



**University of
New Hampshire**

College of Liberal Arts

**COLA P&T
Procedures and Guidelines**

AY 2025-26

Revised 5-9-25

Contents

Introduction	3
Deadlines and Submission	3
Important Documents and Information	3
Preparing the Case	4
Outside Reviewers	9
Other Issues to Consider as Recommended by Past College P&T Panels	11
Case Assembly and Submission	13
University Policy on Retention of Materials	14

Introduction

Each year, members of the College advisory committee on promotion and tenure meet with the Dean to discuss their experiences. This document is a summary of points resulting from these discussions over the years and is designed to anticipate most of the questions that frequently arise about case preparation.

- Please share this with your administrative assistants, who in most instances will assist with assembling the cases.
- Department Chairs should share and discuss this document with their department promotion and tenure committees, in particular, the chair of the promotion and tenure committees or subcommittees.
- Please distribute this document to all tenure-track faculty and especially to candidates with cases coming up this year, and carefully review together.

Our goal is to provide helpful information to make the process smooth. Where you see reference to the College P&T panel or committee, please keep in mind that this generally also applies to all other readers of the P&T document (deans, provost, etc.). If you have questions about anything mentioned in this document, please contact Jenni Cook (jenni.cook@unh.edu) in the Dean's Office.

Deadlines and Submission

In order to have sufficient time to examine the materials submitted in each case and, if necessary, to solicit additional information, the panels are aided significantly by some flexibility in timing deadlines. Although the Collective Bargaining Agreement requires that cases be turned in to the Dean's Office by December 2, 2024, we ask that, as in previous years, they be submitted earlier:

- **Promotion to the rank of Full Professor: Friday, November 7, 2025**
- **Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure: Friday, November 14, 2025**

These earlier deadlines give the COLA P&T panels sufficient time to review and evaluate the cases and to submit their recommendations to the Dean who, in turn, needs to review and evaluate each case and make an independent recommendation to the Provost by early February.

Important Documents and Information

Collective Bargaining Agreement, July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2025. Candidates coming up for promotion should read Article 13, which has critical information about procedures:

https://www.aaup-unh.org/uploads/6/6/3/7/66378907/aaup_contract_2020-2025_-_s.pdf

Information from the Provost's Office on P&T, including procedures and instructions for preparing the P&T case: <https://www.unh.edu/provost/promotion-and-tenure-procedures-documents>

Student evaluations of teaching, the policies and procedures regarding student evaluations of teaching, and the appropriate use of such evaluations in the P&T process can be found at this link: <https://www.unh.edu/institutional-research/assessment-accreditation/student-experiences-learning-survey> (Scroll to “Guidelines for Usage by Deans, P & T Committees, Promotion Committees, and Aggregate Program Assessments”).

Preparing the Case

General Remarks

Please be precise in following the procedures and instructions for preparing the case, and carefully proofread all documents before submitting them. The department committee should make sure that the candidate’s narrative is carefully prepared, and the department Chair should similarly ensure that the committee’s report is carefully prepared. The file names should enable subsequent readers to find any relevant documents easily and quickly. The best cases are those in which the candidate, department committee, and department Chair are all sensitive to the case submission readers, as many of those reviewing the case are not specialists in the candidate’s field.

The department committee should indicate in the narrative if a **candidate is being put forward early for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure** (i.e., one or more years before the mandatory year for a tenure decision stated in the letter of appointment); and the department P&T committee’s narrative and the department Chair’s letter should explain why.

In the case of a **candidate put forward for promotion to Full Professor**, the candidate, the department committee, and the department Chair should address the question of why that individual’s candidacy is being put forward at this time. The department should be explicit about what is expected, be it a book, a certain number of articles of a certain type, exhibitions in galleries of a certain type, and so forth.

