POLICY & PROCEDURES CHECKLIST FOR PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

(First item in applicant’s portfolio)

According to Policy 352, 6.6, “colleges and departments shall document that they have followed all procedures; e.g., by a comprehensive checklist of the steps in the PTE process. The documentation must be included in the portfolio.”

Originating at the department/unit level, this checklist documents that University procedures have been followed at the different levels of review. For each candidate, the evaluating parties are requested to complete their section of the checklist, to sign, date and insert the form as the first item in the applicant’s portfolio. The Dean is responsible for giving a copy of the completed form to the applicant.

Candidate’s Name: ________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit PTE Committee Chair: ___________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit Chair or Head: _________________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair College PTE Committee: _________________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the College: _________________________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. Extension): ______________________________________</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check agreement or mark N.A., not applicable. Be prepared to explain why an item is not applicable.

To be completed at the Unit/Department level of review:

**Department PTE Committee:**
- Members were elected according to department’s PTE document
- Potential conflict of interest situations were identified/mitigated.
- No faculty member being considered for promotion served on PTE committee.
- No administrators, as identified by policy 352, served on committee.
- Departmental voting procedures on applicant’s candidacy were followed.
- The evaluation was based on the written standards and criteria of the department.
- Candidate received letter of evaluation/recommendation by due date.
- Candidate was accorded 14 calendar days to respond.
- Department-specific procedures were followed.
- Committee deliberations were kept confidential.

The department’s PTE document is consistent with
- Policy 352
- College PTE guidelines
Chair or Head:

Outside letters of review were solicited in a timely manner.  
Solicitation of letters of review followed University’s recommended model.  
In case of joint appointments, input from other units was requested and included.  
The evaluation was based on the written standards and criteria of the department.  
Timely inclusion of letters of evaluation and recommendation by  
  Department’s PTE committee  
  Chair/head  
  Others (e.g. Extension)  
Candidate received letter of evaluation/recommendation by due date.  
Portfolio was submitted to the college level by the due date.  

The department’s PTE document is consistent with  
Policy 352  
College PTE guidelines

To be completed at the College Level of Review:

College PTE Committee:

Members were elected according to College PTE document.  
No administrators, as identified by policy 352, served.  
Potential conflict of interest was identified/mitigated.  
No faculty member being considered for promotion served on PTE committee.  
Information added after November 1 conformed to materials listed in policy 352, section 6.2.  
College’s and Dean’s reviews, deliberations, and recommendations were  
  conducted separately and independently of each other.  
College-specific procedures were followed.  
The evaluation was based on the written standards and criteria, policy and  
  procedures of the department and the college.  
Letter of evaluation/recommendation was submitted to Provost by due date.  
Candidate received copy of letter of evaluation/recommendation by due date.  
Committee deliberations were kept confidential.  

The college’s PTE document is consistent with policy 352.

Dean:

Dean’s review, deliberation, and recommendation were conducted separately  
  and independently of review by College PTE committee.  
The evaluation was based on the written standards and criteria, policy and  
  procedures of the department and the college.  
Information added after November 1 conformed to materials listed in policy 352, section 6.2.  
Portfolio was submitted to Provost by the due date.  
Candidate received copy of letter of evaluation/recommendation by due date.  
Candidate received copy of the completed policy & procedures checklist.  

The college’s PTE document is consistent with policy 352.