**Pre-tenure and Tenure Evaluation**

Schedule for reviews

In order to provide for timely diagnostic interventions and to be able to view patterns of performance over time, material should be collected and assembled annually by the faculty member. At the same time, to insure that the evaluation process does not become unduly burdensome or time consuming, the following schedule will be observed:

1. Annual reviews are recommended, but not required. They will be conducted at the department level. Reviews are designed help the candidate, the candidate’s department, and the FWC identify patterns of the candidate’s performance over time. Candidates should collect and assemble material for the department to review annually, so that problems can be detected and remediation offered in a timely manner. This includes SRI summaries and graphs. The chair will write an evaluation letter that is then included in the departmental materials presented during reviews.
2. For tenure track faculty, pre-tenure reviews will be conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee according to the following schedule:
3. With no years granted toward tenure – reviews in the winter or spring of the second and fourth years with the tenure review scheduled in the sixth year.
4. With one year granted toward tenure – reviews in the winter or spring of the second year and fall of the fourth year with the tenure review scheduled in the sixth year.
5. With two years granted toward tenure – one review in the spring of the second year with the tenure review scheduled in the fourth year.
6. The tenure review, conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee, will be consistent with the time frame prescribed by the American Association of University Professors, except that in normal cases, no more than two years of prior full-time experience will be counted towards tenure. This provision is adopted because teaching ability may be less portable across academic contexts than scholarly achievement. It is designed to give the faculty member more time to demonstrate teaching competence in the particular context of this College and to give the College sufficient opportunity to assess the faculty member’s teaching potential. The tenure review will follow the same format as the pre-tenure reviews, examining material for the faculty member’s entire time of service at Augustana.
7. On request, any faculty member may delay the tenure decision by one year for personal reasons related to major illness, the birth or adoption of a child, or the care of a family member.
8. Faculty to be evaluated will be notified by the Dean of the College in the spring term prior to the year of a regularly scheduled review.

Process for reviews

1. College-wide tenure considerations

When the President and the Board of Trustees consider candidates for tenure at least five considerations are taken into account:

 1. the performance of the candidates.

 2. the current staffing and future needs of the departments involved.

 3. the likelihood that the College could attract more qualified candidates.

 4. the financial situation of the College.

 5. the guideline that at any given time no more than two-thirds of the full time

 faculty *college-wide* may be tenured.

It is important to be aware that, while any of these factors may have an important influence on the decision to award tenure or not, only the first factor is within the control of the candidates.