All of the candidate’s **pre-tenure evaluations by the Dean and department Chair** should be included as evidence in a case for promotion and tenure. For those seeking promotion to Full Professor, all the periodic post-tenure evaluations by the dean and department chair since the time of the last promotion should be included. These documents must be provided, and the absence of any such documents should be explained. If course evaluations for a particular course or semester are missing, the department committee and Chair must indicate why (e.g., due to a leave and/or a course release for other reasons).

Department P&T committee composition should be made explicit. In cases where members from outside a department are included in a department P&T committee or when the committee composition in some way diverges from the department’s own written guidelines, an explanation of the committee composition needs to be included in the case, along with evidence of the Dean’s approval. For cases that involve promotion to the rank of Full, all the members of the committee should ideally be Full Professors. Please consult with the Dean’s Office in advance if you believe you need to deviate from this practice.

Recommendations from the department committee and from the department chair are both required. (Note: the department Chair is expected to offer an independent evaluation of the case file and a recommendation, even when that recommendation accords with the department committee.) When a serving Chair is a candidate for promotion, someone who has previously served as Chair of the department typically writes the Chair's letter. The department committee recommendation need not repeat everything from the evaluation sections of the narrative, but the committee should, at a minimum, include an executive summary of those evaluative sections in its recommendation. The recommendation must include the numerical vote of the committee, which should be recorded on the form designating how many are in favor and how many are against promotion (and, if applicable, how many abstained from voting). This form should be completed even if the numerical vote can be inferred from the signature page or other submitted materials.

In many departments, members of the department P&T committee write letters explaining their votes. We strongly encourage those departments that do not follow this practice to add this element to the case file, as it helps the College committee and administrators better understand the grounds for department recommendations (and is helpful irrespective of whether the department recommendation is unanimous or not). Some departments, in fact, expect all tenured faculty at the appropriate rank, including those not on the P&T committee, to review some of the relevant case materials (e.g., the candidate's CV, or teaching evaluations) and write a letter evaluating the candidate's case.

Whenever a tenured faculty member cannot review the case file (e.g., is on leave), it might not be appropriate to vote on a promotion case. However, that faculty member should be allowed to write a letter of recommendation. (This might, for example, be knowledge of prior reviews or direct acquaintance with the candidate's work.)

Department procedures should stipulate under what circumstances **letters from individuals who are not tenure-track faculty** (non-tenure track faculty, staff, and students) are solicited and what role such letters play. Unsolicited letters from such individuals may be placed in the file only after having been read by the candidate. Unsolicited letters even from emeritus/faculty members are to be treated as unsolicited letters. As indicated above, the name and/or email address (if electronic) of any individual contributing a letter (solicited or unsolicited) must be on the letter when placed into the case and before being reviewed by the department and College.

Teaching

Teaching evaluations. The College panel needs to see the full set of students' written comments, not just the numerical summaries. Departments should thus anticipate needing to provide these materials in **their own appendix file within the case**.

Please refer to the UNH policy document on Student Teaching Evaluations for the appropriate use of student evaluations. Note that the policy states that where the response rate on student evaluations is below 2/3, "undersized samples should not be relied upon." **This does not mean that the data shouldn't be reported.** In instances where there is a low response rate, the College P&T committee looks for explanations of the low rate, particularly if a course has both a low response rate and exceptionally low or high scores. The document should address this. The return rate on solicited student letters should also be reported and contextualized.

When departments rely on qualitative rather than standardized teaching evaluations, the College P&T committee has found it helpful to view the original, individual evaluations in addition to summaries prepared by the department committee. These raw data should be included in the appendix. Departments and programs using narrative teaching evaluations should be aware that the College panels and administrators also like to see quantitative evaluations.

Many departments solicit letters of evaluation from the candidate's former (and current) advisees and students. The narrative should explain how the letters were solicited (i.e., who chose the individuals to receive letters) and include a sample letter of solicitation. Although letters written by individuals selected by the candidate provide useful information, the College panel as well as other reviewers find that letters from a broad representation of advisees and students are helpful. A sufficient number of students ought to be invited to write letters to produce a sample of reasonable size.

