

## **College of Arts and Sciences Appointment, Reappointment, Rank and Tenure (ARRT)**

- I. Statement on the Four Criteria for Rank and Tenure**
- II. Departmental ARRT Documents and the Function of the ARRT Committee**
- III. Guidelines for preparation of ARRT Files**
- IV. Biennial Review Schedule**

The College of Arts and Sciences is at the center of the liberal arts education at the University of San Diego, and, accordingly, its faculty and curricula embody the intersection of teaching and scholarship in which the student-centric institution develops the whole person, advances academic excellence, and seeks to benefit local, national, and international communities. Intellectual exploration, curiosity, and inquiry are fostered with a diverse curriculum in the College, across the Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. The College's faculty members are teachers and scholars committed to the holistic development of their students, the expansion of knowledge in and across their disciplines, and the shared governance of the University.

The College acknowledges the public purposes of higher education and strives to prepare students for lives of engaged and responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and contribute to the quality of community life. Faculty can make contributions to these goals through pedagogies, scholarship, and service that support diversity and inclusion, community engagement, and interdisciplinary approaches. In accordance with the University's mission and vision, these contributions are valued across all criteria of faculty evaluation in the College.

The following document includes a statement about the College's understanding of the four criteria, the role of the ARRT committee, a set of guidelines for ARRT file preparation, and a biennial review schedule for faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Specific departmental ARRT procedures may vary given parameters established by the department and approved by the dean.

### **I. Statement on the Four Criteria for Rank and Tenure:**

(Written by Deans Advisory Council on the Four Criteria and supported by vote of the Academic Assembly, 09/2014; revised by Dean's Advisory Council on ARRT 05/2017.)

As indicated in Policy 4.2, faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences are "judged on the basis of their performance in 1) teaching; 2) research, creative work, and professional activity; 3) University and public service; and 4) support of the mission of the University of San Diego" (III.). The policy further states that "[s]uperior achievement, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative work, is an indispensable qualification for reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure" (III.). In unison with Policy 4.2, the College considers all four criteria to be essential facets of faculty performance, but the first and second criteria are given greater weight than the third and fourth criteria in the evaluation process. In the evaluation of their performance, the candidate's rights to full academic freedom (as articulated and enshrined in University Policy 4.1) are to be honored.

A. In the College of Arts and Science, teaching is considered the first criterion for evaluation, and, accordingly, proficiency in teaching and a continuing strong attention to pedagogy are a sine qua non of tenure and promotion. Policy 4.2 provides some general parameters for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, which should be based on the candidate's "total performance" in the first criterion (III.A.1). Teaching proficiency includes pedagogies that create an inclusive learning experience. The candidate's teaching should be evaluated through a comprehensive approach that includes peer observations—scheduled with reasonable frequency and by multiple colleagues—in addition to an examination of student evaluations and course materials.

B. Maintaining an active and productive research agenda and making contributions to their discipline are basic functions of the candidate's work as a scholar and intellectual. Moreover, scholarly and creative activity often enriches teaching. The College's second-criterion expectations closely align with those provided in Policy 4.2, which are broadly defined and support a wide range of scholarly and creative activity. Just as current "work in progress should be assessed whenever possible" (Policy 4.2, III.B.), publications and creative accomplishments completed at a prior institution, or initiated previously and completed at USD, should also be evaluated as part of the candidate's trajectory in the second criterion.

C. The third criterion is understood in terms of active engagement with the Department, the College, the University, the community, and one's discipline. Such engagement contributes to the exercise of shared governance, wherein faculty voice is given greatest weight in matters of curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process. Shared governance, academic freedom, and tenure are inextricably linked and are defining values of a university, and, accordingly, activities related to the third criterion are highly esteemed in the evaluation process insofar as they contribute to the College's values and mission. Similarly, the College values active engagement with the community and the profession at the local, national, and international levels.

