

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs of Ad Hoc Tenure Committees

FROM: Therese A. McCarty
Dean of the Faculty

CC: Tenure Candidates
Ad Hoc Tenure Committee members

DATE: August 11, 2010

The “tenure review checklist,” presented below, complements the Faculty Manual by describing the tenure review process in step-by-step detail. Please be aware that this checklist is updated annually by the FRB to reflect changes in policy and procedure. Any departures from procedures outlined herein should be discussed and cleared with the Chair of the Faculty Review Board.

Thank you in advance for providing leadership of your ad hoc committee, which we know represents a major commitment of time and energy but which also constitutes service of extremely high value to the faculty and to the College as a whole.

General information

The Faculty Manual’s charge to Ad Hoc tenure committees states that “an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Review Board is expected to investigate, evaluate and report; it is not to act as the candidate's advocate.” Past experience shows us that sometimes either a department or an Ad Hoc committee may make assumptions about the ease with which their candidate will get a positive review. Short cuts may result - e.g., a lack of full documentation of teaching or research; or a lack of close, objective questioning of the candidate (at the beginning and end of the review) or of the candidate's department colleagues. We urge you to make no assumptions as you interview each individual and we urge you to confront all issues (positive and negative) that arise in the course of your committee’s deliberations.

All teaching since the ending date of the period covered by the reappointment review and hence not evaluated in the reappointment review should be included in the tenure review, including the term during which the reappointment review was conducted. Most commonly this will be five (5) terms of teaching. The review of scholarship is not confined to the post-reappointment period, but rather includes all published scholarship along with any unpublished scholarship that the candidate wishes to include. The committee need not replicate the work of the Reappointment Committee in its evaluation of service: letters covering service that ended before the reappointment review need not be re-solicited. However, the candidate’s service activities at Union should be presented and evaluated in their entirety.

Please be aware that the Faculty Review Board places considerable weight on the candidate's progress, or lack thereof, in correcting weaknesses identified in the letter written by the Faculty Review Board to the candidate following the reappointment review. Please be sure to address issues identified in this reappointment review letter in the tenure review.

During the review process, be sure to keep all materials received or generated by the Ad Hoc committee. The committee will provide all such materials to the FRB and a list of all materials to the candidate, as indicated in the checklist below. Note, however, that you should not include preliminary drafts of the actual report sections or appendices produced by the Ad Hoc committee itself. You may choose to keep these preliminary drafts on Blackboard for your own working purposes prior to submitting the final version of the report with appendices.

All expenses (postage, telephone calls, copying, etc.) should be charged to account 10700. Please send all bills, charges, etc. to the Dean of the Faculty's Office for our records.

The administrative assistant in the department of the Ad Hoc tenure committee chair is normally expected to perform the support work for the committee, except for work related to preparation of materials by the department chair, which shall be performed by the department secretary. Exceptions to this arrangement should be approved by the Dean of the Faculty. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Nic Zarrelli, provides support to administrative assistants who may need assistance.

Whenever possible, documents uploaded to the Blackboard site should be converted to pdf format (please note that this is very easy to accomplish in Microsoft Word 2007 as it is an option under "save as.") In past reviews, some documents whose originals are in landscape layout, when scanned and saved in a PDF format, are being displayed in a portrait layout. As a result, they are difficult to read and require that each reader rotate the image of each page for viewing. When scanning items into a copier, please remember to load the documents in the manner in which they are displayed. For example, if the documents are in portrait layout, they should be placed into the document feeder or under the glass in a portrait orientation. Similarly, if the documents are in landscape layout, they should be placed in the document feeder or under the glass in a landscape orientation. There are icons on the copier that help clarify this requirement. Please also take care to delete confidential documents from the copier's memory.

A copy of this memo has been sent to your committee and to the candidate. Again, we are most appreciative of your service in this way to your colleagues at Union. If I can assist you with any other procedural matters, please contact the chair of the FRB. This document is reviewed and updated annually by the FRB. If you have suggestions for revisions that could improve its clarity and utility, please send them to the Chair of the FRB and the Dean of the Faculty.

Tenure review checklist

In July

The candidate must deliver the following to the committee chair no later than July 15:

- _____ A full and up-to-date vita
- _____ A concise description (no more than a paragraph) of the candidate's scholarly specialty and/or subfields that will help potential reviewers understand the nature of the candidate's scholarship.
- _____ At the candidate's discretion, but encouraged by the FRB, a list of appropriate journals that could be contacted for the purpose of generating lists of potential external reviewers.

The committee and candidate should take note of the following information: Committees should make every reasonable effort to start the process of identifying reviewers in the summer. However, candidates should realize that this may not be possible. Committees should refrain from proceeding in the other aspects of the tenure review until committee chairs have met with the chair of the Faculty Review Board at the beginning of the academic year.

