



TENURE UNIT STANDARD ROUTING SHEET

In support of the following academic policy statements, tenure unit performance standards will be maintained and made publicly available by the Office of the Provost's Faculty Records Team. Per policy, each of these sets of standards will be reviewed every five (5) years, submitted to the Office of the Provost using this routing form for all signatures.

- APS [900417](#), Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS [980204](#), Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)
- APS [820317](#), The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Please note the following:

- Use a separate routing sheet for each set of tenure unit standards.
- Submit files in portable document format (PDF) only.
- Ensure the set of standards being submitted ***have been approved*** by the tenure unit ***and*** college dean.

Tenure Unit: Department of Art

College/Unit:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAM | <input type="checkbox"/> COCJ | <input type="checkbox"/> CHSS | <input type="checkbox"/> COM | <input type="checkbox"/> NGL |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COBA | <input type="checkbox"/> COE | <input type="checkbox"/> COHS | <input type="checkbox"/> COSET | |

Standard:

- Promotion and Tenure Post-Tenure Review Faculty Evaluation System (FES)

Contact:

Name (first & last): Michael Henderson
 SHSU Email: mhenderson@shsu.edu
 Phone: 936 294-1314

Approved By:

Digitally signed by Michael Henderson
 Date: 2022.12.01 08:18:59 -06'00'

Department Chair

Ronald E. Shields

Digitally signed by Ronald E. Shields
 Date: 2022.12.01 08:25:54 -06'00'

College Dean

Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs



DEPARTMENT OF
ART
Sam Houston State University

**Sam Houston State University
Department of Art**

Standards of Evaluation

Promotion and Tenure

Revised November 2022

Table of Contents

STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	3
TENURE AND PROMOTION STANDARDS FOR TEACHING	3
TENURE AND PROMOTION STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH	4
<i>Performance Indicators for Animation, Graphic Design, Photography, Social Practice, and Studio Arts</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Performance Indicators for Art History</i>	<i>11</i>
TENURE AND PROMOTION STANDARDS FOR SERVICE	14
EXTERNAL REVIEWS	16

Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The following policies and procedures are intended to comply with and supplement SHSU Academic Policy Statement [900417](#), *Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*.

Tenure and Promotion Standards for Teaching

Expectations

Tenure-track faculty and faculty seeking the rank of Professor are expected to demonstrate sustained effective teaching and mentoring as documented by student evaluations and peer and chair review. Other possible measures may include an exemplary record of academic advisement, supervision of student research, or thesis/dissertation direction, as appropriate for the discipline.

Tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate sustained contribution to program support, such as course and curriculum development, innovations in teaching methodology, electronic instruction development, or participation in interdisciplinary academic programs. Faculty seeking the rank of Professor are expected to demonstrate leadership in program support, such as course and curriculum development, innovations in teaching methodology, electronic instruction development, participation in interdisciplinary programs, or mentoring of less-experienced faculty. For faculty seeking the rank of Professor, indicators for leadership in teaching could include: significant curriculum/program development, evidence of sustained and direct contributions to student achievements outside of the classroom, development of new teaching methods/resources that advance pedagogy within the discipline, sustained efforts in community engagement related to teaching, and/or mentoring of faculty in teaching in the department, college, university, or profession.

Performance Indicators

All performance indicators included for Teaching are intended to be as comprehensive as possible and account for the variability of teaching assignments and course loads in the Department of Art. It is understood that a document of this nature might not be able to address every aspect of teaching. In circumstances where a faculty member is engaged in teaching activities that are not addressed in this document, it is important that the faculty member provide a clear case for the significance of those activities within their respective discipline. This will provide context to make revisions, as needed, to this document to ensure that this process is equitable for all faculty.

