of the personal statement and of the CV.**

## NOTES ON THE WELL-PREPARED TENURE/PROMOTION CASE

*(updated March 2007)*

The experience of the committee in recent years suggests that the following remarks may be useful to you as you assemble your case. **A poorly assembled file may jeopardize your case.**

Physically, materials are going to be examined separately by each member of the committee, the Dean, and the President. The PSC suggests that your case be assembled in large 3-ring binders or in files in sturdy file boxes, with removable materials keyed to their respective holders. In constructing your file, you should keep in mind that a case must be assembled in a logical order and should be easily readable.

Student evaluations should be arranged in **reverse chronological order** with a set of questions, machine-read summaries, and individual student responses collated in order for each course. The course number and year must be clearly identified. Course evaluations should not be submitted in envelopes.

The candidate's CV is a critical element of the case file. Items in the curriculum vitae should be listed in **reverse chronological order**, and should be clearly divided into material before and after appointment or previous promotion and tenure. Dates of appointment, promotion, and tenure should be clearly identified. Papers appearing in several guises (revisions published in multiple venues; conference papers reappearing as conference proceedings and then as journal articles or chapters) should be carefully cross-referenced. You must clearly distinguish between scholarly or creative work that is already published, accepted for publication, under review, or not yet submitted.

Once candidate's and department's materials are forwarded to the Professional Standards Committee they will not be available to department chairs or candidates (including letters solicited from students and external reviewers). **Candidates should make copies of all materials that they wish to consult during the evaluation process.** All case materials submitted by the candidate will be returned once all portions of the evaluation process are completed.

Candidates and chairs are also encouraged to consider the following advice:

- Candidates should collect samples of their teaching materials (syllabi, hand-outs, etc.) and of graded student work (exams, papers, lab reports, etc.) to include in their promotion case dossiers. A range of graded material is important, as it indicates to the committee

the kind of feedback that the candidate typically provides to students.

- If the candidate routinely provides a significant amount of feedback to students via conferences or other forms of oral exchange, both the methodology and the philosophy behind it should be included in some kind of narrative in the case dossier that informs PSC about this aspect of the candidate's pedagogy (e.g., within the personal statement in a section on teaching pedagogy and philosophy).
- PSC finds it instructive when candidates comment on courses for which the evaluations indicate that the course was particularly effective or was particularly problematic. This comment could be included in the candidate's personal statement (as part of the broader reflection on the evolution, development, experience of teaching certain courses) or could be an additional document inserted with the specific course materials or evaluations.
- A well-organized dossier is extremely helpful for PSC. A comprehensive table of contents and section tabs with labels identifying the sections' contents assist the committee in its work of reviewing the case materials.
- It is possible for you to include too much material. Material concerning major achievements, such as commissions, book reviews, grant awards, etc., should be included. Items such as minor notes of congratulations or routine correspondence with students should not be included.
- Chairs or program heads act as presenters for a particular case. The presenter appears before PSC on the night the committee reviews the case, acting as resource person to answer questions or providing additional information relative to the department's or program's interactions with, and assessment of, the candidate. Below are some examples of information that PSC has solicited from presenters in the past:
  - Introductory remarks about any element of the candidate's file prior to the beginning of the questions. This should not be a simple reiteration of the file contents but could call attention to elements of the file the department considers particularly worthy of note.
  - Observations on the candidate's work as an advisor: keeping regular office hours, proving accessible to (and effective with) students outside the classroom, etc.
  - Assessments of the sources in which the candidate has been published or of the venues at which the candidate has exhibited creative work. Typical questions: What kind of acceptance rate does this journal/publisher have? Relative to other

similar journals/publishers, how is it regarded in the profession? Was this exhibit juried? How competitive was selection for it?

