These guidelines are designed to assist candidates, their department heads, and their other colleagues in preparing a complete electronic dossier for review by the ATP Committee and Academic Dean. The contributor to each section of the dossier is shown in parentheses below along with relevant deadlines. Files must be saved and uploaded in permanent document file (pdf) format. When necessary, the Office of the Dean of the College will assist in the conversion of printed materials to electronic files. Please note that the intent of these guidelines is to support the Faculty Handbook's formal standards for third-year review (section 404.4). These guidelines provide information ATP needs to ensure that the evaluation is “fair, equitable, and professionally sound” (306.1.2.1).

1. **Candidate Data Sheet cover checklist (provided by Dean’s Office to Candidate, to upload by second Friday of spring semester)**
   This data sheet compiled by the Dean's Office lists all degrees earned, tenure and/or promotion credit awarded at time of appointment, number of years in rank (including at Luther and tenure credit from other institutions).

2. **Comprehensive Course Listing (provided by Dean’s Office to Candidate, to upload by second Friday of spring semester)**
   This is a list compiled by the Dean’s Office of all courses taught by the candidate at Luther College since the date of appointment, with enrollments.

3. **Personal Statement (Candidate, by second Friday of spring semester)**
   Candidates submit a personal statement not to exceed three pages that helps to provide a context for the dossier materials. Typically, this statement includes reflection on (1) the candidate’s philosophy of teaching, a candid appraisal of the candidate’s work as a teacher and advisor, giving attention to strengths and weaknesses identified in course evaluations, (2) the candidate's scholarly development, and (3) the candidate's service in furthering the mission of the College.

4. **Curriculum Vitae (Candidate, by second Friday of spring semester)**
   This should be a complete CV, including all three areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

5. **The Teaching Report (Candidate, by second Friday of spring semester)**
   a. A brief statement (less than one page) that describes the context and rationale for what the candidate has chosen to include in the teaching report.
   b. Course syllabi.
   c. Additional materials such as course assignments, projects, or assessment tools that demonstrate the candidate's teaching approaches.
   d. Any additional evidence the candidate wishes to provide that illustrates effective teaching.

6. **Course Evaluations (Dean’s Office, by second Friday of spring semester)**
   a. ATP course evaluations for the last academic year (two semesters plus Jterm).
   b. Course evaluations for the preceding two academic years may also be made available to the ATP Committee.

7. **Scholarship (Candidate, by second Friday of spring semester)**
   a. A brief statement (less than one page) that describes the context and rationale for what the candidate has chosen to include in the scholarship report. The statement must explain how the candidate has met the expectations laid out in the department's scholarship statement.
   b. Record of publications or other appropriate activity with as complete citations as possible (title, publisher, date, page numbers, etc.), distinguishing among the following categories, and indicating which items are peer reviewed or refereed.
      2. Articles.
      3. Notes and comments.
      4. Chapters in books.
      5. Papers/posters presented at professional meetings.
      7. Evidence of student/faculty research collaborations.
Creative products and performances such as poetry readings, concerts, recitals, exhibitions, shows, and dramatic performances are listed in a similar form. You may comment in the listing about the significance of a particular publication or performance.

c. Products of scholarly and/or artistic activity. For all candidates, these may include offprints of published or presented works, photographed art pieces, or recordings of concerts or other performances. Electronic files (jpeg, mp3, etc.) are preferred, but physical copies of materials are fully acceptable and will be collected in the Office of the Dean and stored for review. Given this is a Third-Year Review, this section of the dossier may include work in progress or work submitted for review to a scholarly press. Work in progress should be clearly designated as such.

d. Products of student/faculty research collaborations. Examples may include co-authored or supervised papers, posters, grant proposals, creative projects.

e. Evidence of ability to relate scholarship, research, and/or artistic activity to effective teaching.

f. Evidence of membership or leadership in scholarly societies, editorial services to scholarly publications, and/or consulting activity.

8. Report on Service to the College (Candidate, by second Friday of spring semester)

A statement that describes how and in what capacity the candidate has served the college, including a, b, and c below. Candidates should explain the extent and significance of their particular contributions.

a. Department/program and college planning and administration.

b. Contributions to the life of the college as a community and leadership in achieving the goals of the college.

c. Contributions to extending the resources of the college to the wider community.