As soon after July 15 as possible

- _____ The Ad Hoc chair and committee must create a list of potential reviewers (minimum of 12, typically around 20). In doing so, it is expected that the committee will consult experts in the candidate's discipline. In addition to the list of suggested journals from the candidate, the departmental representative on the Ad Hoc committee may provide the names of other initial contacts (typically journal editors and also possibly officials of professional organizations), but another member of the committee should, if at all possible, make calls and from the initial contacts elicit names of possible reviewers. If the member making the calls is concerned that he or she may not be able to engage appropriately in dialogue with the editors being called, the departmental representative may be included on the call and participate to the extent necessary to provide professional clarity. The chair of the department should not be the source of contacts. Potential reviewers should be senior scholars (Associate or full Professors). Coauthors, thesis advisors, and anyone else with close ties to the candidate, should be avoided. Please try to obtain at least one reviewer from a comparable liberal arts institution and at least one from a major research university. The candidate's paragraph description of his or her scholarly field(s) should be used to characterize the field(s) to journal editors and others who are providing names of potential reviewers.
One chair of a past Ad Hoc committee started with 45 names, contacted each of them to ask if they would be willing to serve if selected, which left 13 names, which were then given to the candidate for comment. This worked well from the chair's perspective, so the FRB passes this along as a suggestion.
- _____ Submit a list of reviewers to the candidate for comments. The candidate, in writing, may comment on the suitability of any of the reviewers for evaluating the work and may suggest that some names be eliminated from the list. The candidate should not rank potential reviewers. Reasons for their unsuitability must be given and may include, for example, that the person is not in the area of the candidate's scholarship, or that the person may be a hostile reviewer because of extreme ideological, theoretical, or philosophical differenc-

es with the candidate's work. The candidate must inform the Ad Hoc committee about the nature of personal or professional relationships between the candidate and any of the potential reviewers. The Ad Hoc committee has the final authority to select the reviewers. All members of the committee should be involved in the final selection of reviewers. The candidate's comments on the list of potential reviewers must be part of the Ad Hoc committee's report. The letter to reviewers should also contain a request for similar information about the nature of personal or professional ties.

_____ The phone calls to line up the three outside reviewers should be made. (The departmental member of the Ad Hoc Committee should NOT make this contact nor be involved in the phone calls.) Be sure that the potential reviewers understand that they will have only four weeks to prepare their evaluations, and that they will be receiving the material as soon as possible. Please note that the college no longer pays an honorarium to external reviewers.

_____ The candidate must submit the following materials by September 6. The candidate will submit most if not all of these materials by uploading them to his or her Blackboard site. Materials not suitable for electronic submission can be provided to the committee in hard copy.

_____ Copy of dissertation.

_____ A full and up-to-date vita if necessary to reflect changes since July. The vita must include the college committees on which the candidate served, the names of the people who chaired those committees at that time, and any relevant community service or other types of contributions to the College, along with a complete record of education, professional employment, and publications.

_____ Syllabi and sample exams, homework, course portfolios, etc. from courses taught by the candidate

_____ An explanation of what actual work was done by the candidate in articles published by more than one author

_____ A list of consulting work that is to be considered as scholarly activity

_____ A statement of the candidate's teaching goals

_____ A statement of the candidate's research goals

_____ All published scholarly and creative materials and whatever unpublished materials the candidate wishes to have sent out for review. This may include a description of specialized research space, such as a laboratory, including photographic documentation and description of assembly efforts. Please note that materials are still sent to reviewers in hard copy, so the candidate should arrange with the committee chair's department assistant to produce and deliver to the committee chair three full sets of hard copies of materials to be sent out, including article reprints and books.. Please contact the office of the Dean of the Faculty if copies of books need to be purchased for this purpose.

_____ Any other material the candidate wishes to make available

By the beginning of the term in which the tenure review will take place, the Dean of the Faculty's Office will upload the following materials to the Blackboard site:

_____ The candidate's reappointment review

_____ The letter written to the candidate by the FRB in response to that review

- _____ Templates of letters the committee will use (to be revised, with the approval of the FRB chair, if revision seems necessary) for the referees, alumni, and students, and the standard student interview form.
- _____ The departmental letter requesting the formation of an Ad Hoc committee for the candidate, including a statement of the department needs and the role of the candidate in meeting these needs.
- _____ A file that reports grades from all courses taught during the period under review. This file will include random numbers to be used in selecting students for interviews.
- _____ Announcements of the formation of your committee will be placed in the Chronicle and Concordiensis by the Dean of the Faculty's Office and copies of the announcements will be added to the Blackboard site as appendices.

By the end of the first week of classes, you can expect to receive:

Uploaded to Blackboard by the administrative assistant of the candidate's department:

- _____ The candidate's student evaluations since the reappointment review, including those collected during the term of the reappointment review. Student evaluations for senior projects or senior theses should be included. Departmental averages for course evaluation scores should be included. Prior to the 2008-09 academic year, Sophomore Research Seminar evaluations were held by departments. Any such evaluations should be included
- _____ The candidate's fourth-year triennial review
- _____ A brief discussion of grading in the department (for example, in the context of class size, major or non-major course, GenEd courses, upper-level courses, or level of difficulty) by the department chair.

From the Dean of Studies:

These will be provided in electronic files to the Ad Hoc committee chair's administrative assistant, who will upload them to Blackboard during the first week of the term.

- _____ The candidate's student evaluations from First-Year Preceptorial (FYP) (taught since the reappointment review), if applicable.
- _____ Comments on the candidate's contributions to First-Year Preceptorial, if applicable

From the Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies and Special Programs:

These will be provided in electronic files to the Ad Hoc committee chair's administrative assistant, who will upload them to Blackboard during the first week of the term.