Peer reviews of teaching. Peer evaluation of teaching is officially not required under UNH policy on teaching evaluations. However, some form of annual peer review of teaching is now widespread and has been helpful to departments and the College P&T committee. Such peer review could include classroom observation as well as study of the materials used for the course. The peer reviews can form part of the documentation about teaching.

Syllabi. Usually it helps the College committee to see course syllabi and any relevant course materials. This is particularly important when the committee wants to relate course evaluations to the syllabi.

Graduate teaching. If a candidate is a member of a department with a graduate program or has been appointed to the Graduate Faculty by virtue of formal affiliation with a department having a graduate program, the Dean of the Graduate School will review the case. For members of the Graduate Faculty, an appropriate discussion of the expectations for and performance of graduate teaching should be in the file.

The name, signature, and email address (if electronic) of any individual contributing a letter (solicited or unsolicited) must be on the letter when placed into the case and before being reviewed by the department and College. Please ensure that students, in particular, are aware that their name will be known by the individuals reviewing the case (but not by the candidate).

Scholarship/Artistry

Guidelines on the quality of journals or presses in which publications appear or the quality of venues for exhibitions in the fine and performing arts. The best-prepared cases carefully document the quality, circulation, impact factor, readership, and general nature of each of the journals or edited collections in which the candidate's publications have appeared. Helping members of the College panel to recognize the significance of a press in a given field is also recommended, as is providing appropriate information about the standing of, for example, galleries, theaters, or concert venues. By not providing such information, the department leaves it open for the College panel, made up of faculty from fields other than the field of the candidate under consideration, to make judgments on these matters. For example, it is more common in some disciplines than in others to submit co-authored articles to journals. It would be helpful to

the committee to note the relevant disciplinary norms. Additionally, in the case of co-authorship, the candidate and the department P&T committee should identify the specific scholarly contribution of the candidate to each co-authored publication.

Service

Although it is generally the case that teaching and scholarship/creative work weigh more heavily than does service (or engagement), the latter is important and expected. Departments should discuss in detail what kinds of service are normally expected in the department, university, and profession, and how the department weighs service in relation to teaching and scholarship.

In some instances, departments have sought to shield junior faculty from service activities so that they might concentrate on teaching and research. However, because service is expected as part of a faculty member's membership in the academic community, a notable lack of service can raise concerns for the panels.

Document Preparation Narrative

Template

The narrative section must include:

- ☐ The cover sheet
- ☐ Short CV form page found on p. 2 of the Provost's narrative template
- ☐ The candidate's descriptions of teaching, scholarship, and service (**Please note that Sections III, V, and VII of the narrative template need to be completed even if the candidate chooses to submit an integrated self-assessment narrative. In these sections, be careful to note which materials are under review, in press, and published.**)
- ☐ The department committee's evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service
- ☐ The recommendation, numerical vote, and signatures of the committee members only
- ☐ The Chair's recommendation

Confidential letters.

- ☐ When you solicit letters from external reviewers, collaborators, and professional colleagues on or off campus, these letters must be signed. (electronic or otherwise)
- ☐ Electronic copies of confidential letters should be included with your Sharepoint Case appendix. Note that confidential letters can be considered "Sensitive" rather than "Restricted" according to the USNH Data Classification Policy, a crucial distinction with respect to electronic handling. COLA requires the same safeguards used in the USNH General Counsel's Office: confidential letters must only be uploaded to OneDrive, with access limited to those provided the necessary permission and with a special upload link (Request for files is the term in OneDrive) for this purpose. When soliciting letters from reviewers and colleagues, we recommend informing them about these safeguards.
- ☐ **The name, signature, and email address (if electronic) of any individual contributing a letter (solicited or unsolicited) must be on the letter when placed into the case and before being reviewed by the department and College.** Please ensure that students, in particular, are aware that their name will be known by the individuals reviewing the case

(but not by the candidate). Letters of solicitation sent by the department should include a description of the review process and assurances of confidentiality (under all but the most extreme circumstances). Letters submitted anonymously to the case (i.e., letters where the author is not identified within the letter) are in violation of the CBA and should not be forwarded for review to the department or College.

