

CAP'S TIPS FOR CHAIRS

Candidates' Files

Ensure that the file is complete, the biobib is up-to-date, all uploaded documents can be opened and are pdfs (linking Word or Excel documents creates extra steps in review). Messy files take more time to review and make accurate assessment difficult.

For major action reviews (i.e., midcareer, promotion, advancement to Step VI, and Above Scale), include everything since the last major action.

For files containing external letters, the professional stature of the letter writers and their relationship to the candidate should be addressed in the confidential list of letter writers.

CAP asks for a table that summarizes courses taught and selected aspects of student evaluations (overall teaching effectiveness). This table is essential for helping to focus evaluation of the full teaching and mentoring record. The summary table is also helpful for evaluating long-term trends.

Letters

Be brief, to the point, and use lay language wherever possible.

Paraphrase, but do not quote extensively from the APM, the external letters, the candidate's personal statement, or student evaluations.

Be clear and explicit in reporting department votes. Explain negative votes to the extent possible.

Be explicit about rank, step, and salary recommendations: e.g., "We support a one-step merit advancement and an additional salary increment equivalent to one-half step based on outstanding research and meritorious teaching and service."

Clearly indicate the period of review (month/year to month/year). In the case of a major action or career equity, there may be consideration of multiple periods; please specify which achievements occur within which time periods.

Offer expertise to help readers at later stages of review understand the quality, quantity, significance, and impact of research and how these metrics compare to standards in the candidate's discipline or sub-field.

Evaluate *both* teaching and mentoring. Highlight student achievements and post-graduation trajectories for doctoral and master's advisees. Provide context for teaching and mentoring, such as standard workload, courses taught, class size, course level, course release, and buyouts.

Adhere to APM 210, which states that “It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file.” Specify your department’s second method in addition to teaching evaluations (e.g. syllabi, class visits, etc.) used to evaluate teaching; see APM 210 for a list of suggested methods.

Evaluate service contributions in light of the time commitment required and the overall value of those contributions to the constituencies they serve. Do not simply list committees or tasks.

Address obvious weaknesses in the file. Explain and contextualize as appropriate. CAP particularly appreciates clear statements of how problems are being addressed or will be addressed going forward.

Evaluate contributions to diversity, as specified by APM 210, wherever appropriate.

For regular merits, publications (Published, In Press) are considered finished and are counted ONCE. At times, it may be appropriate for the candidate to include an unfinished item (In Progress, Under Review, Under Revision, Submitted) to demonstrate ongoing work. Department letters must state clearly what work was done during the period of review.

For major action reviews, the merit boost plan normally applies only to work (research, teaching, and service) that is new since the last review. The letter must distinguish between work in the full file and work not considered in any prior review.