- _____ The candidate's student evaluations from Sophomore Research Seminars (SRS) (taught since the reappointment review and taught in 2008-09 and subsequently), if applicable
- _____ Comments on the candidate's contributions to components of the General Education Program other than FYP and SRS (to be uploaded after the first day of classes)

The primary tasks of the committee – and the time of the term when it is recommended that each be done – are as follows:

During the first week of the tenure review term:

- _____ Send out the following material to the reviewers (candidate's c.v., published articles/book chapters/ books, unpublished materials of the candidate's choice), along with a letter (at-

tached) that includes the reminder that their evaluation is due four weeks from the date of your letter. (Request vita of each reviewer in these letters.

- _____ Have an organizational meeting of the committee to review the schedule and procedures.
- _____ Decide on times during the second week when the first meeting with the candidate can be held, and set this meeting up.
- _____ Make it clear to your committee that the goal is to complete the information gathering portion of the review by the end of the sixth week of classes.
- _____ The Ad Hoc committee should review the teaching and scholarly material of the candidate. Even if the scholarship is outside of an individual committee member's discipline, each member should be aware of its nature.

During the second week of the tenure review term:

- _____ Have the first meeting with the candidate. This meeting provides an opportunity for the candidate to ask questions about the tenure process, as well as an opportunity for the committee members to ask questions that may clarify aspects of the candidate's work.
- _____ The department representative should develop a schedule for faculty interviews (to be conducted during the third and fourth weeks). All department faculty members should be interviewed, including members who sit on the Faculty Review Board, the departmental member of the Ad Hoc committee, and those who hold administrative positions.
- _____ The letters to alumni (see attached sample) should be mailed in the envelopes provided by Kathy McCann of the Records Department, with self-addressed return envelopes enclosed.

During the third and fourth weeks of the tenure review term:

- _____ The chair of the committee should line up the student interviews (to be conducted during the fifth and sixth weeks). A typical number of interviews is between 20 and 25. You may need to contact 50 or more students to achieve this. Students should be selected using the random numbers provided in the electronic grade file on Blackboard. In all other respects, follow the random sampling procedure outlined in Appendix I of the Faculty Manual. At least two members of the Ad Hoc Committee should be present when the sampling is done. Every reasonable effort should be made to interview every student sampled. Students away on terms abroad should be invited to submit a letter. Records should be kept of any reason why a student could not be interviewed. If the administrative assistant is contacting students, he or she should ask students who decline to be interviewed what their reason is for doing so. Students interviewed should be strongly encouraged to submit a letter in addition to their oral remarks. At least two faculty members from the Ad Hoc committee should be present at each interview.
- _____ The department representative should find "impact factors", if available, and provide acceptance rates, if applicable, for journals in which the candidate has published; determine if there were charges for publication; determine if the work was peer reviewed; and verify the status of scholarly items listed on the candidate's CV.
- _____ The department representative should contact the chairs of committees on which the candidate has served and request a confidential written evaluation or an interview about the candidate from them. Chairs of committees for which the candidate's service ended before the reappointment review need not be contacted again.

- _____ Conduct faculty interviews. The committee member from the candidate's department should not participate in the faculty interviews. Faculty interviewed (this should include the departmental member of the Ad Hoc committee) should be asked if they have read the candidate's scholarship or observed the candidate's teaching. One of the questions asked should inquire as to how they feel the candidate would perform as department chair. Comments from colleagues are summarized for the report, with names removed.. After all interviews are concluded, the department representative should have access to the substance of the testimony (unattributed to individuals).
- _____ The Ad Hoc committee also should interview any other relevant faculty and administrators (Terms Abroad Director, Dean of Studies, etc.), as well as any students, faculty, or administrators who request an opportunity to speak to them.
- _____ Begin interviewing students. The standard interview form will be e-mailed to you as an attachment. If necessary, your committee can add questions appropriate to the discipline to the standard interview form, but any other changes to it must be approved by the chair of the FRB.

During the fifth and sixth weeks of the tenure review term:

- _____ Complete the student interviews.
- _____ Prepare a summary of course evaluation scores and comments, as well as a summary of the student interviews that includes statistics (grades, gender, course taken) to describe the student interview sample.
- _____ The end of the sixth week typically marks the due date for the reports from the outside reviewers.
- _____ At this time, the Ad Hoc committee should contact the Chair of the FRB to schedule its meeting to present the report the FRB.

**WHENEVER THE INFORMATION BECOMES COMPLETE,
BEGIN WRITING THE AD HOC REPORT.**

The Faculty Review Board and I hope that you will keep your report to us as crisp and yet informative as possible. The report itself should not exceed 25 pages.

Again, please be aware that the Faculty Review Board places considerable weight on the candidate's progress, or lack thereof, in correcting weaknesses identified in the letter written by the Faculty Review Board to the candidate following the reappointment review. Please be sure to address issues identified in the reappointment review letter in the tenure review.

A sample procedures section is attached.

Procedural Section:

This section should clearly describe the procedures used by the Ad Hoc committee in obtaining information that it will submit to the FRB, without compromising confidentiality. Confidential documents shall be identified only as to their nature (e.g. "letter from reviewer.")