9. Confidential Letters (Department Head and Dean's Office, by second Friday of spring semester)

The letters in this section must be collected in hard copy format by the Department Head and submitted to the Dean’s Office. The letters will be converted to electronic files in the Office of the Dean of the College after the open files period has closed.

a. Department Head's Letter of Evaluation. Letter should be printed and signed (see Guidelines for Letter Writers below).

b. Letters by Eligible Department Faculty. Letters should be printed, signed, and submitted to department head (see Guidelines for Letter Writers below). If departmental letters are few in number, candidates are recommended to consider category ‘c’.

c. Letters by other faculty who are in a position to comment on the candidate’s teaching (e.g. as a result of having co-taught with the candidate in Paideia).

d. Any other letters from colleagues outside the department, alumni, and professional colleagues in the candidate's discipline that the candidate may wish to submit, appended by the Department Head.

10. Optional Additional Letter by Candidate (Candidate, by end of Open Files period)

The open files period during which candidates may view their files runs for ten business days after the second Friday of spring semester. During this time the Candidate may read, in the Office of the Dean, the hard copies of all letters submitted (see #9 above). After reviewing the confidential letters during the open files period, the candidate may write and upload an additional letter for the dossier, which addresses issues raised in the letters.

The electronic dossier will be sent to the ATP Committee (and/or the Dean) at the end of the Open Files period.

A file is not complete when supporting documents are missing, when shortcomings are not addressed, or when irregularities in the file raise unanswerable questions.

Guidelines for Letter Writers

Department Process Prior to Preparation of Letters:

In preparation for the review process, the candidate should make his/her tenure/promotional dossier available to department members such that they have time to review materials prior to writing letters and prior to the departmental meeting convened by the department head. The department head convenes members of the department senior in rank to the candidate to discuss the candidate’s dossier and progress towards tenure.

Department Head’s Letter:

The Department Head's letter should follow the guidelines for all department members (see below), but should also do the following:

- Summarize senior colleagues’ evaluation of the candidate’s progress towards tenure.
● Provide a context for the candidate’s dossier as it describes the candidate’s role in the department (teaching, research, and service) and evaluates the candidate’s dossier by the standards of the department and discipline. This context should include the candidate’s typical advisee load.

● Provide a context for the candidate’s dossier as it describes the candidate’s role outside of the department, including willingness to participate in college governance and the extent and quality of such contributions.

● Provide an explanation for any unique circumstances of the candidate’s appointment or timeline.

Guidelines for all departmental letter writers

The letter should address the following areas:

Teaching and Advising:
Department member letter-writers should include evaluation of teaching through multiple measures, and the letter should provide a clear description of what the teaching evaluation is based on. The following are suggested measures for department members (all are expected for department heads):

a) interactions/discussions with the candidate in regards to their teaching (approaches, challenges, results, etc.)
b) interactions with the candidate in regards to their advising
c) number and dates of classroom/laboratory visits and observations
d) review of dossier/teaching materials
e) review of candidate’s course evaluations

- department heads have regular access to candidate’s course evaluations
- department members have access to course evaluations only if the candidate chooses to share them, and the candidate is not obligated to do so

In the context of the above activities, letter-writers should provide evaluative comments on the quality of the candidate’s teaching. Evaluation of teaching by voting members of the department should include direct observations. In addition, as advising falls under the teaching component in the Faculty Handbook, writers should also provide appropriate comments with respect to the candidate’s work as an advisor, e.g., level of candidate's willingness/interest/engagement in advising.

Scholarship:
Department member letter-writers should:

a) Provide a description of what their scholarship evaluation is based on.
b) Provide an indication, and corresponding explanation, of whether the candidate has met the requirements specified in:
   ● the Faculty Handbook (section 404.1.2 Scholarship)
   ● the departmental scholarship statement that is currently posted on the Dean’s Office website. (If a previous scholarship statement is to be applied as specified in section 404.1.2, the department head’s letter should include a copy of this scholarship statement.)
c) Provide a context, for colleagues outside of the field, for the quality of the candidate’s scholarly work, e.g., the nature of the journals in which the candidate has published, the professional meetings at which the candidate has presented, the organizations with which a candidate has performed, the galleries in which a candidate has exhibited, etc.

Service:
Department member letter-writers should:

a) Provide an indication of what the service evaluation is based on.
b) Provide an indication of level of candidate’s willingness, interest, engagement, and specific contributions to departmental and college committee work, and any specific knowledge of the quality of that work (e.g., if one has served on a committee with the candidate or knows of results of their committee work).