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When you have questions about Interfolio, start by looking on this page.

There’s lots of information here and you may find an answer! If not, call Anne or Barbara (contact info on last slide)
The lower portion of the page has useful documents, most of which are now updated for 2018-19.
TPAC Dossier Preparation Guide

Instructions:
Number the documents in the dossier according to the checklist below. Do not re-number the documents — skip those not required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Promotion from Assistant to Associate (with tenure)</th>
<th>Promotion from Associate to Professor (tenure previously granted)</th>
<th>Promotion to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Promotion for Professor of the Practice, or (Research)</th>
<th>Reappointment as Assistant Professor, or Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Reappointment as Professor of the Practice or (Research)</th>
<th>Appointment as Associate Professor or Professor (without tenure)</th>
<th>Appointment as Professor or Senior Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Covering memorandum</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative recommendation written explanation to candidate</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Waiver of candidate’s right to a personal appearance before the department</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Information on teaching since last contract review</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Candidate’s current CV</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Candidate’s statement</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Annual or mid-contract reviews since last reappointment</td>
<td>X NA X X NA X NA X NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Department correspondence with the selected referees</td>
<td>X X X X X X X NA X X NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Letters of evaluation</td>
<td>8 8¹ 5² 5³ 5 NA NA 8² 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Brief biographies of external referees</td>
<td>X X X X X X NA NA X X NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Minutes of the official meeting in which the department voted on the recommendation</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Department Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Publications</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Course Evaluations</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ At least five must be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise have a potential conflict of interest. A limited number of writers from a previous action (such as the tenure case) may be included.
² May be a combination of letters from outside evaluators and from individuals at Brown (but not in the candidate’s department). See Handbook of Academic Administration 10.5.1 for further details.
³ From individuals external to Brown who serve in positions similar to the distinguished senior lecturer role or are tenured faculty engaged in pedagogical research or related programs at other institutions. Additional letters may be solicited from individuals at Brown (but not in the candidate’s department). See Handbook of Academic Administration 10.5.2 for further details.
⁴ At least five must be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or otherwise have a potential conflict of interest.

The TPAC Dossier Prep Guide has replaced the checklists for individual faculty actions.
Explanation of Requirements:
The department review for a reappointment, promotion, or senior appointment culminates with the preparation of a dossier presenting the evidence on which the department's recommendation is based. It should also include a description of the procedures by which the materials were obtained. The dossier is then shared with the Dean of Faculty's Office and the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC) for review. This guide provides details about what materials are required in the dossier and is intended to clarify the procedure.

1. **Covering memorandum** (the cover memo and the department review may be combined as one document):
   - The specific recommendation
   - Final vote (with numbers)
   - Names of faculty attending meeting at which the vote was taken
   - Names of eligible faculty *not* at this meeting
   - Stipulated quorum for such meetings
   
   Be clear about the voting procedures and the relevant electorate. Retired faculty are not eligible to vote, and should participate in the discussion only in exceptional circumstances. The quorum and official vote tally include those present and/or participating in the discussion of the case via teleconference, Skype, etc. Votes received by proxy or e-mail should be reported separately. Voting by secret ballot is preferred and taking “straw votes” in order to arrive at a consensus is not recommended; in cases where this is done, such preliminary votes should be reported.
   - A full and candid discussion of the issues raised in the meeting (relative to this candidacy) and of the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
   - Specific start and end dates of the recommended term (n.b. promotions are normally effective as of July 1)
   - A general explanation of the reasons for abstentions
   - An explanation of the views of those voting in the minority (unless the voting is done by secret ballot)
   - The academic unit's view of the importance of the candidate's academic specialty within the larger field or discipline
   
   While details may be difficult to provide when the vote is by secret ballot, the chair should nevertheless attempt to summarize the range of views expressed during the discussion. A draft of the memo should be circulated to all participants for their comments; the chair should inform all members that if any of them has a serious objection which cannot be resolved, they may communicate their views to TPAC in a separate memo. Any such minority communications must be made available to all members who participated in the consideration of the case.
   - The importance of the candidate's academic specialty within the larger field or discipline
   
   Most TPAC members are not experts in the candidate's field, so it is important to explain the intellectual terrain in which the candidate’s work is situated and how it impacts on the field. As appropriate, explain how well the candidate has met the needs and expectations of the department. Provide a candid overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The purpose here is to summarize the considerations that led to the recommendation. This is an opportunity to address any questions that may cause concern when reviewing the dossier, e.g. uneven teaching evaluations or reservations expressed by referees.