To be included:

- _____ description of materials submitted by the candidate, Professor X
- _____ description of sample of students and alumni selected for interviews
- _____ number and departments of faculty members interviewed

- _____ description of letters solicited and received (number, category of the writers: students, alumni, colleagues, etc.)
- _____ a list of any other materials used by the committee in the course of the review
- _____ description of procedures used to select the outside reviewers. (No discussion, however, of the reviewers actually selected appears in this section.)
- _____ dates of two meetings with the candidate

Please remember that the procedure section will be detached from the report and given to the candidate to review. Before giving it to the candidate, the procedure section must be reviewed by the Chair of the FRB. Consequently, it should be written to protect the confidentiality of all those who participated in the review. If the candidate has any questions concerning the procedures, these should be communicated directly to the chair of the FRB, and not to the Ad Hoc committee. The candidate has three days to respond in writing to the chair of the FRB. The chair of the committee should communicate to the chair of the FRB the date when the candidate receives the procedure section.

Teaching Section:

To be included:

- _____ discussion of courses: types, student population
- _____ detailed summary of student interviews and student and alumni letters

A note regarding documentation of student interviews: As you speak with students, please try to standardize such adjectives as "excellent" (e.g., ask the student what would be characterized as "excellent"). In order to provide context for student comments, please identify each student by a letter or number code when reporting comments. Any comments that students make during an interview or in writing stating that a faculty member should or should not pass their tenure review are not to be included in the Ad Hoc report. Student names and signatures should be blocked out when scanned and uploaded to Blackboard for the FRB, but the original letters, with signatures intact, should be included in the original report which is given to the Dean of the Faculty. Please make sure that blocked-out names are not legible when materials are scanned and uploaded to Blackboard.
- _____ summary of colleagues' views, team-teaching, peer review
- _____ review of course syllabi, exams, portfolios, and homework (placed in the context of class size, major or non-major courses, upper-level or introductory courses, and the level of difficulty)
- _____ report on departmental in-class student evaluations and senior thesis evaluations, including reference to departmental averages over the period reviewed
- _____ First-year Preceptorial and Sophomore Research Seminar evaluations, included and discussed separately from departmental courses[
- _____ summary of grades and indication of their place within the department's grading scheme.; discussion of variations from the norm, if necessary.

Scholarship Section:

To be included:

- _____ one to two paragraph discussion and summary of the candidate's field of study

- _____ summary of material submitted for consideration (dissertation, published and unpublished work, discussion of exhibits, etc.) with verification of the status of scholarly items listed on the candidate's CV
- _____ statement of selection process used to find reviewers
- _____ statement of the selected reviewers' qualifications and backgrounds
- _____ summary of reviewers' reports
- _____ summary of colleagues' reports on research
- _____ discussion of the quality of the journals/presses in which the candidate has published. Was the work peer-reviewed? Determine the acceptance rates and journal impact factors, if applicable, and if there were charges for publication.
- _____ Indication of candidate's contribution to jointly written articles.
- _____ Indication of when and where work was done.

College Service Section:

To be included:

- _____ summary of service activities in the department, the college, and relevant community service
- _____ other types of contributions to the College
- _____ summary of statements and letters by committee chairs concerning the candidate's contribution
- _____ summary of colleagues' statements, including their views on the suitability of the candidate as a potential future departmental chair

FINAL STEPS IN PREPARING THE REPORT:

_____ The second interview should take place when the committee's information gathering is complete so as to provide the candidate with an opportunity to reply to important perceived deficiencies in the candidate's record that have been found in the course of the Ad Hoc committee's review. Prepare a list of questions to discuss with the candidate during the second interview. The Ad Hoc committee is expected to ask the candidate those questions which bear on issues that may significantly affect their recommendations to the FRB. The purpose of these questions is to provide the candidate with a reasonable opportunity to respond to criticisms which may have emerged in the Ad Hoc committee's deliberations, particularly in regard to criticisms to which the candidate will not have had previous access or knowledge and therefore cannot have addressed in previous statements or the first interview. Give the list of questions to the candidate and schedule the second interview. This list of questions should be included in the report. The candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to these questions orally at the interview and in writing following the interview. Candidates should be urged strongly to provide written answers to these questions. Any written response from the candidate should be made part of the report.

- _____ Interview the candidate a second time.
- _____ Invite the candidate to submit his or her written response within three days of the second interview. The written response should be included in the report.
- _____ Assemble the report without a conclusion, making sure all pages are numbered and the

size of the type is at least 12 point.

- _____ Compile a list of all the material in the Ad Hoc report and submit the list to the Chair of the FRB. This should be a table of contents of appendices which is included with the Ad Hoc report. (See desired list of appendices attached.) Label each appendix with a letter, then number within the particular appendix: A1, A2, A3; B1, B2, etc.
- _____ Be sure that materials for all appendices have been uploaded to Blackboard.

- _____ Wait three calendar days after the second interview. Determine the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee.
- _____ Write the conclusion of the report. **A sample summary and conclusions page is attached.** There should be an evaluation of the candidate in teaching, scholarship, and college service. The candidate should be evaluated as Excellent, Very Good, Good, or Poor in each category. Along with evaluations in each category, please explicitly indicate the committee's recommendation for or against tenure. It may be helpful for the committee to know that, consistent with the Faculty Manual, the FRB normally considers an evaluation of Excellent in either teaching or scholarship and an evaluation of Very Good or Excellent in the other, along with active involvement in college service, to be consistent with a recommendation for tenure. The committee may provide explanation of their recommendation. Individual members of the Ad Hoc committee will indicate by their signatures their agreement or disagreement with the recommendation. Individual members may append explanations of disagreement with the committee's recommendation.