D. The fourth criterion is the space in which faculty members establish and articulate connections between their professional work as a whole, as understood within the first three criteria, and the mission of the University. As stated in Policy 4.2, "[f]aculty express their support of the mission in many different ways and engage in a rich Catholic intellectual tradition, which is based on a commitment to the deeply held values of free inquiry, ethics, diversity, community, integration of knowledge, intellectual rigor, and social justice" (III.D.) It is here that faculty pedagogy, research, and service promoting inclusion and diversity, as well as practicing community engagement, can be directly connected to the heart of the mission.

Whereas teaching and scholarly and creative activity are considered the most important criteria, given the faculty's primary functions as teachers and scholars, the College does not prescribe specific percentages for a faculty member's allocation of effort. The balance among the four criteria is not rigid, and a holistic evaluation of the candidate predominates in the process. In this sense, Policy 4.2 states that "[i]n evaluating a candidate's qualifications within the four criteria, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised by balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and commitments in another" (III.). This flexible balance recognizes the naturally overlapping areas among the four

criteria and allows individuals to emphasize their strengths while simultaneously meeting or exceeding expectations in all areas and demonstrating excellence in their overall performance. The evaluation process is sensitive to the fact that different strengths and aspirations of individuals may manifest over time and at different stages in their careers.

## **II. Departmental ARRT Documents and Function of the ARRT Committee**

(Adopted from Faculty Handbook on ARRT, 1992; revised by Deans Advisory Council on the Four Criteria and supported by vote of the Academic Assembly, 09/2014; revised by Dean's Advisory Council on ARRT 05/2017.)

### **A. Departmental ARRT Documents:**

Policy 4.2 establishes some broad guidelines for evaluating faculty performance in all four criteria, and this document highlights key nuances for understanding that policy in the context of the College. It is the responsibility of individual departments to define expectations more specifically. Each departmental rank and tenure document must provide its faculty with a fuller description of expected levels of achievement in the four criteria. On the one hand, departments should avoid producing overly prescriptive requirements, and, on the other, they should not interpret flexibility in a way that heightens ambiguity. The departmental document is a key mechanism for giving candidates more guidance and transparency throughout the evaluation process and providing the ARRT Committee greater insight into disciplinary specific expectations.

- i. The departmental document briefly summarizes any departmental circumstances of which the ARRT Committee should be aware if deemed relevant to the evaluation of the candidate in the first criterion, such as, for example, the process of course assignments and rotation in relation to curricular needs. Likewise, the departmental protocol for evaluating teaching is outlined. Finally, the document indicates how the following kinds of activities are valued in relation to departmental teaching: graduate and undergraduate research, pedagogical development, experiential learning, community service-learning, community-based projects, etc.
- ii. The departmental document provides disciplinary specificity with regards to the types of scholarly and creative activity that is valued by the department as well as the expectations for publications and/or creative accomplishments. Such expectations should be reasonably commensurate with the time and resources available to candidates in light of the teaching load in the College, support provided for activity in the second criterion, and expected service commitments. The department document should specify what weight is given to scholarship of teaching and learning, the publication of textbooks and other pedagogical materials, interdisciplinary work, graduate and undergraduate research, etc.
- iii. The third criterion is described above in terms of engagement with the Department, College, University, community, and profession, and as a vital part of shared governance. However, this criterion is broadly defined, and there is not a predetermined balance of service commitments at the College level that applies to all candidates. As appropriate, the departmental document should identify those service activities that are more valued, taking into consideration both departmental circumstances and needs as well as the demands of faculty governance at the College and University levels.

- iv. The department chair and other faculty mentors should help guide the candidate in articulating connections between her or his professional work as a whole, as understood within the first three criteria, and the mission of the University.
- v. The departmental rank and tenure document should clearly define the protocol for the evaluation of candidates. For example, the document should specify if external letters are required, and, if so, the process by which they are obtained. Likewise, the document should explain any shift in expectations between promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and promotion to Professor, in the event Policy 4.2 does not provide sufficient specificity for a given department.

The ARRT Committee reviews each departmental rank and tenure document, and makes recommendations to and/or requests clarifications from the department, if necessary. It is the Dean's responsibility to provide guidance and oversight of this process. Each department should reexamine its ARRT document as part of its Academic Program Review. The departmental ARRT document should be given to job candidates during the on-campus interview for a tenure-track position in the College. It should also be placed at the beginning of every ARRT portfolio submitted to the ARRT Committee for candidates in that department. Finally, all departmental ARRT documents should be made available to the entire College faculty.