2. **Negative recommendation** written explanation to the candidate
   
   All candidates should be informed of the recommendation (not the specific vote). In cases that are positive but not unanimous, it may be fair and appropriate to convey something about the strength of the recommendation; please consult with DOF if such situations arise. For negative recommendations, the candidate should promptly receive a written explanation outlining the reasons.

3. **Waiver of candidate's right to a personal appearance before the department**
   
   This should be done in writing. If a candidate chooses to appear, please include a summary in the meeting minutes. DOF staff will contact candidates about TPAC appearances.

4. **Department review of scholarship, teaching, and service** (the department review and the cover memo may be combined as one document):
   - Commentary on scholarship and professional development
   - Teaching effectiveness in both undergraduate and graduate courses, including a discussion of students’ qualitative evaluations
   - If the candidate supervised independent study and/or engaged in mentoring, an assessment of these activities should be included
   
   Multiple modes of assessment should be used to evaluate teaching, including thorough discussion of students’ qualitative evaluations (using student quotations is encouraged), comparative data, and peer evaluation. For external candidates, please provide evidence as available. See above (#1) regarding discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case.
Multiple modes of assessment should be used to evaluate teaching, including thorough discussion of students' qualitative evaluations (using student quotations is encouraged), comparative data, and peer evaluation. For external candidates, please provide evidence as available. See above (#1) regarding discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

For promotions to Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Senior Lecturer, the following should be included:

- Sustained and documented teaching excellence as attested by student and peer evaluations
- Service to the department, University, profession, and community
- Recognition as a role model, advisor, and mentor for undergraduate and/or graduate students as well as colleagues
- Excellent professional reputation, as demonstrated by membership and active participation in local, regional, or national professional societies (this may be demonstrated through positions of leadership in executive committees, key roles in collaborative projects, and the organization of professional and academic workshops, symposia, and invited lectures)
- A record of outstanding educational scholarship, which may take the form of instructional materials (including online materials), activities associated with the development and implementation of new assessment models, curricular innovation and configurations, publications, performances, or other works), and;
- Research effort within their discipline (while not normally required, this may be taken into account as appropriate).

5. Information on teaching since contract review:
   - Tabular summary of teaching (from Cognos)
   - Class observations by peers, if available
   - Other teaching material, such as syllabi, may be added here
   - If possible, provide comparative information, i.e. how the ratings compare to those in other similar courses.
   This information is not required for external candidates, but if material is available it should be provided.

6. Candidate's current CV

7. Candidate statements
   There is no required format; candidates may freely present their research plans and teaching philosophy. It is not required that external candidates provide statements, but they may be included.

8. Annual or mid-contract reviews
   - since last contract review
   - candidate's written responses to annual reviews.
   If the tenure review follows soon after a reappointment review, it may be appropriate to include earlier annual reviews. Please consult with DOF.

9. Department correspondence with selected referees
   Include a sample solicitation letter and relevant evaluator responses. Deviations from the standard solicitation letter to referees should be discussed in advance with the DOF. Any correspondence that discusses the candidate’s qualifications or work should be included, as should all declinations. Potential evaluators who were contacted and did not respond should be identified.