The following indicators are considered when evaluating teaching:

- Demonstration of instructional competency in program/courses while motivating student learning.
- Presentation of current research topics in classroom learning activities.
- Actively contributing to the development of curriculum and instructional media.
- Evidence of experimentation in pedagogical methods and techniques in courses taught.
- Participation in workshops, conferences, and/or conventions to remain informed of present topics within their discipline.
- Evidence of positive student impact through various feedback channels.
- Evidence of direct contributions to student achievements outside of the classroom.
- Evidence of course revisions based on up-to-date academic sources, emerging technology, student evaluations, and peer-to-peer feedback.
- Maintaining a level of professional integrity in the classroom that is congruent to institutional standards.
- Mentoring students with appropriate academic decisions/advising and showing empathy for student life.
- Maintaining and/or expanding area labs/studios/lecture rooms to aid in student safety and success.
- Seeking grant/funding opportunities related to teaching.
- Guiding students towards professional opportunities such as internships, exhibitions, publications, festivals, employment, etc.
- Encouraging creative and critical thinking skills.
- Facilitating student development for analytical skills.
- Facilitating student development for writing skills.
- Engaging in implementation of academic community engagement related to courses/teaching.
- Integrating departmental, college, and university initiatives into curriculum.
- Engaging in collaborative and/or team-taught courses in a productive and symbiotic manner.
- Engaging in other activities identified as teaching by their department.

Tenure and Promotion Standards for Research

Expectations

All Department of Art Faculty are expected to demonstrate evidence of continuous progress towards the development and completion of scholarly and/or creative projects related to their respective disciplines. Faculty on the tenure-track are expected to demonstrate a sustained pattern of peer-reviewed research/publications, creative activities, or scholarly

work that contributes to their discipline. Faculty seeking the rank of Professor are expected to demonstrate leadership in peer-reviewed research/publication, grantsmanship, creative activities, or scholarly work that contributes to their discipline. Indicators for leadership in research could include: evidence of innovation in scholarly/creative work that advances the discipline, evidence of sustained and significant scholarly/creative contributions to the discipline, sustained efforts in community engagement related to research, and/or mentoring of faculty in research in the department, college, university, or profession.

Distinction in scholarly and creative accomplishments is supported through evidence of peer-reviewed recognition of the contributions the faculty member has made in their discipline, along with evidence of the quality of that peer-review process.

Evidence of growth in the quality/significance of scholarly or creative contributions is expected for both tenure-track faculty and faculty seeking the rank of Professor. The quality of venue/publication, increased scope or scale of work, or expanding into new areas of exploration may be representative of growth. Growth may also be marked by transition in a faculty member's creative and/or scholarly interests.

Faculty seeking the rank of Professor are also expected to demonstrate a sustained contribution to the intellectual culture of the University.

Performance Indicators

All performance indicators included for Research are intended to be as comprehensive as possible and account for the variability of the creative and scholarly activities within and across the disciplines that all faculty in the Department of Art are engaged. It is understood that a document of this nature might not be able to address every aspect of creative and scholarly work. In circumstances where a faculty member is engaged in creative or scholarly activities that are not addressed in this document, it is important that the faculty member provide a clear case for the significance of those activities within their respective discipline. This will provide context to make revisions, as needed, to this document to ensure that this process is equitable for all faculty.

Performance Indicators for Animation, Graphic Design, Photography, Social Practice, and Studio Arts

1. The following indicators are considered when evaluating independent creative work:

1.a The main evidence by which independent creative work can be measured is a record of exhibition in peer-reviewed events, which include: museums, commercial and/or university galleries, animation and film festivals, nontraditional public venues, non-profit venues, trade and discipline publications, and the internet.

1.b More weight is generally given to exhibitions with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

1.c Additional factors when evaluating the significance of an exhibition include:

1.c.1 The relative reputation of a gallery, or institution, event, or publication.

1.c.2 The reputation of the curator or juror of the event.

1.c.3 Work that has received an award (see 1.d).

1.c.4 Multiple works selected for a single event (see 1.e).

1.c.5 Was the exhibition a large group, small group or solo show.

1.c.6 The ratio of submitted works to accepted works.

1.c.7 Was the work selected as part of an invitational process (see 1.f).

1.c.8. The reputation of other exhibiting artists or presenters in the event.

1.d Awards that are adjudicated as part of a separate peer-review process are considered to be more significant than awards given to all accepted participants. The level and competitiveness of the award is also taken into consideration.