- The department's/program's perspective on issues such as the range of courses offered by the candidate, the frequency with which courses taught by the candidate have been offered, etc.
  - More detailed descriptions of the candidate's work within the department (on search committees, departmental assignments, etc.).
- 
- Candidates are encouraged to balance comprehensiveness of contents with efficiency when selecting materials for the case dossier.
    - While the committee wishes to see a representative syllabus for each course a candidate has taught, for example, it doesn't need to see every syllabus when the candidate has taught multiple sections of the same course during the probationary period. However, if a course's syllabus has evolved quite a bit over time, an older version can be helpful. Some questions the syllabi help to answer are the following: Is the course up to date? How has the course developed over time? Is the level of the course appropriate?
    - All evaluations must be included.

There should be copies of all of the candidate's scholarship or creative work in the dossier.

For clarification on any of the information above, or if you have other questions not addressed here, please contact the current chair of the Professional Standards Committee.

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE PEER REVIEW OF COURSES**

Departments must include in the dossier of candidates for tenure and promotion the report of a committee of three or more department or program peers appraising the content and coverage of courses taught by the candidate.

### **Departmental/Program Guidelines**

Each department or program should describe its guidelines for conducting peer reviews, being sure to include the method by which reviewers have been selected and the procedures employed for carrying out the review. It is in the best interest of the candidate and the university that these decisions not be made on an *ad hoc* basis.

### **Courses Reviewed**

Given the diverse nature of the university's curriculum, departments or programs may wish to develop their own guidelines for the selection of courses. Nevertheless, the review should include introductory and advanced courses, courses that have been offered on several different occasions, and courses for which syllabi are determined by the department. While a representative range of courses must be reviewed, it is not necessary to review every course offered every year by the candidate.

### **Dossier**

- Candidates will wish to provide sufficient materials to enable the committee to achieve a full understanding of their courses. Since no single source of information is reliable, the dossier should include a variety of materials. Therefore, the dossier may include, but need not be limited to the following documents:
  - Instructor's statement of aims, goals, and accomplishments
  - Course syllabi and/or outlines
  - Assignments
  - Hand-outs
  - Reading lists and bibliographies
  - Examinations
  - Grades
  - Samples of graded examinations and assignments
  - Other evaluations of student work

### **Nature of the Review**

- Review committees should consider such questions as the definition of course goals, currency of the materials, their adequacy and appropriateness to course goals, and the breadth and depth of coverage. Review of the intellectual tasks set for the students may focus on the methods and

materials used to encourage critical thinking and evaluative skills, the kinds of feedback provided by the instructor, and course grades. In the case of courses that use a common departmental syllabus, the committee may wish to study the adequacy of the course in achieving departmental goals.

- The committee should consider the faculty member's commitment to the pursuit of excellence in teaching by studying evidence of course revision, the design of new courses, participation in colloquia, and other activities concerned with the teaching process.
- In addition, as required by the Faculty Handbook, the review committee must perform classroom visits.

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSENSUS LETTER**

Provide responses to the following concerns:

### **Teaching**

- **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.** Assess the candidate's teaching as it is influenced by qualities such as initiative, creativity, degree of respect for-and regard by-others, etc. Discuss principal strengths and weaknesses. Please draw explicitly on the peer review of courses and indicate other bases of judgment, such as student evaluations, the candidate's dossier, or other sources.
- **AVAILABILITY TO STUDENTS.** Describe attitude toward students. Students' attitudes toward candidate.
- **COURSE CONTENT.** Comment on depth, breadth, innovation, new courses designed, etc.
- **PERFORMANCE OF TEACHING-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES.** Address areas such as meeting classes, following university policies (in regard to examining, to change of grades, etc.), and being punctual (work finished on time and properly prepared).
- **PERFORMANCE AS AN ACADEMIC ADVISOR.**

### **Scholarship and/or Creative Arts**

- **SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES.** Comment on the nature of the candidate's scholarly activities, assessing the quantity and quality of such activities. Assess the candidate's scholarship and/or creative work with respect to its quality, creativity, acceptance and engagement with the discipline at large, etc. Discuss principal strengths and weaknesses.
- **PROFESSIONAL GROWTH.** Is the candidate maturing and assuming increasing stature in chosen field? Include research, consulting activities, and creative contributions.

