Tenure review preparation guidelines

Some candidates have provided thousands of pages of supporting material, while others present fewer than a hundred pages. In addition, some candidates provide limited proof of teaching effectiveness, and some Department Chairs have presented little information beyond that provided by the candidate.

This document seeks to explain the nature of the tenure process at Augustana and to offer suggestions that may result in more standardized tenure presentations and more effective and transparent case preparation for candidates and Chairs.

An overview of the tenure process

The tenure process is described in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. When the President and the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) consider a candidate for tenure, at least four considerations are taken into account:

- The demonstrated performance of the candidate
- The current staffing and future needs of the department(s) involved
- The likelihood that the College could attract a more qualified candidate
- The financial situation of the College

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 candidate. Considerations such as how the financial condition of the College might affect a tenure decision are within the purview of the administration and the Board of Trustees.

Evaluating a candidate's performance

In evaluating a candidate's performance, the committee typically considers the same three prevailing performance criteria.

The first of these criteria is *teaching effectiveness*, which also involves any student advising and mentoring done by the candidate. FWC asks for the opinions of colleagues who observe the teaching of the candidate, and looks at the clarity and specificity of course and advising syllabi, and the variety and difficulty of the courses taught. Another measure is student course evaluations (Student Ratings of Instruction, SRIs; currently the IDEA form). Evidence of student learning is the most important element of a case for teaching effectiveness but is often the hardest component to assess.

The second criterion is *professional expression and development*, an umbrella term used to signify all of those activities which reveal the presence of an active, imaginative and developing intellect. Evidence of professional expression might include submission or acceptance of publications, professional presentations, public presentations of artistic creations and performances, the application for or receipt of research grants, and conference or other presentations. Evidence of professional development might include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, completion of professional certification, and continuing education in relevant areas.

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, which means that FWC looks for evidence that the candidate’s presence has enriched the communities in which they live and work. While off-campus community service beyond that which involves professional expertise is encouraged, it is voluntary; that is, lack of active community service (e.g., scout parent, church or municipal committee representative…) not directly linked to one’s profession will not be viewed negatively by FWC or the President. However, service to the College and one’s profession is a central expectation for tenure-track faculty. On-campus service includes departmental and campus-wide committee work, while pertinent off-campus activities include service to professional organizations, journals or conferences, as officers, editors and reviewers, and organizers and session chairs, respectively.

The remainder of this document offers a list of suggestions which will help candidates and their advocates generate the best possible evidence to strengthen their case-making narrative for FWC's consideration.

Guidelines for tenure case preparation

1. Responsibility of the Department Chair

A. To guide the candidate's preparation

Few candidates will have gone through this process before, so even steps that seem self-evident and common-sense may be news to them and, thus, should be clearly articulated. As Chair, your responsibilities begin as soon as faculty members are hired. Years before a junior colleague actually stands for tenure, you should be helping them become the best possible educator they can be and assisting them in building the portfolio and evidence that illustrate their development. See Faculty Handbook section 3.3.2 for details. You should help tenurable faculty members prepare for their tenure review by:

- Providing the candidate with a copy of the department's statement of expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service (https://www.augustana.edu/academics/faculty-welfare/review-preparation/departments) as they begin their first year at the College, and answering any questions about these expectations;
- Encouraging them to participate in Center for Faculty Enrichment (CFE) and FWC activities that are designed to help them learn about, adjust to and navigate the rules and norms of the lengthy review process;
- Observing their teaching and helping them administer the required IDEA course evaluations, beginning with their first semester and including every appropriate course taught; “helping” includes discussions about the selection of relevant choices of IDEA form essential, important and minor learning objectives;
- Coordinating teaching observations of the candidate by the tenure committee (the tenured members of the department, or a separate committee in the case of departments without three tenured faculty);
- Helping them interpret the results of student evaluations and encouraging them to graph those results to show trends over time and across courses;
- Helping them improve their teaching in response to justifiable student critiques;
- Providing them with opportunities to participate in the life of the department and College and reminding them about the importance of factors beyond classroom teaching;
- Providing an annual review of their progress, including a letter and conversation with the candidate.