10. Letters of evaluation
   A core number of letters should be from individuals who are not close collaborators, dissertation supervisors, or have other potential conflicts of interest. Letters from collaborators beyond that core number are permitted. The list of potential referees should be reviewed by the appropriate Dean before letters are solicited. Please refer to the checklist above for the required number of letters for each type of case. For more details, please see the Handbook of Academic Administration, Appendix C, No. 10.
When preparing a dossier, please consider including a chart of evaluators, particularly if the number of evaluators approached exceeds 12-15 people. It makes it easier and less frustrating for TPAC to have this spreadsheet, rather than scrolling through pages of emailed responses from evaluators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>institution</th>
<th>rank/title</th>
<th>candidate or committee recommended</th>
<th>accept/decline/no response</th>
<th>letter received</th>
<th>letter writer response (you may want a separate document for these, if they are extensive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This spreadsheet, available on the Tenure and Promotions page, is useful to include in #8, Department Correspondence with evaluators.
11. Brief biographies
   Provide a brief biography for each external referee to inform TPAC why the individual is qualified to evaluate the candidate’s work. Please indicate if individuals have had a working relationship with the candidate or wrote a previous assessment. It is helpful to provide a single-page table in this section that lists the names, institutions, and responses (accept/decline) of all persons solicited, and also indicate if they were recommended by the candidate or the department.

12. Minutes of the official meetings in which the department voted on the recommendation
   If more than one candidate is discussed at the same meeting, please redact the minutes so each candidate’s dossier includes only a discussion of his/her case. Minutes should be a detailed transcript of remarks, giving a full accounting of the issues that arose in discussions. It is not necessary to attribute remarks to specific individuals.

13. Department Standards and Criteria
   TPAC will use the Standards & Criteria to examine the arguments given by the department in support of the recommendation.

14. Publications
   The candidate’s principal publications and/or completed work can be submitted either electronically or in hard copy (which will be returned after the review).

15. Teaching Evaluations
   A Cognos course evaluation report showing courses taught since the last review, or since appointment. In the case of new external appointments, attempts should be made to obtain evaluations from the candidate’s current institution.
Using Interfolio for TPAC dossier preparation

Interfolio is used at Brown for

- Searches and hiring (since 2012)
- Promotion and tenure (since 2014)
- Annual reviews (in DoF only, since 2016)
Interfolio is an online document tracking and management system.

- Secure
  - Different levels of access for users
  - Different roles for users
  - Candidates for review cannot see material
- (Relatively) intuitive to use
- Accessibility
  - Dossiers are online
  - Dossiers are archived and can be accessed in the system even after the case is complete
Interfolio has a hierarchy and workflow that allows different users different levels of access and control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Permissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutional administrators (Anne and Barbara) | • Create cases/workflows and view them throughout workflow  
• Create and manage users and committees |
| Administrators (some dept managers)       | • See the cases throughout the workflow (even after the case “leaves” the dept)  
• Add and manage users and committees  
• Add or remove documents |
| Committee Managers (most dept managers or staff) | • See the cases when at department level  
• Add/recuse users to case-specific comm.  
• Upload documents and forward the case to the next level |
| Committee Members (faculty, TPAC members) | • Read cases to which they are given access  
• Download case documents as pdfs |
Interfolio’s workflow always moves forward!

For security and confidentiality, anything added to a dossier/case can only be seen in that committee and in any committees further up the hierarchy.

If you add material in one committee and try to send it back to an earlier committee, the new material will not be visible to that committee.
Interfolio’s workflow always moves forward!

Workflow for TPAC Cases

1. Department admin review (chair and manager)
2. Department voting faculty (optional)
3. DoF Office (Anne)
4. TPAC Members
Workflow for Annual Reviews

- Department 1st draft of annual review
- DOF Review (Joel, Anne, Janet)
- Department final draft of annual review
- Final Submission of Annual Review (Melissa)
Smart people deserve smart technology.
The first ever faculty information system.

Our Products
Our products represent a modular approach to technology that supports the entire career lifecycle of the faculty.

Faculty Information System
A platform that offers your institution holistic support for the full scope of faculty research, advancement, and service.
Select Brown University from the drop-down list, and you will be directed through Brown’s SSO, Shibboleth, into the Interfolio system. Some people might prefer this access to creating a unique password—but either method will work!
Welcome back, Anne Windham

Your Action Items

Josiah Carter
Psychoceramics | Promotion | Tenure | Review, Promotion and Tenure

All of the cases to which you have access will be available on this homepage. Click on the faculty member's name to go into the case.
Committee Managers can . . .