1.e In regard to multiple works accepted by a single event, works awarded or accepted in multiple categories, or by different jurors, should be considered as unique accomplishments.

1.f Invitational shows may occur in a variety of venues, which may include nonprofit galleries, commercial galleries, and museums. These exhibitions often do not involve an open call for submission of individual works. Instead, gallery/museum curators or faculty members of a college/university exhibition committee invite the artist to participate in group or solo exhibitions. For invitational shows, the significance of the event is based on the reputation of the venue. The selection process for the event may also add additional significance to the event.

1.g Alternative and non-traditional spaces, including electronic media venues, such as websites and online galleries are given recognition; the significance of an exhibition in such a space is based upon the reputation of the organization operating the space or venue and its record of exhibition or presentation.

1.h In work that was created as part of a collaborative process, the extent of the work done by the faculty member is considered when evaluating its significance. More weight is generally given to work where the faculty member was creative lead or director.

1.i Variables in production time and the mobility of various types of work are considered.

1.j Multiple publications/exhibitions/awards for a single work or body of work may demonstrate an added significance of that work. The expectation is, however, that the faculty member will also be engaged in the production of new works.

1.k Traveling exhibitions may be given additional weight. The reputation of the venues and significance of the event relative to the discipline will be weighed.

1.l Institutional acquisition of work may be given additional weight. The reputation and significance of the institution relative to the discipline will be weighed.

1.m Private acquisition of work may be given additional weight. The reputation and significance of the party making the acquisition relative to the discipline will be weighed.

1.n Inclusion of work in online archives and digital libraries may be given additional weight. The reputation and significance of the collection relative to the discipline will be weighed.

2. The following indicators are considered when evaluating client-based creative work:

2.a More weight is generally given to clients with national and/or international presence, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.b The relative reputation of the client is considered when evaluating the significance of client-based creative work.

2.c The extent of the work that was done for the client is considered when evaluating the significance of the activity.

2.d Additional significance may be given to client-based work that was selected by the client as part of a competitive process. Additionally, client-based creative work that has been included in peer-reviewed events or publications should be considered as a unique accomplishment beyond the initial work created. The indicators used when evaluating independent creative work (Section 1.a to 1.j) will apply to client-based work included in peer-reviewed events or publications.

2.e In work that was created as part of a collaborative process, the extent of the work done by the faculty member is considered when evaluating its significance. More weight is generally given to work where the faculty member was creative lead or director.

2.f Variables in production time and the mobility of various types of work are considered.

2.j Multiple publications/exhibitions/awards for a single work or body of work may

demonstrate an added significance of that work. The expectation is, however, that the faculty member will also be engaged in the production of new works.

2.h Emerging means of publication via electronic media should also be recognized as valid outlets for Creative Work/Research/Scholarship activities. Peer-reviewed acceptance procedures are preferred, but recognition of the publication venue and its reach to the field should also be considered.

3. The following indicators are considered when evaluating social practice:

3.a More weight is generally given to exhibitions with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

3.b The term “exhibition” should be inclusive of site-specific projects that happen outside of art venues in public spaces and institutions for an audience that may be outside of peer groups.

3.b.1 When a site-specific project is supported by an arts organization, is led singularly by the artist, and is not part of a group exhibition or group award, it can be considered a solo exhibition. Weight will be dependent on the reputation of the arts organization.

3.b.2 More weight will be given to site-specific projects that are supported by reputable institutions through a competitive peer-reviewed proposal process which may include awards, commissions, fellowships, residencies, and grants.

3.b.3 Invitational projects may be supported by a variety of institutions, which may include nonprofit institutions, art centers, galleries, museums, and foundations. For invitational projects, the significance of the event is based on the reputation of the inviting institution. The selection process may also add significance to the event.

3.b.4 Successful acquisition of community partnerships and co-production sources will also be considered.

3.b.5 If a site-specific project is produced during a general exploratory residency that is not proposal-based, it will generally be given less weight.