Please refer to the [P& T Discussion and Training notes](#) document from 2022 for more information.

An appendix should include:

- ☐ A complete (and clearly organized) CV noting carefully which materials are under review, under contract, in press, and published
- ☐ Publications
- ☐ Peer and student teaching evaluations and course syllabi
- ☐ Solicited and unsolicited letters from outside consultants, department and other UNH faculty members, and students
- ☐ Annual reviews or post-tenure reviews (including the Dean's review letters)
- ☐ A statement of current department guidelines, procedures, and standards for P&T
- ☐ For those being considered for tenure, the appendix should contain a copy of each and every publication and submitted manuscript listed on the CV
- ☐ For those being considered for promotion to Full Professor, include copies of every publication and manuscript since the previous promotion.
- ☐ Material that was listed "under review" or "in press" in the P&T document from the last promotion and has since been published
- ☐ For books that have been accepted for publication, please include pre-publication reviews and the most recent correspondence with the publisher indicating the current status of the project. For journal articles accepted for publication, please include a letter that confirms acceptance.
- ☐ Other material that may be relevant to the particular case or unique to your discipline

Curriculum Vitae. The Provost's guidelines on promotion and tenure ask that a one-page CV, following a prescribed form, be included as the first page for each case submitted. It would be helpful to the College committee if departments would fill in the form provided by the Provost's Office or, if they wish to retype it, to do so exactly and completely.

Mandatory year for a tenure decision. Two questions on the cover sheet address the date at which a tenure decision is mandatory and whether or not years at other institutions were officially credited toward tenure.

In light of the challenges to academic productivity posed by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, UNH and the AAUP have agreed that both the 19-20 and 20-21 academic years will be excluded from the calculation of the year faculty are up for mandatory tenure review. However, there is no expectation that faculty *must* delay their tenure case by one or both of these years if their case meets the criteria typically applied to assistant professors seeking tenure and promotion.

Years in rank. The calculation of "years in rank" should include the current year – the year in which the case is being considered.

The department's promotion and tenure guidelines. A copy of the department's promotion and tenure guidelines should accompany each case. The College committee finds these guidelines to be particularly helpful as members review the judgments of the department committee. Because guidelines are idiosyncratic and reflect disciplinary differences, it would be helpful to the panel to offer some contextual explanation, perhaps even citing the guidelines of peer institutions. Because this is a period of rapid transition in academe, benchmarking your criteria for promotion and tenure with comparator institutions at regular intervals is desirable.

In recent years, the College committee has found that some of the most difficult cases to assess have involved promotion from Associate Professor. Committees have regularly expressed some concern about inadequate mentorship of candidates by senior colleagues, ill-defined criteria for promotion to Full Professor in departmental guidelines, and a lack of rigorous departmental vetting procedures to determine if a case was ready to be brought forward. While Assistant Professors face a mandatory tenure decision in their sixth year, promotion to the highest rank has no fixed schedule and delaying a case at that level may be in the best interests of the candidate. In short, many departments need to revisit their guidelines to ensure that procedures and standards for promotion to Full Professor are as explicit and thorough as those dealing with promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Outside Reviewers

Selection of Outside Reviewers

Departments should choose impartial reviewers in the candidate's field who have no vested interest in the candidate (e.g., who have not served as a mentor or academic advisor to the candidate, nor with whom they have a close personal or professional/co-authoring relationship). In some cases, it may be appropriate to solicit letters of evaluation from individuals with vested interests, but if so, those reasons should be made explicit. Each outside reviewer should be requested by the department to state their previous knowledge of the candidate's work and relationship with the candidate, if such exists. Reviewers' CVs should be appended to their letters.