- _____ Prepare a cover sheet. The cover sheet should include the name and department of the candidate, the term and year of the review, and the names of the Ad Hoc committee indicating agreement or disagreement with the recommendation. **A sample cover sheet is attached.**
- _____ Give the statement of the procedures to the candidate, instructing the candidate that any response to the statement of procedures should be written and submitted to the Chair of the FRB within three calendar days. If the candidate objects to any of the procedures, the FRB will decide whether it considers it necessary to return the report to the Ad Hoc committee for any necessary corrections before it hears the presentation of the Ad Hoc committee.
- _____ Confirm the date and time of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee with the Chair of the FRB. All members of the Ad Hoc Committee are expected to be at this meeting.
- _____ Make 8 copies of the report and the appendices that contain the CV, teaching and research statements, and external review letters, for the following individuals: five senior faculty members of the FRB (Donna Burton, Palma Catravas, Brad Lewis, Judith Lewin, and Gary Reich), the President (Stephen Ainlay), the Senior Director for Campus Diversity and Affirmative Action (Gretchel Hathaway), and the Dean of Academic Departments (David Hayes). The original, including original appendices, goes to Therese McCarty, the Dean of the Faculty.
- _____ The reports should be put in manila envelopes labeled with the candidate's name and the recipient's name and delivered to the locations described below. Do not purchase binders or notebooks for the reports. Please deliver the reports for Hathaway, McCarty, and Ain-

lay to Judy Ludwig in Feigenbaum Hall. Please deliver all other copies to Carol Cichy in S&E S-100.

_____ Any supporting material not uploaded to Blackboard should be taken to the Dean of Academic Departments Office in S-100.

_____ When the Chair of the Ad Hoc committee is informed by the Dean of the Faculty of the College's decision, the Chair should inform the committee and thank them for their work.

LETTER TO STUDENTS

Dear _____:

You are invited to participate in a formal review of the teaching capability and effectiveness of Professor _____ in connection with his/her tenure review. You have been selected for participation in this tenure review through a random sampling process. The participation of students thus selected is very important to the review process, so we thank you in advance for your contributions.

In the near future you will be called on to arrange a meeting, involving you and members of Prof. _____'s Ad Hoc committee, at which you may present oral testimony concerning your experience in Prof. _____'s classes. To guide the discussion, the Ad Hoc committee requests that you bring to this meeting a letter in which you evaluate Prof. _____'s teaching performance according to criteria below. If you wish to give only a signed written evaluation, you may do so. Your oral and written testimony will be held in strictest confidence.

Nothing is more important to the vitality of an academic institution than the maintenance of a strong and committed faculty. Therefore, the College must conduct thorough and fair evaluations of faculty performance to ensure that faculty quality remains high. The College recognizes the right of the student to participate in the evaluation process. In turn, there is a strong hope on the part of the College that current and former students will exercise this right when asked to participate and will do so in a thoughtful manner. Your views and those of your fellow students and alumni constitute the major portion of the evidence used in the teaching evaluation.

As a guide to aid you in preparing your written evaluation, the committee asks that you reflect on the questions below before you begin to write. Your letter should then address any or all of those questions that seem appropriate based on your experience. Please feel free to include additional information that you believe is pertinent to the evaluation but that is not covered in the guide questions. However we ask you not to make any comment on whether you believe that Prof. _____ should be tenured. If you are among those writing a senior thesis under Prof. _____'s direction, please make it a point to comment candidly upon that experience, emphasizing especially the quality of Prof. _____'s advice and the value of the thesis as a learning experience.

1. What did you perceive to be the major strengths and weaknesses of Prof. _____'s teaching? Did you find him/her to be sufficiently knowledgeable in the subject area? Was he/she generally prepared? Were his/her lectures and discussions adequately organized?
2. Was your academic performance adequately evaluated by Prof. _____? Did you find that his/her course(s) presented a sufficient academic challenge? Was the course taught in such a way that your ability to think critically and analytically was markedly improved?
3. Would you take another course from Prof. _____, assuming that your schedule would permit?

4. Has what you learned in your course(s) with Prof. _____ been useful to you? If so, in what sense? Can you imagine what difference it might make to you in your future endeavors that you took a course or courses with Prof. _____?
5. How would you characterize the rapport that Prof. _____ had with his/her class? Was he/she available to provide help outside of class if and when you needed it?

When answering these questions it is important that you include, wherever possible, specific reasons for your responses. These responses should be frank but devoid of cruelty and gossip.

The committee would like to thank you in advance for the time you will spend in this vitally important process. In order for this review procedure to be effective, the College must depend upon your willingness to participate and to exercise mature judgment.

Sincerely,

LETTER TO ALUMNI

Dear _____:

You are invited to participate in a formal review of the teaching capability and effectiveness of Professor _____.

Although you have left Union and gone on to other endeavors, your opinions and experiences while you were a student here remain important to us. Therefore, you have been selected as a part of a random sample of alumni invited to participate in a formal review of the teaching capability of _____, Assistant Professor of _____ in connection with his/her tenure review. Our records show that you took one or more courses with Prof. ____ during your time at Union.