### **B. The Function of the ARRT Committee**

The evaluation of the candidate constitutes the primary function of the ARRT Committee. Policy 4.2 states that “[T]he Committee's functions include the evaluation, recognition, and encouragement of each candidate's achievements” (I.C.). Similarly, the Constitution of the Academic Assembly states that the Committee “shall review and make recommendations in all matters concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty members and shall also serve as a review board in disputes involving faculty appointments” (VI.C.4.). It must be emphasized, however, that primary weight in the review process is given to the department. Policy 4.2 underscores that in the evaluation of the candidate, “[s]pecial emphasis should be given to peer evaluations” (III.). Nonetheless, in difficult cases in which the balance of favorable and unfavorable evidence has led to a split decision at the departmental level, the ARRT Committee necessarily assumes a greater responsibility in the final judgment.

The role of the ARRT Committee is to make recommendations on reappointment, tenure and promotion to the provost and president. Its judgment on, and recommendation regarding, any candidate may on occasion differ from the judgment and recommendation of the candidate's own department.

The expectations for rank and tenure emanate from the department and the discipline, but they are framed within the context of the College's values and the institution's identity. The Committee's review of the candidate focuses in large part on ensuring that there has been a proper evaluation by the department in accord with the department's own policies and standards—as defined in its ARRT document—and that those policies and standards are in accord with the College as a whole. If the ARRT Committee determines that the department has not evaluated a candidate in accord with its own expectations, if those expectations—including the relative weight given to each criterion—do not align with the College values, or if the department did not evaluate the candidate in a sufficiently objective and just manner, those findings are communicated to the department. In

this situation, the ARRT Committee carries out its primary responsibility of evaluating the candidate, but it also makes recommendations to the department—completely independent of that candidate’s review—in order to address those concerns with the department’s ARRT process. The Dean oversees this process and communicates the ARRT Committee recommendations to the department.

The ARRT Committee will provide written feedback to all faculty who are reviewed by that Committee for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The ARRT Committee chair shall produce a written summary of the Committee’s evaluation that is both useful and constructive. The chair shall preserve the anonymity of comments and criticisms made by individual ARRT committee members. The summary shall be forwarded to the faculty member as soon the faculty member has been informed in writing of the action taken by the President. The chair’s letter shall be the final communication between the elected members of the ARRT Committee and the faculty member under review. However, faculty members with questions about the ARRT committee letter are encouraged to talk to the dean about the ARRT letter. As a member of the ARRT committee, the dean may have insights to share with a faculty member.

### **III. Guidelines for Preparing ARRT Portfolios**

The guidelines for preparing ARRT portfolios for candidates in the College of Arts and Sciences follow from the University rank and tenure policies described in the University of San Diego Policy Manual, section 4.2. The candidate and the chair of the candidate's department share the responsibility for preparing the portfolio. The candidate should begin by organizing relevant materials that will be uploaded to the Blackboard site established for the candidate's department. The chair of the candidate’s department adds all letters from USD faculty outside the candidate’s department and all external letters before the portfolio is made accessible to members of the department for the purpose of preparing their peer letters. The chair organizes the additional confidential material (peer letters, summary letter, supervisory letter), which will be provided to the Dean's office when department review of the portfolio has concluded. All materials available to department faculty must be included in the portfolio that is provided to the Dean’s office and ARRT Committee. The Dean’s office will not accept incomplete portfolios for review.

The Dean’s office will make the portfolio available to the ARRT Committee after the confidential material has been added. The Dean’s office also will add the Dean’s letter and ARRT Committee summary letter from the candidate’s previous ARRT review to the portfolio, before the ARRT Committee accesses the portfolio. The Dean’s letter shall be forwarded to the candidate and the chair of the department in a timely manner to allow appropriate responses to that letter before the ARRT Committee considers the case. Should the candidate wish to respond to the supervisory letter, peer summary letter, or Dean’s letter, the candidate submits the response directly to the Dean (who will place the response in the portfolio and send a copy to the department chair for informational purposes only; no comment from the chair is permitted).