An effort should be made to solicit outside letters from individuals affiliated with institutions comparable to UNH. Please consult with the Dean's Office in advance if you believe it is important to use a reviewer who is not a faculty member/academic for a case. Likewise, for cases that involve promotion to the rank of Full, all the members of the committee should ideally be Full Professors. Please consult with the Dean's Office in advance if you believe you need to deviate from this practice.

If much of a candidate's scholarship is collaborative or co-authored, departments should solicit letters from co-authors, asking for a description of the nature of the relationship with the candidate, an evaluation of the work, and for a precise description of the division of responsibilities with the candidate. These letters, however, should *not* be among the mandatory external reviewer letters, but as supplementary data in the case materials.

Please send out invitation letters to reviewers as early as possible in the process. We recommend doing this during the spring semester when possible, both as a courtesy to the reviewer and to ensure that you have the requisite number of letters in hand well before the deadline for submission of the case.

Number of Outside Reviewers

There is considerable variation in the College, but generally the committees and administrators reviewing the cases have been most comfortable when there were **at least five letters and preferably eight**. Why? Frequently one or more letters are ambiguous or superficial. If one or two letters fall into these categories and are joined by one or two letters written by individuals with close connections to a candidate (despite the expectation that such individuals not serve as external reviewers), then a career decision might depend heavily on a single outside letter. Departments, therefore, commonly now provide six to eight letters. The higher number occurs when a department sends out multiple inquiries and a larger than expected number agree to serve as reviewers.

Who Selects Outside Reviewers

Cases are substantially weakened when a candidate has nominated a majority of the outside reviewers selected, unless the department provides adequate justification for such a choice. If necessary, it is better for senior colleagues to consult with their counterparts at other institutions who may know a field better than themselves rather than to rely solely on the candidate for suggestions of outside reviewers. Another strategy is to consult with editors of journals in which the candidate has published. One wants to identify reviewers who can both evaluate a specialized body of work but also place it in a broader disciplinary context. The narrative should specify the basis on which each reviewer was chosen. It is fair to draw a minority of the reviewers from a list supplied by the candidate, provided that these individuals can make impartial judgments.

What to Send to Outside Reviewers

When soliciting individuals to serve as reviewers, send along the candidate's full CV and relevant pieces of work. Please offer the reviewer the opportunity to examine any additional items on the CV.

What to Request of Outside Reviewers

The Provost advises that departments word their requests to solicit only an evaluation of the qualitative significance of the body of work being reviewed, and not to provide a general recommendation on promotion and tenure or promotion. Outside reviewers cannot know the exact standards for teaching, service, and research/scholarship/artistry that are used at UNH. It is helpful if the reviewer's evaluation addresses both the narrow and broad significance of the work. Remember that the audience that will read the evaluations include College panelists and administrators who are not specialists in the candidate's field, and they will want to know whether and how the candidate's work makes a contribution, how it challenges accepted paradigms or advances a field, and so forth. In your letter soliciting the review or in a cover letter accompanying the materials, it is a good idea to specify what should and should not be assessed. Finally, ask the reviewers to comment on their prior knowledge of the candidate. It is important to know whether the reviewer and the candidate have served together on panels, worked as former colleagues, or have had other professional (or personal) associations.

Confidentiality

You should inform those writing solicited letters (and this also applies to letters on teaching and service) that the normal practice is to maintain the confidentiality of the names of the authors and the contents of the letters. However, under UNH rules, a candidate may request a list of names and a summary of the letters (see CBA 13.10.3). Any such summary information provided does not connect the content of letters with the identities of the respective authors. However, you cannot promise absolute confidentiality to anyone. Indeed, the university now recommends that you include the following language in your letter soliciting evaluations:

“Please note that although it is our intention to hold your response in confidence, under recent legal precedents we, like any other college or university, may be required to disclose your response along with other peer evaluations materials in the course of certain legal proceedings.”