- Upload documents to the dossier and organize them
- Delete documents*
- Add users (faculty committee members) to case-specific committees
- Recuse committee members from cases
- Send case forward to the next review level
  
  * Note that you can only delete documents that you added yourself
How to upload documents

Click on Add File
How to upload documents

A pop-up screen appears and you can browse to find your file. Only one file may be uploaded at a time!
Always remember to click Read Case after uploading, to make sure that the documents look OK!
Read Case shows that the numbering is out of order and the CV has a lot of unnecessary bookmarks. Review the document “Submitting a dossier through Interfolio,” located on the Tenure and Promotion page, for instructions on how to reorder items and add or delete bookmarks.
How to edit titles or delete documents

Click the pencil icon for the document. You can change the title of the document or delete it (Note: committee managers can only delete documents that they have added themselves).
How to add or recuse committee members

Click “Case Details”
How to add or recuse committee members

Click Edit
Click “Add Member” and type faculty member’s first or last name, the user profile should pop up. To recuse someone, click the circle with the line through it (🚫).
How to forward a case

Go to the case home page, click send case.
How to forward a case

You will next get a pop-up screen. This shows you where and to whom the case is going. You have the option to send a message through Interfolio, or click on the blue check mark and you can send without a message. The message system doesn’t always work! Better to copy the address of the case (for example, Josiah’s is https://rpt.interfolio.com/10128/cases/42614) and email your faculty member’s case address to your voting faculty.
Committee Managers can ask the University Administrators to . . .

- Create a new user
- Create a new standing committee
- Delete a document in a dossier that was added by someone else
- Get a dossier back once you’ve forwarded it beyond your committee
Always follow the TPAC Dossier Prep Guide for the appropriate faculty action (tenure, reappointment, etc.)

Maintain the numbering system from the TPAC Dossier Prep Guide, do not re-number dossier items

We recommend that you upload documents in a non-modifiable format (pdf)

After uploading documents, click the “Read” button and see what they look like! This is how TPAC will view them.
Using Interfolio for annual review submission

Workflow for Annual Reviews

1. Department 1st draft of annual review
2. DOF Review (Joel, Anne, Janet)
3. Department final draft of annual review
4. Final Submission of Annual Review (Melissa)
Standards, Criteria, and Reviews

Standards and Criteria

All Assistant Professors, tenure-track Associate Professors without tenure, and Lecturers at Brown are reviewed annually by their department, in consultation with their cognizant dean. This requirement has been extended to include the right of all faculty to a statement of departmental standards and criteria in matters of research, teaching and service that would apply when important personnel recommendations or decisions affecting their interests are made by the department.

These statements must be detailed, clear, objective and manifestly fair, and they must indicate the relative importance ("weight") given to each criterion - research, teaching and service. The department is responsible for providing each member of the department with a copy of its standards and criteria, especially new faculty and those who may be candidates for reappointment, promotion or tenure in the near future. Please refer to the attached document, Suggestions for Improving Standards and Criteria documents for guidance when reviewing departmental standards and criteria.

Annual Reviews

All Assistant Professors, tenure-track Associate Professors without tenure, and Lecturers at Brown are reviewed annually by their department, in consultation with their cognizant dean. Senior lecturers should be reviewed once, in the middle of their appointment. Annual reviews of untenured faculty are directed by the chair of their unit and conducted at a meeting of the tenured faculty of the department. Faculty members under review are advised to provide their department chair with an updated curriculum vitae, and may wish to refer to the cv guidelines posted here. Explicit instructions for conducting the annual review can be found in chapter nine of the Handbook.

Annual reviews are due to the Dean’s office in mid-October. The Dean will comment on the review, after which the chair should meet with the faculty member and provide him or her with a written copy of the review and a confirmation of receipt form, which should be signed and returned to the Dean’s office.

Related Files

- Standards and Criteria Guidelines.pdf
- Confirmation of Receipt form.docx
For Interfolio access:
Anne Windham  anne_windham@brown.edu
ext. 3-5410

Scheduling, agenda:
Barbara Zdravesky  barbara_zdravesky@brown.edu
ext. 3-6880