In the year before the candidate's tenure review, the Chair should at minimum:

- Explain the nature of the tenure review process;
- Review the available teaching evaluations and observations of teaching made by tenured faculty about the candidate;

- Conduct a thorough end-of-year annual review and compile all previously completed annual reviews;
- Discuss prior case-making narratives (i.e., the 2- and 4-year statements) and any appropriate revisions, based on FWC comments and candidate’s subsequent growth;
- Help the candidate stay within reasonable quantitative limits in the submission of material. If you need help in defining "reasonable" limits, please contact your Division Chair.

B. To collect information from colleagues and students

During the spring semester before the fall tenure hearing, the Department Chair should attempt to directly observe the candidate's teaching on more than one occasion, survey current students and alumni who had the candidate as a teacher or advisor, and consult with faculty colleagues who have observed the candidate's teaching.

C. To share the candidate’s compiled portfolio with tenured members of the department

This step should occur early enough in the fall semester to allow any concerns to be conveyed to and addressed by the candidate before the departmental vote. Ideally, most of the tenured members will have participated in the prior pre-tenure review process, so there should be no surprises or new demands made upon the candidate at this stage.

D. To conduct a departmental meeting

The tenured members of the department should review the candidate's portfolio and then meet with the Chair to discuss the report compiled by the candidate and the information gathered by the Chair. The long-term needs of the department should be discussed, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s portfolio. The Chair should take notes of the discussion to help in the writing of the Chair’s letter. Following the meeting, each tenured member of the department should vote in a secret ballot whether or not to support a tenured appointment for the candidate.

E. To write a summarizing departmental report

The report (Department Chair’s letter) states the level of departmental support for the tenure candidate, including the number of tenured faculty members who support the granting of tenure, the number who are opposed and the number of abstentions. Further, this report will summarize the evidence for whether or not the candidate meets the performance criteria as established in the departmental statement of tenure expectations and in the Faculty Handbook.

The report should also assess the indications of promise for continued growth in effective teaching and advising, scholarly and professional achievements, and service, as well as the ways the interests, training, and capabilities of this individual meet the long-range needs of the department and College. The report will reflect the collective assessment of the tenure committee, and must be vetted by all members of the tenure committee. All committee members should sign the letter, which indicates their agreement with its contents.

This departmental report should be treated as confidential and should be shared only with the tenured members of the department, the candidate for tenure, and the Faculty Welfare Committee.

F. To share the department's report with the candidate

The Department Chair is responsible throughout the candidate's probationary period for notifying the candidate of unfavorable information at the earliest opportunity. Fairness demands that a candidate have as much time as possible to assess and respond to any information that may damage the candidate's prospects for tenure, or to withdraw from the tenure process if a favorable outcome is considered unlikely.

The Department Chair will share the department's written report with the candidate well in advance of the tenure review, and should address any questions and concerns the candidate has about the report before the tenure review.

If the department is unable to give unqualified support to a candidate's tenure case, or if the Chair learns of information that may affect the candidate's case, the Chair must provide the candidate with a verbal summary of areas of concern.

G. To report to the Faculty Welfare Committee the recommendation of the department

If the department is unable to give unqualified support to a candidate's tenure case, or if the Chair learns of information that may affect the candidate's case, the Chair must document those concerns in the Department Chair’s letter to FWC. During the tenure hearing, the Chair will not be permitted to introduce new information – information that has not been discussed with the candidate or written into the letter – only elaborate on the departmental letter or the discussion topics covered during the hearing. This restriction is intended to protect the candidate from unsubstantiated hearsay, innuendo and rumor, which is why an honest, frank, thorough, and detailed written department report is so critical. This departmental report should be treated as confidential and should be shared only with the tenured members of the department, the candidate for tenure, and the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The deadline for submission to FWC is Monday of week five of the fall semester. The Department Chair should electronically submit the written report (the Department Chair’s letter, as a pdf file) and, if they have not been submitted previously, all prior annual review

letters, as email attachments to *BOTH*:
facultywelfare@augustana.edu

AND

facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu. The subject line of the email should be, “Chair’s support letter for first name last name date” with the date in mm.dd.yyyy format (this would be an appropriate name for the actual pdf file as well).