Department ARRT guidelines should be provided by the chair. All other materials should be provided by the candidate. The Committee requests that each candidate and their chair use good judgment in selecting representative materials for the portfolio. If there are questions about materials for a file, a discussion with the chair and the dean may be helpful.

### **Materials provided by the candidate include:**

1. Current curriculum vitae
2. Letter of self-evaluation
3. Record of courses taught by semester for period under review, noting sources of reassigned time by semester
4. Representative sample of completed professional work, e.g., clearly labeled journal articles, papers presented at professional meetings, sample excerpts from books, copies or descriptions of artistic work, or any other relevant information about completed professional work
5. Representative sample of or description of professional work in progress
6. Representative sample of course materials, e.g., syllabi, exams, handouts, etc.
7. Teaching evaluations by students (originals plus tabulated results for each set) for the following time periods:
  - a. For the 2nd year review, include the first two semesters at USD. The fall semester evaluations from year 2 are not included.
  - b. For subsequent reviews, two years of teaching evaluations are submitted, including summer and/or intersession if applicable.
  - c. For tenure or promotion cases and triggered reviews, include two years of evaluations.
8. Grade distributions for the period under review and department averages for the same period, as provided by the Chair.
9. Other information deemed pertinent.

The period under review is considered to be one year for faculty who have completed less than two years at USD and two years for faculty who have completed two or more years at USD. Faculty applying for promotion to Professor may include scholarship materials that were completed any time post-tenure if these materials are necessary to illustrate a trajectory of scholarly progression beyond the information presented in the curriculum vitae. However, as noted previously, care should be taken to include representative materials in the ARRT portfolio.

### **Writing a self-evaluation letter**

The letter of self-evaluation is an opportunity for candidates to present to their peers, the dean, and the committee a portrait of themselves as faculty. It should be a reflective statement addressing the four criteria as described in the University of San Diego Policy Manual, section 4.2. Candidates should reflect on their teaching philosophy, relating this philosophy to classroom method; successes, challenges and notable accomplishments are to be addressed; achievements in research and publication are to be described, and a research agenda is to be clearly articulated; candidates should reflect upon the nature and quality of one's service to the university and (where relevant) to the community; and a similarly reflective attitude should inform the candidate's statement of support for USD's mission, vision and values. Where applicable, candidates should respond to feedback in previous ARRT Committee summary letters, explaining how criticisms and suggestions have been addressed. Self-evaluation letters should not exceed five pages in length. The ARRT committee may ask for the self-evaluation to be revised if it is longer than five pages.

## **Guidelines for writing peer letters**

The ARRT Committee seeks peer letters for insight or expertise regarding the material in the portfolio. These letters are considered by many to be one of the most important components of a file and should be crafted carefully. These letters should focus the evaluation of the candidate's holistic performance across all four criteria. All tenure-line faculty members are expected to write a thoughtful and thorough peer letter that helps to contextualize items in the portfolio. For example, a letter might highlight that an article or creative work is the best in the field; that the scholarship is cutting-edge; that teaching has improved with peer mentorship; or that work on a particular committee is especially time-consuming or important. Classroom observations are particularly useful in this regard, as are reactions to student evaluations by a peer who has taught the same course. The letter should not simply reiterate facts that are already in the portfolio.

Department chairs should work directly with new and untenured faculty on writing peer letters that provides the ARRT committee with the insight and disciplinary expertise necessary to help make an evaluation.

It is important to avoid information that references something that is not in the portfolio or cannot be verified, such as candidate behavior in the hallway, overheard remarks to students in the candidate's office, vague charges that the candidate is not a good fit for the department or university, or extensive praise for their personal virtues.

Although it can be helpful to organize the letter by referencing the ARRT criteria individually, it is important to make *connections* between their work under each criterion and evaluate the candidate holistically. Irrespective of organization, the letter should respond to all four criteria. Include a statement about support or non-support for a candidate's reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure at the beginning of the letter so the outcome of the peer evaluation is clear.

Try not to exceed two pages for a peer letter.