1. Department role
2. Department members provide valuable information on candidate performance during pre-tenure reviews. In its tenure assessment, the department should also present an overview of the departmentneeds and future possibilities. Enrollment data and programmatic considerations should be included.
3. Department members must regularly evaluate their tenure-track faculty and ultimately recommend or not recommend an individual for tenure.
	1. Tenured members of a department (or the members of the tenure review committee formed in the event a department has fewer than three tenured members) should provide information to the chair for each pre-tenure review, and should vote on the tenure recommendation. To ensure that departmental members have all the information necessary to make informed decisions, tenure candidates should present copies of their reports to the tenured members of the department at least two weeks before the department votes and the chair prepares the departmental report.
	2. The department chair will regularly observe a candidate’s classes during the years leading up to tenure. Other tenured members of the department will also plan observations in the term before tenure consideration(or more frequently) and provide feedback to the chair.
	3. The chair will also interview graduating students in the spring before the tenure review and current students in the term prior to the tenure consideration. A summary of these results will be included in the chair’s report.
4. In order to clearly communicate with tenure and promotion candidates, departments have been asked to craft statements of teaching, scholarship, and service expectations for tenure and promotion. Approved statements have been vetted by the Faculty Welfare Committee to insure that they are in agreement with college standards. These statements will be used by the department members in their evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion. Tenure candidates from departments without approved statements will rely on information provided by the Faculty Welfare Committee.
5. For departments with fewer than three full-time tenured faculty, the Dean of the College, in consultation with the department chair and the Faculty Welfare Committee, will appoint a tenure review committee. This tenure review committee will comprise of the tenured member(s) of the department and one or two tenured faculty members from outside the candidate’s department to join the candidate’s tenure review committee. If the department has one tenured member at the time of the hire, two faculty members from outside the department will be appointed to the committee; if the department has two tenured colleagues, only one faculty member from outside the department will be appointed. In either case, the outside members will remain on the committee until the time of the tenure review and will be replaced should they leave the college. External members are expected to act as full participants in the entire review process, including advising the candidate, participating in pre-tenure reviews, and rendering the tenure recommendation.
6. The department chair is responsible throughout the probationary period for notifying candidates of concerns about their performance at the earliest possible moment. Fairness demands that candidates have as much time as possible to respond to any information that may damage their prospects for tenure, or to withdraw from the tenure process if they consider a favorable outcome unlikely. If the department is unable to give unqualified support to a candidate’s tenure case or if the Chair learns of information that may negatively affect the candidate’s case, the Chair must provide the candidate with a verbal summary of that information. Further, It is the obligation of the department chair to share these same concerns with the Faculty Welfare Committee. Faculty Welfare is similarly obligated to articulate concerns to the department and the candidate.
7. Faculty Welfare Role
8. The pre-tenure review process is designed to provide candidates and departments with all relevant information on progress toward tenure. The most likely outcome of these reviews will be an analysis of the candidates strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement. In rare cases, however, the department and FWC may recommend that the candidate be issued a terminal contract.” For pre-tenure and tenure reviews, the candidate prepares a statement and assembles supporting materials that are reviewed by the committee. (See item Section E for further elaboration)
9. For pre-tenure and tenure reviews, the candidate and candidate’s chair meet with the committee. During the review, the candidate provides a brief opening statement and answers questions from the committee. After the candidate leaves the meeting, the department chair then elaborates, where necessary, on the department’s statement, and addresses any questions the committee has. The President participates in the tenure review but not pre-tenure reviews.
10. In evaluating a candidate's performance, the committee typically considers three performance criteria during pre-tenure and tenure reviews.
11. The first of these criteria is teaching effectiveness. One important measure is course evaluations, but the committee also solicits the opinions of colleagues, and examines grading tendencies, syllabi and the variety and difficulty of the courses taught. Candidates are expected to present evidence of student learning.
12. The second criterion is professional expression and development. Evidence of professional expression might include publications, professional presentations, the receipt of research grants, to perform with distinguished musical ensembles, or to hold exhibitions. Examples of professional development include the completion of professional certification and workshop and conference participation.
13. The final criterion is service to the College and to the community. The College has always held that the responsibilities of its professionals extend beyond the limits of their classrooms and disciplinary interests. This means that the committee looks for evidence that the candidate's presence has enriched the campus community. Service to the off-campus community may also be included at the candidate’s discretion.
14. Following pre-tenure reviews, the committee writes a statement to the candidate, and the Dean, the division chair and department chair meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s observations and recommendations. Following tenure reviews and subsequent deliberations, the committee votes on whether a candidate should be recommended for tenure. That vote is communicated to the Dean and the President.
15. Role of the Dean, President and Board of Trusteesin Tenure Decisions

After receiving the the votes of the division chairs in tenure decisions, the Dean presents his/her recommendation to the President who then determines if the candidate will be recommended for tenure to the Board of Trustees. The candidate is informed of this recommendation shortly after a decision is made. The Trustees vote to award tenure at their May board meeting, and if granted, the candidate receives tenure at the beginning of the next academic year.

1. Preparing a case for pre-tenure and tenure reviews

 As a general matter, candidate are expected to provide a report(**nine** copies: one for each member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, one for the president, one for archives). In addition, candidates will provide electronically in a single file, a copy of the personal statement, c.v. and any other available documentation. At minimum, the report must include:

1. an updated curriculum vitae.
2. a personal statement discussing what has been accomplished in the preceding years, plans for the near future and a consideration of the candidate’s role in relation to relation to the department and life of the college. This statement should be about 10-15 pages and should be a:
	1. case-making statement on a) work as a teacher and advisor; b) scholarly/artistic achievements and goals; and c) service to the campus and/or community.
	2. reflective assessment of personal philosophy on student learning, as well as specific student learning objectives, teaching strategies for meeting those objectives, and evidence of student learning outcomes for those objectives.
3. a grade tendencies report available from the Dean’s Office.
4. a compilation of teaching evaluation summaries. The Institutional Research Office can provide an Excel workbook with a summary table and graphs of ratings. Please contact the Director of Institutional Research if interested in this option. The following college policies govern SRI ratings.

 The IDEA form was adopted for faculty use in October, 2010.

 Institutional norms are to be established in 2010-211. Items from

the SRI will be included as supplemental questions. The College’s Institutional Researcher collects the IDEA Center forms after they have been administered and submits them to the IDEA Center for compilation and analysis. The Institutional Researcher returns a copy of the report and the original forms to each individual faculty member. The Augustana faculty considers the original completed forms to be owned by each individual faculty member. But the raw and summary data are the property of the College. The College maintains the quantitative database and provides quantitative summaries to each instructor for each course evaluated. The use of the SRI and IDEA forms by the individual instructor and the Faculty Welfare Committee is governed by the following guidelines:

1. Probationary faculty should administer the form in each class section with more than 10 students. All relevant data, the individual course summary sheet and any summary data should be submitted to the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) at each pre-tenure review as well as at the tenure hearing.
2. Tenured (and non-tenure track) faculty should administer the form to as many appropriate class sections as they choose. Data necessary to substantiate claims the faculty member wishes to make to FWC at the post-tenure review should be submitted. Any submission of data should include the Summary Report produced by the Office of Institutional Research.
3. The decision by a faculty member not to submit student-commented SRI response forms will not be a factor in the review process.
4. For tenure reviews a weighting sheet must also be completed so that in the event of a favorable tenure decision, the weightings will be used as part of the formula for determining merit pay. Such weighting sheets are not completed for pre-tenure reviews.
5. Supplemental materials for pre-tenure and tenure reviews

 The Dean’s Office will accept files of supporting material from each candidate and will make this material available for review by the members of the committee. As a general rule, the supporting materials file contains any relevant material which cannot be duplicated for all members of the committee. The exact nature of appropriate supporting material is highly dependent upon an individual career. The quantity of supporting materials should be great enough to give an educated outsider the ability to draw a full and accurate picture. This is rarely accomplished in less than a hundred pages and rarely requires more than a few hundred.

Two copies of an inventory should be provided. (i.e., a sheet listing the contents of the supporting materials “package”). One copy to remain with materials and one copy to be provided to the Dean’s office. Among the material to consider including are:

1. reviews of professional work or other evidence of its quality.
2. a representative sample of professional work. This might include books or book chapters, articles, convention presentations, or reproductions of creative work. In selecting material for inclusion, remember that the background and training of the members of the committee varies widely.
3. letters from former students who may be able to attest to the candidate’s role in their personal and professional growth.
4. the original student evaluation forms for courses.
5. copies of syllabi and other class material.
6. reproductions of works of art.
7. audio or video tapes of performances.
8. syllabi, sample assignments and exams, and evidence of student learning such as sample student work across of range of achievement levels (i.e. sample A, B and C papers, assignments or exams)
9. letters of support can be included but are not required. These letters can be from:
10. colleagues on campus, including those with whom the candidate has served on committees and those who have observed his/her teaching. In order to guarantee the greatest level of candor and credibility, the candidate should *not* have the opportunity to read individual letters. Letters should be addressed directly to the Dean and potential letter-writers should be assured that their letters are absolutely confidential.
11. colleagues at other institutions who may be able to attest to the role of the candidate’s contribution to the discipline.
12. Presentation during review

 Hearings last approximately one hour. The first part of each hearing consists of an oral presentation by the candidate. These presentations typically take about five to ten minutes and care should be taken to avoid needless repetition of previously submitted written materials.The candidate may wish to:

1. draw attention to particular strengths, particularly those factors whose significance might not be immediately grasped by someone from outside of the field.
2. respond to those factors which might reflect negatively upon the case (e.g., a relatively small number of professional activities or undistinguished teaching evaluations).
3. discuss role in the future of discipline, department and college.
4. provide updated information that has emerged since the submission of review materials to the committee.

 At the conclusion of the oral presentation, the committee will have an opportunity to raise questions with the candidate. The rest of the hearing involves presentations by and discussions with the Division Chairs.