2. Responsibility of the candidate for tenure

The primary responsibility for preparing an effective tenure case rests with the candidate, not with the Department Chair. Do not presume that your past successes are self-evident; this is *not* the time to be humble – you must detail your accomplishments and make a persuasive argument as to their relevance to your case. Just because you may really be good enough to be granted tenure doesn’t mean that FWC will come to that same conclusion, if your portfolio is not complete or convincing. You should take the initiative whenever necessary to make sure that your Chair is well informed about the progress of your career. Make sure that the Chair and all tenured department members have the opportunity to observe your work and to gather necessary evidence as specified in the guidelines for Chairs (e.g., surveys of current students and alumni, feedback from departmental colleagues, etc.). Remember that you are trying to become a permanent part of a team, and most of your senior team members have a say in that decision; thus, it behooves you to work with your Chair to address differences of opinion, suggestions or criticisms that you may have received from your senior departmental colleagues. If you need advice or counsel, any of the Division Chairs or the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee would be pleased to offer assistance or guidance.

The College's decision about your tenure candidacy reflects not only judgments about what you have accomplished, but also judgments about what you are likely to accomplish in the future. We must ask not only who you *are*, but also who are you going *to become*. Indeed, the greatest challenge in this entire decision-making process is trying to predict whether an individual, after several years of probationary employment, will still be vital and flexible after 10, 20, or 30 career years at the College.

In this sense, then, you are well-advised to build a case that projects the constructive role you could play as a member of your home department, your own probable growth and maturation as a teacher and advisor, an academic professional, and a contributor of service as an Augustana faculty member in the general sense. It may be useful to keep the forward-looking nature of our deliberations in mind as you decide how best to present your case. In particular, you may wish to use your opening oral presentation during the review as an opportunity to highlight these issues.

Upload the well-organized materials comprising your portfolio onto your Google Drive folder and share them with your Departmental Chair, all tenured members of your department and *BOTH* facultywelfare@augustana.edu *AND* facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu. You must label the shared main folder with the following information, formatted as specified: “Tenure portfolio for first name last name date” as mm.dd.yyyy (example: “Tenure portfolio for Gustav Mauler 09.01.1860”). Files and subfolders within this main folder can be labeled and organized any way you see fit.

In addition to the electronic submission of your tenure portfolio, complete and submit a hard copy of the “Checklist for Tenure Reviews” form to the Academic Affairs Office along with eight hard copy sets of your core documents (see below).

The deadline for this official submission is Monday of week five of the fall semester; however, note that, in order to submit your departmentally vetted final version by this date, you should probably begin the internal department review process by or even before the beginning of the fall semester. Remember, you've already done much of the work building your case with your submissions of prior FWC (pre-tenure) review materials.

Checklist for Tenure Review Materials:

1. Eight hard copies of your primary, core review materials packet (stapled, bound or 3-ring binder) that includes:

- Your updated curriculum vitae
- Your ~15-page case-making narrative on your teaching and advising, scholarship and service since you arrived at Augustana. Address prior FWC-suggested areas for improvement. Include analysis of IDEA score trends, ideally with tables and/or graphs.
- The front summary page & last comments page of each IDEA report (not entire reports)

2. In addition, please provide one electronic version of the primary review materials: CV, Case-Making Narrative and IDEA Folder. See above for submission and folder name instructions.

3. One copy of supplemental materials, in well-organized and clearly labeled folders. If hard copy, then deliver to Academic Affairs Office. If electronic (preferable), please provide documents via Google drive and allow access to *BOTH* facultywelfare@augustana.edu *AND* facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu as well as all tenured members of your department. You must label the shared main folder with the following information, formatted as specified: "Tenure supplemental material for first name last name date", with

date as mm.dd.yyyy. Files and subfolders within this main folder can be labeled and organized any way you see fit.

