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The Advisory Committee consisted of the following five regular members:
1. Roxane M. DeLaurell, Professor, Department of Accounting and Legal Studies
2. Anne Gutshall, Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education
3. Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Associate Professor, Department of Communication
4. W. Scott Poole, Professor, Department of History
5. Vijay M. Vulava, Associate Professor, Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences (incumbent)

The Advisory Committee began reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion on January 10, 2018 and completed all deliberations on February 21, 2018. During the committee’s bi-weekly meetings, 3-4 candidate packets were evaluated. Most meetings lasted 2-3 hours, with some of the more challenging cases requiring additional time. In total, the Advisory Committee reviewed 33 cases:
- Promotion to Senior Instructor: 3 cases
- Renewal as Senior Instructor: 4 cases
- Tenure for Librarian II: 1 case
- Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: 19 cases
- Promotion to Full Professor: 6 cases

Seven of these cases necessitated the inclusion of four of the five alternate members of the Advisory Committee:
- Isaure de Buron, Professor, Department of Biology: 3 cases
- Angela Flenner, Acquisitions & Resource Management Coordinator, Library: 2 cases
- Hector Qirko, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology & Anthropology: 4 cases
- Paul Young, Professor, Department of Mathematics: 1 case

As in the previous two years, no representative of Academic Affairs was present during the Advisory Committee’s deliberations. Provost Brian McGee conducted his own independent review of the candidates. The Advisory Committee is grateful for the technical assistance provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, including support from Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs), Beth Murphy (Assistant to the Provost for Budget and Personnel), and Cathy Peebles (Office Manager).

Below are a few general observations the Advisory Committee would like to share with the campus community:
• Most candidates diligently put together their packets to make the best case for themselves. Ultimately, FAM emphasizes that it is the candidate's responsibility to make the most effective case in their own support.

• In a minor number of cases, the candidates did not follow the instructions shared through the Academic Affairs' Joint Memo. In addition, the Departmental Evaluation Panel (DEP) did not take steps to correct this oversight thereby necessitating additional work by the Advisory Committee.

• A summary sheet preceding each publication included in the packet, describing the candidate’s contribution (in multi-authored) to each publication as well as clear evidence of peer-review (from journal masthead or from editors) was helpful.

• A summary “table of contents” for each representative course included as evidence was very helpful. Candidates need only include one example each of a recent course syllabus, a module of teaching materials (PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc.), a typical assignment, a quiz, an exam, examples of student evaluation (a wide range of student examples and students’ names redacted), etc. It was not necessary to include an entire semester’s materials for review.

• An increasing number of candidates’ packets include external reviews of research in T&P and Promotion cases. These external reviews have been helpful, but the organization of letters and CVs of external reviewers by DEP could be improved.

• Some programs and departments used Qualtrics (campus-provided) very effectively for collecting graduate surveys. They provided summary statistics and analytical data that were very useful in evaluation of the candidates. However, other programs and departments either provided PDFs of Qualtrics raw data or PDFs of paper surveys, and both options were difficult to review.

• Some schools and departments still do not provide PDFs, or when PDFs are provided, they are of poor quality. Such materials were not helpful.

• Many DEPs did not address concerns about candidates raised in individual colleagues’ letters. DEPs are encouraged to address and document resolution of such concerns during deliberations and candidate interviews.

• DEP letters that specifically evaluated, polled, and rated candidates in each evaluative category were especially helpful.

• Colleague letters that evaluated the candidates in each evaluative category were more helpful than a broad letter of support.

On March 30, 2018, the Advisory Committee met with the Provost for a debriefing session as well as to discuss suggestions for improvement of the review process. The Advisory Committee concluded its formal duties by attending multiple informational sessions for faculty, department chairs and deans regarding the next year’s tenure and promotion process. The PowerPoint from that meeting will be made available on the Academic Affair’s website.