Other Issues to Consider as Recommended by Past College P&T Panels

Problems in a Case Should Be Explicitly and Directly Addressed

This cannot be stressed enough. Department P&T committees and department Chairs should expect that the College committee and Dean(s) will notice possible evidence-based weaknesses in a case. Most cases comment on strengths, but weaknesses should be addressed head-on and not ignored. Be specific. It is not enough, for example, to say of a very mixed record of teaching or scholarship, “On balance, we find the positive comments more compelling than the negative.” An argument should be made that addresses the evidence contained in the documentation. Exactly how has a department interpreted and dealt with low teaching evaluations? If a candidate’s scholarly productivity has been low, inconsistent, or perhaps not quite up to the department’s standards, this should be discussed clearly. Negative or ambivalent comments in solicited letters should be addressed. Cases are substantially weakened when departments do not acknowledge and address negative evaluations, and particularly those of the outside reviewers or students. The department has an important opportunity to enable the College P & T committee to form a contextualized judgment in spite of negative comments by addressing the issues raised by such comments.

Be Mindful of the Tone of the Narrative

Avoid exaggerated language. Although the Provost’s standards call for excellence, departments should avoid excessively positive language while documenting a case. The same is true with regard to excessively negative language. Statements that are overly critical of students should also be avoided.

Reconcile Discrepancies Between Pre- and Post-Tenure Reviews and P&T Recommendations

It is very important that departments conduct their pre- and post-tenure reviews *thoroughly and candidly*. The College P&T committee panelists scrutinize the promotion files very carefully. Invariably, they easily see where there are discrepancies between the documented accomplishments of a candidate and the reviews of that candidate submitted to the Dean by the department review committee and/or Chair. It is in everyone’s best interest, especially the candidate’s, that pre- and post-tenure reviews characterize the candidate’s strengths *and*

weaknesses. The P&T document, in turn, should then reflect on how problems noted in the pre- and post-tenure reviews have or have not been rectified by the candidate. Departments should be aware that contradictions between pre- and post-tenure reviews and P&T recommendations can raise concerns. For example, a faculty member might receive several years of glowing evaluations, but the department nonetheless makes a negative recommendation. There might be good reasons for this shift, but it should be addressed fully. Otherwise, the implication is that the pre- and post-tenure reviews may have been flawed or that the P&T recommendation is unwarranted.

Misrepresentation

Before a case is submitted, the department committee should take special care that nothing is misrepresented anywhere in the file. For example, the file should not suggest that a piece of work is “in press” when it has been submitted to, but not accepted by, a journal for publication. The word “forthcoming” is often used ambiguously, so every effort should be made to be precise about where a piece of work is in the publication process. For this reason, the committee would find it helpful if you make the following distinctions with work that has not been published:

- The manuscript is under contract, but writing is still in progress
- The manuscript has been submitted and is under review
- The manuscript has been accepted for publication pending revisions
- The manuscript has been accepted for publication with no further revisions
- The manuscript is in press, meaning that it has been typeset and paginated

A letter from the publisher or editor indicating when the work is likely to appear in print can be very helpful. The College committee may not accept a candidate’s assurances at face value. If a piece of work is described as being “in progress” or “nearly complete,” the College panelists will want to know exactly what that means. All publications listed in the CV should be documented with off-prints. Pieces of work that are substantially identical but published in two places with altered titles (perhaps a journal article and a book chapter) should not be presented in the file as if they are entirely different.

Defining the Period of Review

Prior appointments at other institutions. The department committee should distinguish clearly which activities have been completed during the candidate’s appointment at UNH from those that were completed (or substantially finished) before the UNH appointment. Further, referencing as appropriate the letter of appointment, the department committee should evaluate the quality of the candidate’s work in both settings. The department committee needs to explain the basis on which they included and judged work in prior institutions.