Include an inventory of your supporting materials (i.e., a contents list); in addition, regardless of whether they are electronic or hard copies, you must tell us why you are including them – *why* are they important to your case-making narrative. The quantity of supporting materials should be great enough to give an educated outsider the ability to draw a full and accurate picture of your career. This outcome is rarely accomplished in fewer than a hundred pages and rarely requires more than a few hundred. A few exemplars are always preferred to an overabundance of repetition.

- Include a hard copy of CV and case-making narrative if submitting any hard copy supplemental materials
- Individual complete IDEA forms with student comments (the summarizing tables, graphs and analysis of these data must be part of your case-making statement)
- Evidence of student learning usually comes in the form of samples of student work that illustrate learning outcomes connected to the clearly articulated objectives you set for your courses. Samples of student work should display a range of student outcomes (e.g., not just "A" work, but at a variety of grade levels). They should also illustrate growth or improvement of student performance over time (e.g., multiple paper drafts; pre- and post-test results). It is helpful to include a brief cover statement on such samples, to inform the reviewers how the samples address your learning objectives and what specific qualities to look for in the samples. Evidence of student learning can also come in the form of data you collect from students based on relevant instruments (e.g., pre- and post-testing, student knowledge surveys, etc.), if feasible and desirable. Though this critical component of your overall portfolio can be

exhaustive in this supplemental materials section, a summary and analysis of these data should be part of your case-making narrative, as well.

- Syllabi
- Evidence of advising engagement and/or effectiveness
- A representative sample of your professional work. This might include books or book chapters, articles, conference presentations, reviews, or reproductions of creative work (e.g., pictures, audio and/or video formats of creations or performances). In selecting material for inclusion, remember that the background and training of the members of the committee varies widely. Include items that have been published or submitted/accepted for publication.
- Reviews of your professional work or other evidence of its quality.
- Evidence of the quality and effort of your contributions in the area of departmental, campus, professional, and/or community service, beyond a mere list of service items.
- Letters from former students who may be able to attest to your role in their personal and professional growth.
- Letters of support from colleagues on campus, including those with whom you have served on committees and those who have observed your teaching.
- Letters of support from colleagues at other institutions who may be able to attest to the role of your contribution to your discipline. In order to guarantee the greatest level of candor and credibility, you should *not* have the opportunity to read individual letters. Ask your writers to address their letters directly to the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and assure them that their

letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.

4. Your Department Chair should electronically submit the Department Chair's letter of support and all annual review letters to *BOTH* facultywelfare@augustana.edu *AND* facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu. You should remind them to do so in a timely manner.

The tenure review hearing

Tenure hearings last approximately one hour. The first part of each hearing consists of an optional oral presentation by the candidate. These presentations typically take fewer than five minutes; you should avoid needless repetition of information already submitted in the written materials. You may wish to:

- Provide important updates on relevant points occurring after the submission of your materials.
- Draw attention to particular strengths of your case, particularly those factors whose significance might not be immediately grasped by someone from outside of your field.
- Respond to those factors which might reflect negatively upon your case (e.g., a relatively small number of professional activities, undistinguished teaching evaluations, unresolved departmental conflicts or disputes,…).
- Discuss your role in the future of your discipline, department and College.

At the conclusion of your oral presentation, the FWC faculty members, the Dean and the President will ask you questions for another 30 to 45 minutes, generally concerning your past experiences and future plans with the College, and more specifically asking for clarifications and elaborations of the details of your portfolio. At the conclusion of this discussion, you will leave the hearing. Your Department Chair will remain to discuss the merits of your case with the Faculty Welfare Committee, and to answer any questions they may have.

3. Responsibility of the Division Chair

To give advice and guidance to the candidates for tenure and to their Department Chairs.

- To observe the candidate's teaching, if asked to do so by the candidate. Because a single or even a few observations do not necessarily provide the most complete summary of teaching, in recent years the FWC has deemphasized this procedure, relying on the department’s abundance of observations and interactions to gain a more accurate picture of the candidate’s teaching abilities.
- To survey faculty members in their division who are familiar with the work of the candidate, particularly the tenured members of the candidate's department, to confirm the departmental vote and to understand the reasoning that informs a department's positive or negative tenure recommendation.

Revised 6.1.20 mbw