1. Archiving materials
2. Following pre-tenure reviews, candidates will be notified when their materials can be retrieved from the Dean’s office.
3. Following the tenure review process materials submitted will be retained by the Academic Dean’s Office. In the case in which the President recommends a candidate for tenure to the Board of Trustees, materials will be returned following the spring meeting at which the board considers and approves the President’s recommendations for tenure. In the case where the candidate is not recommended for tenure, all materials submitted will be retained for a period of seven years following the candidate’s last date of employment by the College, as required by Illinois state employment law and federal employment regulations. With assistance from the Division Chair in documenting its removal, candidates can withdraw manuscripts, books and other one-of-a kind items. Materials remaining in the file will be destroyed at the end of seven years.
4. Appeal Process
5. A candidate not recommended for tenure by the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) and the President may request a meeting with the Dean of the College and the President to discuss the decision of the FWC. Only the Dean and the President will speak for the committee; otherwise, the deliberations of the FWC remain confidential. This meeting must be requested by January 20 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
6. Following this meeting the candidate not recommended for tenure may make a written request to the Dean and the FWC asking that the FWC explain the reasons for its decision. This letter of explanation becomes a part of the probationary faculty member’s personnel file. The request for reasons underlying the FWC’s decision not to recommend the candidate for tenure must be requested no later than January 31 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
7. The candidate for tenure who has requested that the FWC explain the reasons for its negative recommendation in writing will be notified by e-mail when the FWC’s response has been prepared and may be picked up in the Dean of the College’s office. In no case will this be later than February 15 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
8. After receiving this letter of explanation the candidate not recommended for tenure may elect to request, in writing to the Dean of the College, a rehearing by the FWC. Reasons to request a rehearing are limited to allegations of a violation of academic freedom or other breaches of professional ethics by those involved in the tenure decision, a violation of College policies against discrimination, a procedural error, or an inadequate consideration of evidence. Such a request for a rehearing of the tenure decision must be submitted to the Dean of the College not later than March 1 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
9. Request for Rehearing and Appointment of Review Panel
10. The request for a rehearing will be reviewed by a randomly selected panel of three former members of the FWC, each representing a different academic division and each coming from an academic division different from that of the candidate for tenure.
11. The Dean of the College will poll former division chairs who have served at least one full three-year term in office to determine their availability and willingness to serve on such a Review Panel.
12. From the pool of those former division chairs willing to serve, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will randomly select the Review Panel, assuring that its membership includes former chairs from three different divisions and excludes a representative of the tenure candidate’s division. This Review Panel must be named by March 15 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
13. The Review Panel will consider ONLY the question of whether a rehearing of the case, based on allegation of a violation of academic freedom, a violation of College policies against discrimination, a procedural error, or an inadequate consideration of evidence, is warranted. It is not asked to reevaluate evidence presented but only to consider whether the process followed by the FWC merits a reconsideration of the tenure case.
14. The Dean of the College will meet with the Review Panel to summarize the deliberations of the FWC leading to its initial tenure recommendation but will have no vote in its proceedings and will not participate in the writing of the panel’s report.
15. The Review Panel may examine any part of the candidate’s materials submitted to the FWC as well as any new information bearing directly on the question of whether there was error (as specified above in paragraph d) on the part of the FWC in its original tenure recommendation**.** The Review Panel may also interview any persons it deems necessary. **All proceedings of the Review Panel are confidential.**
16. Review Panel Outcomes
	* + 1. If a majority of the Review Panel recommends against a tenure rehearing, the reasons shall be communicated to the candidate, the Dean of the College and the President in writing and the tenure rehearing process shall be terminated. In this case, the original decision not to recommend the candidate for tenure shall stand.
			2. If two or three members of the Review Panel recommend in favor of a rehearing,this shall be reported in writing to the President, the Dean of the College, the FWC and the candidate, together with an explanation of the possible “errors” (as specified above in paragraph d) that lead the Review Panel to believe a rehearing of the tenure case is warranted.
			3. In either case, the report of the Review Panel must be delivered to the Dean of the College and the candidate by March 31 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
17. If the Review Panel recommends a rehearing of the tenure case in question, the candidate for tenure will have one week to prepare and submit materials not already on file with the FWC to the Office of the Dean of the College. Submission of any additional materials is limited to materials deemed immediately relevant to the reasons for which the rehearing is being granted. Such materials must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of the College not later than April 8 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
18. Based on the Review Panel’s recommendation and report, the candidate’s originally submitted materials and any additional information that either the candidate for tenure or the FWC believes bears directly on the reasons for which a rehearing was granted, the FWC will then rehear the case. This rehearing must be scheduled between April15 and April 30 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
19. This rehearing by the FWC will resemble the procedures followed in the initial tenure hearing as closely as possible. The President and the Dean of the College will be present, as will all the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee. The candidate, as in the original tenure hearing, will make an opening statement followed by questions from the members of the FWC. At the conclusion of the questions and answers, the candidate for tenure will be asked to leave and the FWC will meet with the department chair only for further discussion of the candidate. Following this discussion, the department chair will be asked to leave and the FWC will begin its deliberations.
20. Rehearing of a tenure case by FWC represents the final stage of the appeal process; no further appeal is possible. All proceedings of the Faculty Welfare Committee are confidential**. Letters submitted to the FWC by the candidate for tenure or by members of the Augustana community become the property of the FWC and Augustana College as part of its administrative procedures and as such are covered by the same expectations of confidentiality. Copies of such letters are
not to be shared with any one beyond the members of the FWC, to whom they
should be addressed, and designated members of the college administration**.
21. If the Faculty Welfare Committee recommends against tenure for the candidate in question, it will state its reasons in writing to the candidate and the President, including a response to the findings of the Review Panel. If the Faculty Welfare Committee recommends that the candidate should be advanced to tenured status, it will report that decision to the President. In either case, the report of the rehearing must be submitted to the President and the candidate not later than May 1 of the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure.
22. Final decision, as specified in the Constitution of Augustana College, rests upon the positive recommendation of the President and the approval of the Board of Trustees at its spring meeting in the academic year in which the candidate was considered for tenure. The long-term staffing needs of each department and the College will be taken into consideration by the President and Board of Trustees when candidates are reviewed for tenure. Criteria that need be considered may include, but are not limited to: enrollment patterns, program changes, potential for staff additions, prospective retirements and resignations and financial considerations.

What’s been relocated or removed:

All of the information on how we evaluation components and the formulation of merit points has been moved to the post-tenure chapter.

All of the information on a faculty portfolio has been removed from the handbook.