Nothing is more important to the vitality of an academic institution than the maintenance of a strong and committed faculty. Therefore, the College must conduct thorough and fair evaluations of faculty performance to ensure that faculty quality remains high. The College recognizes the right of the student to participate in the evaluation process. In turn, there is a strong hope on the part of the College that current and former students will exercise this right when asked to participate and will do so in a thoughtful manner. Your views and those of your fellow students and alumni constitute the major portion of the evidence used in the teaching evaluation.

As a guide to aid you in preparing your written evaluation, the committee asks that you reflect on the questions below before you begin to write. Your letter should then address any or all of those questions that seem appropriate based on your experience. Please feel free to include additional information that you believe is pertinent to the evaluation but that is not covered in the guide questions. However we ask you not to make any comment on whether you believe that Prof. _____ should be tenured. If you were among those writing a senior thesis under Prof. _____'s direction, please make it a point to comment candidly upon that experience, emphasizing especially the quality of Prof. _____'s advice and the value of the thesis as a learning experience.

1. What did you perceive to be the major strengths and weaknesses of Prof. _____'s teaching? Did you find him/her to be sufficiently knowledgeable in the subject area? Was he/she generally prepared? Were his/her lectures and discussions adequately organized?
2. Was your academic performance adequately evaluated by Prof. _____? Did you find that his/her course(s) presented a sufficient academic challenge? Was the course taught in such a way that your ability to think critically and analytically was markedly improved?
3. Would you take another course from Prof. _____, assuming that your schedule would permit?
4. Has what you learned in your course(s) with Prof. _____ been useful to you? If so, in what sense? Can you imagine what difference it might make to you in your future endeavors that

you took a course or courses with Prof. _____?

5. How would you characterize the rapport that Prof. _____ had with his/her class? Was he/she available to provide help outside of class if and when you needed it?

When answering these questions it is important that you include, wherever possible, specific reasons for your responses. These responses should be frank but devoid of cruelty and gossip.

The committee would like to thank you in advance for the time you will spend in this vitally important process. In order for this review procedure to be effective, the College must depend upon your willingness to participate and to exercise mature judgment.

Sincerely,

LETTER TO REVIEWERS

Dear _____:

Thank you for agreeing to review and evaluate the scholarly research and publications of Professor _____, who is under consideration for tenure at Union College. We are enclosing the following:

(list materials sent)

This list of materials may include a description of the facilities and equipment in Prof. ___'s specialized research space, and the procedures used to acquire and assemble them (if applicable).

We appreciate your willingness to assist our Ad Hoc Tenure Committee in arriving at an overall evaluation of Professor _____'s scholarly activities. Your comments will be most helpful to us if they bear on at least the following points:

1. The degree of professional competence demonstrated;
2. The quality of intellect which is reflected in the work reviewed;
3. An estimation of the candidate's potential for future scholarly achievement based on your overall assessment of what has been accomplished up to the present.
4. Please include specific comments on individual publications where warranted in addition to a global assessment.

Comments on any other aspects of Professor _____'s scholarship which you consider relevant to our assessment of it, such as the extent to which it contributes to existing knowledge in its subject area, are most welcome. Please note that our interest is primarily in the quality of the work under review, rather than on quantitative considerations. We must ask that you restrict your remarks to evaluating the quality of the scholarship and not offer an opinion as to the tenure of the candidate at Union College, since this tenure evaluation also involves teaching, college service and relevant college-wide standards. Will you also indicate if you have any personal or professional acquaintance with the candidate under review? Your comments will be kept in strictest confidence to the fullest extent allowed by law.

We hope that you will be able to return your evaluation by _____. Will you please send us your vitae along with your evaluation? Once again, we thank you.

Sincerely,

Enclosures

STUDENT INTERVIEW FORM FOR TENURE COMMITTEES

Student's Name _____ Class _____ M F
Major _____
Course(s) _____
Term(s) _____
Grades in these courses _____

(Reminder to the student: Your testimony, both oral and written, is a key element in the evaluation of Prof. X's teaching capability and effectiveness. We appreciate your willingness to participate in the tenure review process. Your testimony is strictly confidential, i.e., your name will not be used in any context in the committee's report.)

Open-Ended Questions

Before we ask you specific questions about the various aspects of Prof. X's teaching,

1. What is your overall impression of Prof. X as a teacher?
2. What are Prof. X's particular strengths as a teacher?
3. What are weaknesses, or areas in need of improvement, in Prof. X's teaching?

Presentation/Skills/Class Rapport

1. What is your assessment of Prof. X's lectures and style (i.e., presentation of material)?
2. Please characterize Prof. X's presentation of material with respect to:
 - (a) Preparedness?
 - (b) Organization?
 - (c) Clarity of exposition (ability to explain)?

(d) Enthusiasm?

3. How would you characterize Prof. X's interaction with the class?

(a) General rapport (class atmosphere)?

(b) Encouragement of questions and discussion or debate (when relevant) and responsiveness to students' questions?