3.c. Grants, fellowships, and awards are significant indicators of peer-reviewed professional achievement. A grant or fellowship award period may initiate a project that is fully realized in the future (see section 1.i and 3.f on variables in production time).

3.c.1 More weight is generally given to grants, fellowships, and awards with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

3.c.2 If the application process is restrictive to the applicant's location of residence (e.g. state, region, etc.), this will be taken into account. In this case, the significance of the grant to the discipline should be made clear.

3.d In work that was created as part of a collaborative process, the extent of the work done by the faculty member is considered when evaluating its significance. More weight is generally given to work where the faculty member was creative lead or director.

3.e Social practice artists may focus a large portion of their career on a singular project. If the artist's primary activities are devoted to a singular project, more weight will be given to projects that evolve and deepen their significance over time. Evolution may be determined by either sustainability within one community, or engaging with new communities and/or within new cultural contexts to establish the proliferation of the project in society.

3.e.1 One-off and short-term projects that do not demonstrate a time commitment duration that is long enough to meet stated project goals will be given less weight.

3.f Variables in production time will be considered. Bringing a project from concept to implementation often requires long-term and multi-phase groundwork. Stages of groundwork may include the following: dialogic research, feedback sessions, public forums, prototypes, activities generating buy-in among relevant stakeholders and community leaders, fundraising, cultivating institutional and/or community partnerships, community-building and trust-building within those partnerships, and/or organizing multiple participants. In addition, project production and implementation may happen in separate stages. Some artists utilize a 2-3 year groundwork period leading up to a project. Engagement in groundwork is evidence of creative work. Additional factors may influence evaluation of production time:

3.f.1 Due to the community engagement and site-specificity that is foundational to social practice, creative work often cannot be produced in advance of exhibition opportunities as is typical of studio art. Instead, work must be produced within the community through a durational process of community engagement. Therefore, producing new works may require relocation for the length of the project. Institutionally-supported project commissions can range from 1 month to 1 year in length but are typically longer than 3 months. Scheduling longer projects around faculty commitments may take time and will be given due allowance.

3.f.2 Artists who must be tied primarily to one location due to faculty commitments may need to work longer with less prestigious support to build local initiatives on their own from the ground up (new initiatives).

4. Other Indications of Peer-Reviewed Professional Achievement

4.a Presentation at conferences, seminars, forums, panels, and workshops, including non-traditional venues (e.g. CD/DVD, website, digital video, and other electronic venues)

4.a.1 More weight is generally given to presentations at conferences with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.a.2 More weight is generally given to presentations that show evidence of scholarly and/or technical research.

4.b Chairing or Co-Chairing at conferences, seminars, forums, panels, and workshops, with more weight being generally given to presentations with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.c Peer-Reviewed publications of scholarly work

4.c.1 More weight is generally given to publications with national and international importance to the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.c.2 The reputation of the journal/publisher/writer is considered when determining significance.

4.c.3 Work that has received an award will be given greater significance.

4.c.4 For additional performance indicators for the publication of scholarly work, refer to the Art History Performance Indicators section of this document.

4.d Grant writing to support scholarly and/or creative activities

4.d.1 More weight is generally given to grant programs with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.d.2 The reputation and competitiveness of the grant is considered when determining significance.

4.d.3 More weight is generally given to grants that show evidence of scholarly and/or technical research.

4.d.4 If a collaborative grant, the level of the contributions that the faculty member made on the grant is considered when determining significance.

4.e For awards of grants that support scholarly and/or creative activities, the indicators in section 3.c will apply in determining the significance.

4.f Artist Residencies

4.f.1 More weight is generally given to residencies with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.f.2 The reputation and competitiveness of the residency and its peer review process is considered when determining significance. Residency programs should provide resources including stipends or accommodations.

4.f.3 The reputation of other artists/curators in the residency is considered when determining significance.

4.g Professional consultancy and invitational activities (including lectures and industry recruitment) based on expertise

4.g.1 More weight is generally given to national and international activities, followed by regional, state, then local.

4.g.2 The reputation of the institution is considered when determining significance.