### **Confidential materials from the department include:**

1. Chair's supervisory letter of evaluation (Chairs must give the candidate a copy of this letter by the time the portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office.)
2. Summary of department/program peer evaluations (This must be written in a manner that clearly conveys the essence of the peer evaluations but also preserves the anonymity of individual peers. Chairs/directors must give the candidate a copy of the summary as soon as the portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office.)
3. Peer evaluations by members of the candidate's department/program (These are confidential and should be added by the chair/director when the portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office.)
4. Letters from USD faculty outside the candidate's department/program that are relevant to the evaluation of teaching; research, creative work, and professional activities; service; or support of the mission of USD (optional) (These are provided by the chair to the members of the department and included in the portfolio.)
5. External letters relevant to the evaluation of teaching; research, creative work, and professional activities; service; or support of the mission of USD (optional) (These are provided by the

chair to the members of the department and included in the portfolio.). Guidelines for requesting external letters are included on the Chair's Resources webpage.

ARRT materials should be organized in Blackboard as outlined in the addendum.

## **V. Guidelines for Chairs Mentoring Faculty in the ARRT Process**

### **What should you tell the candidate?**

Explain to the candidate all the procedures outlined in "Guidelines for Preparing ARRT Portfolios." Each candidate must have a copy of those guidelines, and you may simply want to provide copies for all members of your department. Guidelines should be provided to faculty when they begin their appointment at USD, and chairs should ensure that candidates have the current department guidelines at least three months before the deadline to submit an ARRT portfolio to the Dean's office.

The candidate must be given a copy of both the chair's supervisory letter of evaluation and the summary of departmental peer letters as soon as the portfolio is submitted to the Dean's office.

### **How should you write the supervisory letter?**

The chair's supervisory letter is written and addressed to the ARRT Committee (rather than the candidate) and serves a dual purpose: 1) it conveys the chair's assessment as a colleague of the candidate and 2) it positions the candidate's performance (strengths, weaknesses, specific areas for improvement) in the context of the department expectations. The following questions may serve as prompts to facilitate writing the supervisory letter, and are not intended to be answered by prescription:

- Address candidate's strengths and weaknesses in each of the criteria.
- How does the candidate's workload contribute to the quality and profile of the department?
- Is the candidate engaged in the creation and revision of courses to meet current standards in the discipline?
- Has the candidate taken advantage of any professional development opportunities either on-campus or off-campus?
- How does the candidate's research/scholarship fit with the department's needs and interests?
- How does the department view the quality of the candidate's work?
- Are there any issues regarding teaching, research, or service of which the ARRT committee needs to be made aware?
- How does that candidate's service fit with the need of the department, College, profession, or community?
- Does the candidate's emphasis on any one type of service require explanation?
- Clearly state whether you support reappointment, promotion or tenure. If your opinion does not reflect the majority view, explain and include evidence or documentation.

### **How should the peer summary letter be written?**

The peer summary letter is primarily written so the candidate has a clear sense of their peers' evaluation of their progress, and may be written by the department chair or by a tenured faculty member. It should be reviewed by the chair prior to being included in the portfolio. The peer summary letter is intended to capture the sentiments and comments expressed in the individual peer letters. This summary begins with a brief introductory paragraph that provides an overview of the collective evaluation made by members of the department and may include the actual vote count. The remainder of the letter may consist of excerpted quotes from the peer letters organized by criterion. The selection of quotes must be representative in order to provide the candidate with transparent feedback, but the summary peer letter must also ensure anonymity. In some cases, the letter writer may report peer observations that takes place during a department discussion. In this case, it is important to ensure that faculty members review the letter for accuracy.

### **How do you guide your faculty to include student and peer teaching evaluations in a faculty portfolio?**

Both student and peer teaching observations are essential for reappointment, rank, and tenure review in the College of Arts and Sciences.