Course Content

1. Were the goals and objectives made clear? Were they realized?

2. Did you find the amount of work and pace required appropriate?

3. Did the tests and assignments enhance and supplement the classes?

4. Did the course present a sufficient academic challenge. If so, how?

5. Did the course increase your interest in the subject matter?

6. How did the course compare with your prior expectations?

7. Is there anything about the course, as taught by Prof. X, that you think should be changed?

8. Would you recommend this course, as taught by Prof. X, to other students?
(If not, why not?)

Professional Obligation to Students

1. How would you characterize Prof. X's interest in, and commitment to, teaching?

2. Were your tests and assignments returned promptly and with sufficient and useful comments?
3. Was your work evaluated conscientiously and fairly?
4. Was Prof. X readily available outside of class? How did you feel about approaching him/her for help with the course work?

Overall Rating

1. Would you recommend Prof. X to other students?
2. On your own personal scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the typical Union College professor?
3. (Only for students who have taken several courses in Prof. X's department.) On this scale, how would you rate the average member in the _____ department of Prof. X.
4. On this scale, how would you rate Prof. X?

Other

Is there anything you would like to add to the above? Are there any aspects of Prof. X's teaching, which have not been touched on, that you would like to comment on?

Thank you again for participating in this important process.

LAYOUT OF REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. PROCEDURES.....	1
II. TEACHING	X
III. SCHOLARSHIP	XX
IV. SERVICE.....	XX
V. CONCLUSION.....	XX
APPENDICES	

Section I

SAMPLE OF PROCEDURES PAGES

1.1 Materials Submitted by Professor Dumbledore

Professor Dumbledore submitted to the *Ad Hoc* committee, by the first week of the term, a collection of material including 10 notebooks of teaching material, a notebook of scholarly material, a bound copy of her/his dissertation, and a notebook containing her/his C.V., Statement of Teaching Goals, Brief Statement of Scholarly Specialty, Statement of Research Goals, a guide to publications and a co-author statement. The teaching materials included: a notebook of syllabi, notes, and exams for each of six courses; a notebook of graded sample student work from Course XXX Divination; notebooks of lab materials from Course XXX Herbology and Course XXX Potions; a notebook of supplemental readings and materials from Course XXX Defense Against the Dark Arts. The notebook of scholarly material contained 5 peer-reviewed research publications based on work done at Union, one XXX education publication, 4 peer-reviewed publications which predate Prof. Dumbledore's arrival at Union, one funded XXX grant proposal and one unfunded XXX grant proposal, and four conference papers. Professor Dumbledore also provided a list of appropriate journals in her/his area of specialty.

1.2 Sample of students and alumni

The *ad hoc* committee used the College's Random Sampling Procedure to draw students from Professor Dumbledore's class rosters for the 7 terms of teaching (14 classes, not including the two independent studies) from the Spring Term of 2008 through the Spring Term of 2010. One of the three sets of college supplied random numbers was assigned to each of 14 multi-student class rosters. Four students were selected from each of the rosters, and a fifth was selected from each of the two largest classes. The resulting 50 enrollments contained 47 different students.

All 47 students were sent invitations by email and regular mail to participate in interviews. All alumni and on-campus students were sent versions of the standard letters. (Appendix

XXX). Follow-up contacts were made by phone (using student cell phone numbers) until 24 interviews were scheduled; all but three of the students showed up for the interview. Thus, in the end, we interviewed 21 students (13 men and 8 women). The group interviewed included 11 seniors and 10 juniors. Their distribution amongst the courses was: Course WWW (5), Course YYY (3), Course XXX (9), Course YYY (8), and Course ZZZ (7). Four letters were received from alumni members of our random sample. These are in Appendix F.

Three students agreed to provide written comments without being interviewed. Members of the Ad Hoc committee, acting in pairs, interviewed the remaining students, six of whom also supplied written evaluations. The written responses are in Appendix XXX. The questionnaire used for student interviews and the letter sent to current students and alumni are in Appendix XXX.

1.3 Faculty interviews and letters

The *Ad Hoc* committee interviewed 9 faculty members on September 20 and 27, all of whom are members of the Department of X. Two of these faculty members also submitted written testimony.

1.4 Letters solicited and received

Notices (Appendix XXX) were placed in the *Chronicle* (September 17, 2010), and the *Concordiensis* (September 16, 2010) inviting members of the Union community to submit testimony regarding Professor Dumbledore's teaching, research, or service. All of the students and alumni in the sample were individually asked to submit letters regarding Professor Dumbledore's teaching. The three outside reviewers were asked to submit letters evaluating Professor Dumbledore's scholarship. Emails soliciting testimony regarding service were sent to "members of the community with whom the candidate has worked" since the end of the reappointment review period.

The committee reviewed a letter from Prof. XXX, chair of the Department of XXX, which outlines the role of Prof. Dumbledore in the Department and requested the formation of an *Ad Hoc* tenure committee. This letter, which is dated April 25, 2010, can be found in Appendix XXX. Appendix XXX also contains a letter we received on November 10, 2010 from the Chair discussing peer observation of Prof. Dumbledore.

The *Ad Hoc* committee received 3 letters from the outside reviewers (Appendix XXX), and 2 letters from the Chairs of Committee on which Professor Dumbledore was a member (Appendix XXX). The committee also received one letter from an alumnus who was not selected for interview through the random sampling procedure (Appendix XXX). The committee also received an unsolicited letter from an administrator.