Performance Indicators for Art History

1. The following considerations are used to evaluate scholarly work:

1.a The main evidence by which scholarly accomplishment can be measured is a record of peer-reviewed publications which may include: essays in peer-reviewed journals, book publication, edited volumes, and essays in museum exhibition catalogs.

1.b More weight is generally given to publications with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

1.c The reputation of the journal/publisher is considered when determining significance.

1.d Work that has received an award will be given greater significance.

1.e Less weight is given to publications whose audience is general and nonacademic.

1.f Exhibition reviews may be considered both in print and electronic publishing, based upon the publication's reputation. These are weighed less than original scholarly research but are evidence of scholarly activity.

1.g Variables in writing and publication time are considered. Once an essay is submitted to a journal, it may take 6 months (or more) for a response. Often, that response may be "revise and resubmit" which adds time for revision and then consideration for publication. Once accepted, this process may take anywhere from several months to a year (sometimes more) for publication. "Revise and resubmit" and evidence of work after acceptance (copyedits, image permissions) may be considered for evidence of scholarly work. If the essay is published in an edited volume, this process (after acceptance) may take two years. A book publication will take considerably longer. It must also be considered that it is inappropriate to submit the same manuscript to more than one publication for consideration. Therefore, an essay may be "out" for six months and be rejected by a publication and then submitted elsewhere and be accepted. This is evidence of scholarly work but may require additional time.

1.h Invitation for an essay's re-publication shows evidence of the scholar's contribution to the field and should be considered.

1.i If an essay or publication is co-authored, the extent of the work done by the faculty member is considered when evaluating its significance. More weight is generally given to work where the faculty member was creative lead or director.

1.j Book reviews in reputable journals (both electronic and physical) are weighed less than peer-reviewed scholarship but are given consideration.

1.k Editing a volume such as a collection of essays featuring various authors or editing an exhibition catalog should be weighed less than a solo-authored project but should be given consideration as a scholarly contribution to the discipline.

2. Other Indications of Peer-Reviewed Professional Achievement

2.a Presentation at conferences, seminars, forums, panels, and workshops, including non-traditional venues (e.g. CD/DVD, website, digital video, and other electronic venues).

2.a.1 More weight is generally given to presentations at conferences with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.a.2 More weight is generally given to presentations that show evidence of scholarly and/or technical research.

2.b Chairing or Co-Chairing at conferences, seminars, forums, panels, and workshops, with more weight being generally given to presentations at conferences with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.c Professional consultancy and invitational activities (including panel respondent and lecturer) based on expertise.

2.c.1 Invitational activities' weight may be impacted by the nature of the invitational activities. Being invited to give a lecture (45 min -1 hr) related to one's research or invited to be a guest lecturer at an outside institution (relating to one's research) should be given weight. Panel respondents should be given weight, but less than these other examples.

2.c.2 More weight is generally given to national and international activities, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.c.3 The reputation of the institution is considered when determining significance.

2.d Peer-reviewed curatorial work

2.d.1 More weight is generally given to curatorial activities with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.d.2 The reputation of the institution is considered when determining significance.

2.d.3 If a curated exhibition travels to other peer-reviewed institutions, additional significance will be considered.

2.e Grant writing to support scholarly and/or creative activities

2.e.1 More weight is generally given to grant programs with national and international importance within the discipline, followed by regional, state, then local.

2.e.2 The reputation and competitiveness of the grant is considered when determining significance.

2.e.3 More weight is generally given to grants that show evidence of scholarly and/or technical research.

2.e.4 The level of the contributions that the faculty member made on the grant is considered when determining significance.

2.f Awards of grants that support scholarly and/or creative activities. The criteria in section 2.e will apply in determining the significance of a grant award(s).

Tenure and Promotion Standards for Service

Expectations

All Department of Art Faculty are expected to demonstrate continuous evidence of sustained, intentional growth in service to the department, college, university, community, and profession. Faculty on the tenure-track are expected to demonstrate a sustained pattern of service. Faculty seeking the rank of Professor are expected to demonstrate leadership in service. Indicators for leadership in service could include: initiating new service opportunities in the department, college, university, profession, or community; evidence of a sustained role in the management, governance, or organization of service-based activities in the department, college, university, profession, or community; sustained efforts in community engagement related to service; and/or mentoring of faculty in service in the department, college, university, or profession.