- Student evaluations are expected to be collected for every class a faculty member teaches, including summer and intersession. Two years of these evaluations must be included in the faculty member portfolio for rank, tenure, and promotion review.
- Peer teaching observations are expected to be conducted prior to pre-tenure biennial review and promotion to full professor. Peer faculty should observe at least one class taught by a faculty member under review. Peer faculty should reflect on their teaching observations in their individual peer letters and/or in formal committee teaching observation letters.
- If a peer faculty member references a faculty member's teaching in their letter, they should reference the section and semester they attended the class.
- The expectation of the College is that all faculty members in a department will participate in a peer teaching observation of the candidate throughout the review period. Candidates should be consulted about the timing of peer observations.
- In rare cases, some larger departments may opt to form peer teaching observation committees. In this case, it is recommended that these committees include at least 50 percent of the department and have clear written processes for evaluating and including commentary in faculty portfolios. Efforts should be taken to ensure that there is committee consistency for each review of the candidate.
- In all cases, it is expected that the Chair performs a teaching observation in preparation for the Supervisory letter.

### **How do you mentor faculty for promotion?**

Faculty members are eligible for promotion to full professor after completing five years at the associate professor rank. Strong candidates will demonstrate significant progress across the criteria since promotion to associate professor, with a clear articulation of how their work supports the mission of the University.

A candidate who has been denied promotion has the right to apply for promotion again the next year. Yet in order for there to be good grounds for granting promotion the next year, there should obviously be new material in the portfolio. Often this is difficult if the candidate applies the very next year. For example, if an individual is refused promotion by the ARRT Committee in the spring semester and then reapplies the following fall, the likelihood that there will be significantly new information in the portfolio is small. (It is always possible, of course, that there might be a dramatic improvement in teaching, that several papers might be accepted, or that the candidate might be elected to numerous committees.) Departmental chairs may well want to advise candidates who have been refused promotion to consider waiting at least one year before reapplying, except in unusual circumstances, for this will allow them sufficient time to deal with the issues which initially stood in the way of promotion. Of course, this can only be a recommendation, and the candidate retains the right to make the final decision.

## **VI. Biennial Review**

The College of Arts and Sciences has a system of biennial reviews for reappointment. Under the biennial system, ARRT reviews of non-tenured faculty take place as follows:

(R = reappointment review; T = tenure review; Fall/Spring)

Years Credited Toward Tenure When Hired	Year at USD					
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5 <sup>th</sup>	6th
0	-/*	-/R	-/*	R/-	-/*	-/T
1	-/*	-/R	-/*	R/-	-/T	
2	-/*	-/R	-/*	-/T		
3	-/*	-/R	-/T			

For faculty with less than two years of credit toward tenure when hired, there would be at least two reappointment reviews before the tenure review. Faculty with triggered reviews in the third year will have their 4<sup>th</sup> year review the following Spring. Asterisks indicate semesters in which no ARRT review is scheduled but in which an additional review can be conducted, if a triggered review is requested.

Faculty undergoing an ARRT review in a particular academic year will be notified of the results at the end of May. First-year faculty undergoing a triggered ARRT review in the spring semester will be notified of the results by March 1.

By mid-November of each year in which no regular ARRT review is scheduled, the candidate will prepare a brief outline of their significant activities since the previous full review. This outline and the review recommendation ballot will be distributed to the tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the department, who will return the ballot to the department chair so that the candidate can be notified at least one month in advance of the full-review deadline whether or not there will be a triggered review.

### **Procedures regarding triggered ARRT reviews**

An additional ARRT Committee review should be regarded as an extraordinary circumstance. Departmental faculty or members of the ARRT Committee voting for an extra review thereby

signify that their doubts about a faculty member's performance are significant enough to place their affirmative vote for reappointment/tenure in question during the next regularly scheduled review.

Review during years in which no review is scheduled will be conducted if requested by:

- A. The candidate, by written request to the Dean.
- B. A vote of at least one-third of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the candidate's department. The candidate neither votes nor is counted in the size of the department.
- C. A vote of at least three members of the ARRT Committee at the time the previous full review was conducted.

If a full review is not to be conducted, then the department chair will inform the Dean in writing of the numerical vote of the department as reflected in "B" above by the full-review deadline. The Dean shall notify the Committee of the department's decision and send the candidate's outline and the chair's letter to the President.