1.5 Outside Reviewer Selection

The committee initially emailed 15 journal editors in July 2010 after they received a brief statement of scholarly specialty and a list of appropriate journals in the fields from Professor

Dumbledore. The editors were asked for their recommendations for possible outside reviewers of Professor Dumbledore's scholarly work. Five of these journals were deemed to be the most suitable journals and another ten are possible journals, according to Professor Dumbledore's classification. Based on these initial recommendations, the committee solicited more names by emailing five additional individuals who are associated editors, members of advisory board, or were suggested by one of the editors. This procedure produced 26 potential reviewers. The committee further learned about the suitability of these potential reviewers by examining their research profiles and academic ranks available from their websites. We eliminated two potential reviewers who are Professor Dumbledore's coauthors and another five potential reviewers whose research focus seems to be in a different concentration from Professor Dumbledore's. The Committee prepared a list of 19 potential reviewers (Appendix XXX) and presented it on September 7 to Professor Dumbledore. She/he returned it with their comments (Appendix XXX) on the possible reviewers. Taking Professor Dumbledore's comments into account, the committee selected three perspective reviewers. The Chair of the committee then emailed these individuals. The first reviewer accepted the invitation. After four business days, the Chair of the committee followed up with phone calls and emails to the two other chosen reviewers who eventually agreed to accept. Three outside reviewers were established and Professor Dumbledore's materials were sent to these reviewers in mid-September. The letters received from the reviewers are in Appendix XXX.

1.6 Two meetings with Professor Dumbledore

The first meeting of the *Ad Hoc* committee and Professor Dumbledore was held on September 13, 2010 and the second meeting was held on November 8, 2010. Prior to the second meeting, the *Ad Hoc* committee gave Professor Dumbledore a list of questions (November 1) asking about perceived deficiencies (Appendix XXX). Professor Dumbledore responded orally at the second interview and in writing (Appendix XXX) after the second interview.

Section V

SAMPLE OF SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS PAGE

As evidenced by Professor Dumbledore’s course material, end-of-term student evaluations, comments from colleagues in her/his department, unsolicited letters from other faculty members of the College, and our interviews with students, we find that Professor Dumbledore is highly organized, enthusiastic, and very effective in the classroom and lab. We therefore rate her/his teaching as excellent/very good/good/poor.

Based upon the letters from the three outside reviewers and the observations from her/his colleagues in her/his department, we feel that Professor Dumbledore's publications are very high in quality, with an excellent trajectory for future productivity. We therefore rate her/his scholarship as excellent/very good/good/poor.

Her/his College-wide service on the XXXXX and YYYYYY Committees are to be commended. Her/his departmental service, specifically on the ZZZZZ Committee, was also exemplary. As mentioned by the Dean of Studies, she/he is also a regular contributor to the general education program at the College. Several of her/his colleagues consider her/him to be the "go to" person in the department when they want something done. Therefore we rate her/his service as excellent/very good/good/poor and recognize that Prof. he/she has been actively involved in college service.

In view of Professor Dumbledore’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and college service, the committee recommends that he (should / should not) be granted tenure. Committee members have indicated below their agreement or disagreement with the recommendation.

_____	Circle one: (agree / disagree)
Pomona Sprout Professor of Herbology	
_____	(agree / disagree)
Severus Snape Professor of Potions	
_____	(agree / disagree)
Minerva McGonagall Professor of Transfiguration	
_____	(agree / disagree)
Sybil Trelawney Assoc. Professor of Divination	

Date submitted: _____

APPENDICES

- A. Professor X's CV
- B. Statement of Teaching Goals
- C. Scholarship
 - 1. Brief statement of scholarly field(s)
 - 2. Statement of Research Goals
 - 3. Explanation of work published by more than one author
 - 4. List of appropriate journals in candidate's field(s)
 - 5. Letters of acceptance for publications listed as "forthcoming"
- D. Outside reviewers
 - 1. List of potential outside reviewers
 - 2. Candidate's comments on potential outside reviewers
 - 3. Sample letter to outside reviewers
 - 4. Letters from outside reviewers
 - 5. CVs of outside reviewers
- E. Student Testimonies
 - 1. Letter to Students
 - 2. Letter to Alumni
 - 3. Interview Form
 - 4. Student and Alumni Letters
- F. Grade report from the Institutional Studies Office
- G. Notices placed in Campus Publications
- H. Service-related letters
 - 1. Letters from Committee Chairs on which Prof. X Served as a Member (may or may not be applicable)
 - 2. Letters and Emails from Members of the Committee on which Prof. X was the Chair (may or may not be applicable)
- I. Departmental Letter Requesting the Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee
- J. Second Interview materials
 - 1. List of Perceived Deficiencies: Letter to candidate with questions for the second interview
 - 2. Candidate's written response
- K. Prior review materials
 - 1. Triennial merit review written in year 4 at the College
 - 2. Letter from the FRB to the candidate following the Reappointment Review

Other Materials to be Delivered to the Faculty Review Board (one copy only)

- 1. Binders with Scholarly Items and Ph.D. Dissertation, if these were not submitted in electronic form.
- 2. End-of-Term Student Course Evaluations—full sets of individual forms AND summary sheet printouts for courses covered by the tenure review [Given our input routine do we actually want these?]
- 3. Notes from student interviews

Sample Cover Page

TENURE REPORT

Professor _____

Department of _____

Fall 2010

Prepared by:

Prof. _____, chair

Prof. _____

Prof. _____

Prof. _____