All Department of Art Faculty are expected to demonstrate effectiveness as a contributing member of the faculty in accomplishing the goals of the department/college/University. Distinction in service accomplishments is supported through documentation and/or recognition of the contributions the faculty member has made in the service activities.

Evidence of growth in the quality/significance of service contributions is expected for both tenure-track faculty and faculty seeking the rank of Professor. Growth and leadership may also be marked by transition in a faculty member's service interests and assignments.

1. The following are possible activities that may be considered when evaluating faculty service:

1a. Department, college, and university:

- Committee Service
- Coordination of Programs
- Student Recruitment
- Student Advisement
- Acquisition of facilities, equipment, grants, or other resources
- Student and faculty mentoring

- Student organization(s) sponsorship
- Program/curriculum development
- Program assessment
- Active engagement in the department through organizing and/or attending events and supporting student activities
- Promoting civic engagement activities and cross-pollination between University and community (University outreach)
- Creating and promoting career-readiness opportunities for students
- Creative contributions to other departments
- Assuming administrative duties

1b. Profession and community:

- Contributions to professional organizations including but not limited to leadership and active service on professional organizations' boards and committees, service as a peer reviewer and/or juror, mentoring, development of programming such as workshops, conferences, festivals, exhibitions, peer reviews, guest lectures, consultations
- Discipline-specific professional development activities
- Faculty-community collaboration for scholarly research
- Faculty-community projects for leadership in economic or social service development
- Scholarly and pedagogical contribution to higher education resources and programming
- Non-credit educational programs

Performance Criteria and Indicators

All performance indicators included for Service are intended to be as comprehensive as possible and account for the variability of the creative and scholarly activities within and across the disciplines that all faculty in the Department of Art are engaged. It is understood that a document of this nature might not be able to address every aspect of service work. In circumstances where a faculty member is engaged in service activities that are not addressed in this document, it is important that the faculty member provide a clear case for the significance of those activities within their respective discipline. This will provide context to make revisions, as needed, to this document to ensure that this process is equitable for all faculty.

Criteria used to evaluate service objectives prioritize active, goal-oriented contributions rather than memberships only in name. It should be noted that service to the Department is a priority and weighted the most heavily but that every faculty member will have different strengths, skills, and interests they bring to serving the College, University, profession, and wider community, locally, nationally, and internationally.

1. The following indicators are considered when evaluating service:

1.a Faculty member will present adequate documentation of service activities and explanation of active engagement and significance to include, but not limited to:

- The specific contributions of the faculty member to the service activity
- Awards or special recognitions of service
- Service activities that coalesce as intentional and goal-oriented growth related to faculty members' service interests
- Visibility and reach of initiative, organization, or committee service
- Impact of service activity to the department, college, university, community, and/or profession - impact may be tangible or intangible, qualitative, or quantitative; we recognize that impact can be difficult to measure

1.b Additional documentation of service may include:

- Recognition or awards
- Support testimonials from others participating in the service activity
- Material such as emails, articles, photographs, or other forms of documentation
- Evidence of assigned committees or service responsibilities

External Reviews

The Department Chair shall provide for the solicitation of outside reviewers to provide an objective evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service as related to the standards of performance defined in this document. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. The candidate for tenure or promotion shall nominate at least three reviewers and the Department Chair or DPTAC shall nominate at least three. At least two names will be selected from each list and a final list will be approved by the Dean with the goal of receiving at least three external reviews.

Each external reviewer will be asked to provide their assessment on whether, in teaching, research, and service, the candidate's performance aligns with the performance standards for the Department of Art and the University. They will not be asked to provide an opinion on whether the candidate should or should not be granted tenure. To facilitate this process, each external reviewer will be provided with the candidate's full tenure packet, excluding student perception of teaching documents, and department and university policy documents.

When soliciting external reviews of a candidate's scholarship, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review. The College's and University's policies regarding external reviews will be followed.