### **Addendum**

**ARRT materials should be organized in Blackboard as follows:**

- Department ARRT Guidelines

#### Candidate Documents

- CV
- Self-Evaluation Letter

#### Scholarship Materials

- 1) Completed Work (Selected)
  - Files containing selected completed work
- 2) Work in Progress (Selected)
  - Files containing selected work in progress

#### Teaching Materials

- 1) Record of courses taught by academic term for period under review, noting sources of reassigned time by semester. This list should include summer and intersession teaching.
- 2) Course Materials (Selected)
  - Labeled by course number and academic term
- 3) Teaching Evaluations
  - Peer teaching evaluations, if the department practice is to generate peer teaching evaluations separate from peer letters
  - Labeled by course number and academic term
- 4) Grade Distributions

#### Other Materials

- Additional materials that the candidate wants to include in the portfolio

Each file should be given an informative name that will permit reviewers to identify the contents easily before opening the file. Since the ARRT committee reviews files from faculty in many departments each semester, some standardization of file names will help to make the review process easier and less confusing. The following naming guidelines should be used when preparing files to be uploaded.

Department ARRT guidelines: <Department name or abbreviation> ARRT guidelines.pdf

- Ex: MUSC ARRT guidelines.pdf
- Ex: Music ARRT guidelines.pdf

Candidate documents: <Candidate last name> <document type>.pdf

- Ex: Thurman CV.pdf
- Ex: Thurman self-evaluation.pdf

Letters: <Candidate last name> <document type> - <author last name>.pdf

- Ex: Weller Peer Letter - Mendez.pdf
- Ex: Weller Summary Letter.pdf
- Ex: Weller USD Outside Letter - Macleod.pdf
- Ex: Weller External Letter - Mitchell.pdf

Scholarship Materials: Simple, descriptive titles

- Ex: Garcia et al. 2015.pdf
- Ex: Garcia performance Aspen Music Festival June 2015.mp4
- Ex: Garcia installation SD Museum of Contemporary Art Sep 2016 image 02.jpg

Course Materials: <course number> <semester> <item>.pdf

- Ex: POLS 120 Spring 2016 syllabus.pdf
- Ex: POLS 120 Spring 2016 midterm 1.pdf
- Ex: POLS 120 Spring 2016 writing rubric.pdf

Teaching Evaluations: <course number> <semester> evaluations.pdf

- Ex: THRS 112 Fall 2015 student evaluations.pdf
- Ex: THRS 112 Fall 2015 peer evaluation.pdf

Grade Distributions: <Candidate last name> <semester> grades.pdf

- Ex: Albertson Spring 2016 grades.pdf

All materials should be uploaded into the appropriate folders in Blackboard. All text documents should be uploaded to Blackboard as pdf files. Image, video and audio files should be uploaded in commonly viewed formats (jpg, gif, mp4, avi, mp3, etc.) that can be displayed or played using software that is standard on Windows or Apple computers. ARRT materials should not be provided by linking to files on an external site, such as Google Drive.

Confidential materials (peer letters, chair/supervisory letter, summary letter, and any external letters) should not be uploaded into Blackboard. These should be made available to department faculty by the department chair, separately from the Blackboard organization. These, the Dean's letter, and the previous ARRT committee summary letter and Dean's letter (if this is not the

candidate's first ARRT review) will be added to the portfolio by the Dean's office before the portfolio is shared with the ARRT committee.

Some materials may not be suitable for sharing through Blackboard. Examples include a book or a website that was produced by the candidate. In such cases, the Blackboard ARRT portfolio should include selected excerpts from those materials (e.g., selected chapters from a book) or links to website where the relevant materials are hosted. Ideally, websites should not be edited during the time that a candidate's ARRT portfolio is being reviewed, so that all reviewers see the same version of that site. Books and other physical items should be made available for review, first in the department office (during the department review period) and later in the Dean's office (during the ARRT committee review).

It is recommended that each candidate assemble their ARRT portfolio on a personal computer before uploading any materials to Blackboard. Content may be built as items or files, depending on the candidate's preference. Once materials have been uploaded, they can be viewed by all members of the candidate's department. During the period when a candidate's ARRT portfolio is being reviewed by the department, the ARRT committee will not have access to the portfolio.