### **University Service**

- **RANGE OF SERVICE.** Include departmental, university, and broader community contributions; evidence of leadership, quality of contributions.
- Assess the candidate's University service with respect to qualities such as dependability, cooperation, relationships with others, etc. Discuss principal strengths and weaknesses.

**A signed copy of the Department/Program Consensus Letter should be attached to the Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation Form when it is submitted to the Dean.**

MEMO TO: Department Chairs and Tenure Candidates

FROM: Karl Schonberg  
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs

RE: Solicitation of Student Letters

This memo explains the process for soliciting student letters for tenure cases. **Three copies of the attached form along with one copy of the abbreviated curriculum vitae** are to be returned to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs Office **by November 6, 2009**.

One copy of the form will be for our files, one copy for the PSC files, and one copy will be forwarded to the Registrar's Office (where course grade summaries will be produced for PSC).

Names of the candidate's current and former students will be selected at random from university computer records and a list will be produced for each of the following groups:

1. Current majors/minors
2. Current students
3. Alumni majors/minors

Random selection will continue until the 200-name maximum has been met or the lists are exhausted.

A copy of this list will be provided to the candidate and to PSC. It is the candidate's responsibility to review the list and report any errors.

**After reviewing the list of students selected at random, a candidate may, no later than November 16, 2009, submit to the Associate Dean's office a list of additional students to whom he/she would like letters sent.**

Letters soliciting input regarding the tenure candidate will be mailed from the Associate Dean's office to each student on the list of students selected at random and students selected by the candidate.

If you have questions, please feel free to call (x5993).

**SAMPLE**

**MEMO TO: Majors in [DISCIPLINE]**

FROM: Karl Schonberg, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs

RE: Tenure and promotion recommendations for [CANDIDATE'S NAME]

This fall, [CANDIDATE'S NAME], who is currently an Assistant Professor in the [DISCIPLINE] Department, will be a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at St. Lawrence. Tenure and promotion decisions are among the most important decisions made at a university.

The St. Lawrence tenure and promotion policy states that tenure and/or promotion are not automatic and are not solely the result of time spent in teaching. Excellence in teaching is a primary requirement with contributions in scholarship and community service also weighing importantly in the decision.

Students who have taken a professor's courses are particularly well qualified to comment on teaching ability and the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), which makes recommendations on tenure and promotion, finds student and alumni letters extremely helpful. The PSC is composed of seven faculty members and the Dean of Academic Affairs.

I strongly urge you to write and address your experience with [CANDIDATE'S NAME] as teacher and/or professor. Only signed letters will be considered. Letters will be held in confidence and will be read only by those evaluating the candidate: the members of the Professional Standards Committee and the President of the University. We cannot, under law, guarantee complete confidentiality since a court of law or government agency might require disclosure.

Enclosed you will find a list of the criteria used by the committee as well as an abbreviated curriculum vitae provided by [CANDIDATE'S NAME]. Also enclosed is an envelope in which your comments can be forwarded to my office at Vilas 103.

Letters are due in this office no later than [DATE]. I thank you in advance for your help in this matter.

Enclosures

**SAMPLE**

**MEMO TO: Former Students** of [CANDIDATE'S NAME]  
[DISCIPLINE] Department

FROM: Karl Schonberg, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs

RE: Tenure and promotion recommendations for [CANDIDATE'S NAME]

This fall, [CANDIDATE'S NAME], who is currently an Assistant Professor in the [DISCIPLINE] Department, will be a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at St. Lawrence. Tenure and promotion decisions are among the most important decisions made at a university.

The St. Lawrence tenure and promotion policy states that tenure and/or promotion are not automatic and are not solely the result of time spent in teaching. Excellence in teaching is a primary requirement with contributions in scholarship and community service also weighing importantly in the decision.