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor. The focus of the review and the evaluation and recommendation should be on the candidate’s work post-tenure. Nevertheless, unless prohibited by department guidelines, pre-tenure activities (teaching, advising, scholarship, and service) may be discussed in the document. These should be significant activities that represent effectively the candidate’s work at the University.

Case Assembly and Submission

When a case is ready for Dean's Office review, email Jenni Cook at jenni.cook@unh.edu. When it is impractical, illegal, or unreasonably burdensome, please feel free to submit hardcopy, using your own judgment as a guide. The electronic reproduction of books, for example, violates copyright laws, and candidates might consider digital versions of their paintings or photographs to be unacceptable substitutes.

When finalizing case materials, please follow these guidelines:

OneDrive Shared Folder

Please refer to the "COLA-PT-SharePoint-Documentation-and-Instructions" document for more information.

P&T cases are set up in SharePoint for each departmental P&T committee. If you do not have access to the case already, please notify Jenni Cook immediately. **Candidates for promotion will not have access to cases in SharePoint.**

Faculty who anticipate coming up for promotion even a few years hence may find it very helpful to develop the habit of organizing and storing material on their hard drives or in OneDrive so that it can easily be transferred at a later date. For example, you might create a folder with copies of all grant applications, or one for letters thanking you for your service on committees. Giving these folders and documents appropriate names and dates as you accumulate material during your review period will make final assembly of your case much easier.

The Provost's narrative template, which has to be edited subsequently by those preparing the final case for submission to the College, should be shared electronically by the candidate to the department committee chair or department admin via the department OneDrive folder. Members of the department committee and the Chair will have permission to access the candidate's folder at all times in order to evaluate the case.

Once candidates have submitted their sections of the narrative template and all digital files converted to PDFs and clearly labeled for the case appendix, to the department committee, the department committee copies materials to OneDrive so that the files can be added to the case. If the candidate wishes to add something to their file (e.g., a newly published journal article) they can do so by arrangement with the department committee or administrative assistant. At this point, material can be rearranged and supplemented by the department committee or administrative assistants.

Training

Committee Chairs and Department Admins: There will be training sessions for the case assembly process. Associate Dean Jenni Cook is available to provide assistance throughout the P&T process. Committee Chairs and Department Admins are encouraged to reach out when they have questions. Group discussions and individual training sessions will be scheduled as needed.

***USNH now has an Adobe license available for all benefits eligible faculty and staff covered with no out of pocket cost to the colleges or departments.

University Policy on Retention of Materials

After the completion of a case, please follow the instructions below about the handling of materials in order to comply with a university policy adopted in 2001, after consultations among the Colleges, Academic Affairs, and the UNH lawyer.

The Dean's Office will keep the narrative, confidential letters of all kinds from the appendix upon which the evaluator letters of the department, Chair, College panels and Deans are based, and copies of those evaluations/recommendations. **These materials will be kept for four years and then destroyed.**

We will return to the department other non-electronic parts of the appendix after the Board of Trustees meet in June. **The department should retain teaching evaluations--both summaries and raw forms upon which decisions were based--and other materials used in reaching the department's and chair's recommendation.** (Unsolicited letters fall into this category.)

The department should retain these materials for 4 years, after which time they should be destroyed. (You may or may not wish to make copies of unsolicited letters, such as thank you notes for service, for the candidate.) Note this exception: If an Associate Professor comes up for promotion to Full Professor, and that case is not successful, the department should retain the relevant materials in the eventuality that this individual might wish to be considered for promotion to Full Professor at a future date.

Final case material will be archived in SharePoint until the retention deadline. Please see the policy regarding retention of promotion and tenure files for additional information:

https://www.unh.edu/provost/sites/default/files/media/2022-03/promotion.tenure.file_.retention.policy.pdf