Students who have taken a professor's courses are particularly well qualified to comment on teaching ability and the Professional Standards Committee (PSC), which makes recommendations on tenure and promotion, finds student and alumni letters extremely helpful. The PSC is composed of seven faculty members and the Dean of Academic Affairs.

I strongly urge you to write and address your experience with [CANDIDATE'S NAME] as teacher and/or professor. Only signed letters will be considered. Letters will be held in confidence and will be read only by those evaluating the candidate: the members of the Professional Standards Committee and the President of the University. We cannot, under law, guarantee complete confidentiality since a court of law or government agency might require disclosure.

Enclosed you will find a list of the criteria used by the committee as well as an abbreviated curriculum vitae provided by [CANDIDATE'S NAME]. Also enclosed is an envelope in which your comments can be forwarded to my office in Vilas 103.

Letters are due in this office no later than [DATE]. I thank you in advance for your help in this matter.

Enclosures

## **SAMPLE**

### Tenure and Promotion - External Review

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

Assistant Professor of [**discipline**] [**candidate's name**] is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor by the Professional Standards Committee at St. Lawrence University. You have been recommended to help in the evaluation of [**his/her**] scholarship.

While St. Lawrence is a liberal arts college where excellence in teaching is primary, faculty are also expected to be professionally involved and active. An individual must present evidence of “excellence of teaching..., together with contributions to scholarship and to the University community” to be tenured and promoted to the rank of Associate Professor.

The Professional Standards Committee asks you to write a letter in which you provide your professional assessment of Professor [candidate's name] [scholarship/creative work] and how it contributes to the field. If appropriate, it would be helpful to have your assessment of the quality of the journals or publications in which [**he/she**] has published. Please also tell us whether or how you know Professor [**candidate's name**] and [**his/her**] work.

I have attached a copy of Professor [candidate's name] curriculum vitae for your perusal. If you are willing to write a letter, we need to receive it by Monday, February 1, 2010. Your letter will be held in confidence and will be read only by those evaluating the candidate: the members of our Professional Standards Committee and the President of the University. We cannot, under law, guarantee complete confidentiality since a court of law or government agency might require disclosure.

Please let me know by telephone (315/229-5993) or e-mail ([acadean@stlawu.edu](mailto:acadean@stlawu.edu)) whether or not you are willing to provide this important service. If you are willing, please forward a copy of your curriculum vitae with your letter. Please also indicate by return e-mail if there are individual items you already have at your disposal. Otherwise, we will send a packet of materials for your review.

Peer review is an important function of our profession and we would certainly be very grateful for your participation. Beyond gratitude, I can offer only a modest honorarium (\$100) for this

imposition on your time.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Valerie D. Lehr

Vice President of the University and Dean of Academic Affairs

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
SOLICITING STUDENT LETTERS FORM**

This form is to be completed by the department chairperson and returned to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The information on this form will be used to generate a random list of former students of the candidate.

Candidate's Name:

Department:

Candidate's SLU ID Number:

From the list below please indicate the applicable majors and minors

**Majors:**

af-hi	African Stds-Hist	cn-re	Can St-Rel Stds	ge-ph	Geol-Physics
af-go	African Stds-Govt	cn-so	Can St-Soc	geol	Geology
af-an	African Stds-Anth	cn-sp	Can St-Spanish	ger	German Studies
af-ec	African Stds-Econ	c s	Computer Science	gs	Global Studies
anth	Anthropology	e-mba	Econ-Math B.A.	govt	Government
as-go	Asian Stds-Govt	e-mbs	Econ-Math B.S.	hist	History
as-hi	Asian Stds-Hist	econ	Economics	ma-cs	Math-CS
as-rs	Asian Stds-Rel	env	Env Stds	math	Mathematics
bioch	Biochemistry	en-an	Env Stds-Anth	mfdba	Multi-field B.A.
biol	Biology	en-bi	Env Stds-Bio	mfdbs	Multi-field B.S.
conbi	Conservation Biology	en-ch	Env Stds-Chem	multl	Multi-Languages
biph	Biology - Physics	en-ec	Env Stds-Econ	mus	Music
chem	Chemistry	en-en	Env Stds-Eng	nrsci	Neuroscience
cn-an	Can St-Anthro	en-ge	Env Stds-Geol	pca	Perf & Comm Arts
cn-ec	Can St-Econ	en-go	Env Stds-Govt	phil	Philosophy
cn-en	Can St-English	en-ph	Env Stds-Phil	phys	Physics
cn-fa	Can St-Fine Arts	en-ps	Env Stds-Psyc	psyc	Psychology
cn-fr	Can St-French	en-so	Env Stds-Soc	rel	Religious Studies
cn-gt	Can St-Govt	eng	English	soc	Sociology
cn-hs	Can St-Hist	f a	Fine Arts	span	Estudios Hispanicos
cn-ml	Can St-MultiLang	fr	Francophone Studies		

**Minors :**

a s	Asian Studies	film	Film Stds	outdr	Outdoor Studies
afs	African Studies	f a	Fine Arts	pca	Perf & Comm Arts
anth	Anthropology	fr	Francophone Studies	phil	Philosophy
biol	Biology	gndr	Gender Studies	phys	Physics
chem	Chemistry	geol	Geology	psyc	Psychology
clas	Car Latin Am Stud	ger	German Studies	rel	Religious Studies
cn s	Canadian Studies	gs	Global Studies	soc	Sociology
c s	Computer Science	govt	Government	span	Estudios Hispánicos
econ	Economics	hist	History	spls	Sprt Stds/Exer Sci
educs	Educational Studies	JPN S	Japanese Studies	stats	Applied Statistics
educt	Education Cert.	math	Mathematics	us st	US Cult & Ethnic St
eng	English	mus	Music		
eur	European Studies	na st	Native Amer Stdes		

## PEER REVIEW OF COURSES

Name of Candidate \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation for \_\_\_\_\_ tenure  
\_\_\_\_\_ promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

NAME AND ACADEMIC AFFILIATION OF REVIEWERS:

COURSES REVIEWED:

Catalogue Number

Course Title \_\_\_\_\_

When Offered

EVALUATION (Please use additional pages if necessary):

---

Signature of Candidate

**St. Lawrence University**  
**Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation Form**  
**For Faculty Promotion**

[N.B.: This form is to be completed by the department chairperson or program coordinator and submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs for the use of the Professional Standards Committee. The chairperson or program coordinator is encouraged to consult all the members of the department or contributors to the program to aid in this recommendation, but must consult the tenured members or contributors. A signed copy of the department's/program's Consensus Letter should be attached to this form.]

**PROFESSIONAL RECORD**

Last Name \_\_\_\_\_

First Name \_\_\_\_\_ Middle Name/Initial \_\_\_\_\_

Other legal names by which candidate has been known at St. Lawrence University:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Record of First Appointment to St. Lawrence University**

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Specialization (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Summary of special agreements (if any) made at the time of appointment:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Subsequent appointments/ranks held at St. Lawrence University**

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Specialization (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Specialization (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Summary of special agreements (if any) made at subsequent appointments:

---

---

**List the type and dates of all leaves (sabbatical, FYP, leave of absence) and any administrative assignments (part-time or full-time, on- or off-campus) since the candidate's initial appointment at St. Lawrence University for which teaching was interrupted:**

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ to Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Leave/Assignment:

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ to Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Leave/Assignment:

Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ to Date (Month/Year): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Leave/Assignment:

#### **DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION**

**Does the department/program recommend the candidate for promotion?**

YES \_\_\_ Recommended for promotion to the rank of: \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_

**Does a majority of the tenured faculty members concur?** YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Does the department chairperson/program coordinator concur? YES\_\_\_\_\_NO\_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of department chair/program coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**I have reviewed the Candidate Evaluation and Recommendation Form as well as the attached Department/Program Consensus Letter.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of candidate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date