

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs of Ad Hoc Tenure Committees

FROM: Therese McCarty
Dean of the Faculty

CC: Tenure Candidates
Ad Hoc Tenure Committee members

DATE: July 1, 2009

This memorandum, which is commonly referred to as the “tenure review checklist,” 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.

Please note that this year will mark the first time that we organize tenure review materials electronically rather than on paper. Candidates will submit materials electronically (on a jump drive). Candidates can request assistance from their department assistants to scan long documents such as books and the dissertation. A Blackboard “course” will be set up for each candidate. The Blackboard site is pre-arranged with sections for materials, the report, and appendices. The ad hoc committee chair and his or her department assistant will be “enrolled” as instructors, with the ability to upload documents. Please note that the instructions in this document have not yet been altered to reflect this paperless approach. I would like to go through one cycle using the paperless approach before undertaking a revision of the procedures. Please, therefore, ignore instructions about making copies and assume that all materials will be handled and delivered electronically. Original documents, such as signed letters and interview notes should still be delivered, with signatures visible, to my office at the end of the process. Since this is a significant change in the way we operate, we are all likely to have questions as we proceed. Please do not hesitate to ask questions and make suggestions. And thank you for this contribution that you are making to the environment!

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 courses not evaluated in the reappointment review should be included in the tenure review – normally this will be five (5) terms of teaching.

A candidate should be specifically invited by you to submit written materials he or she wishes to offer to document scholarly work and contributions to teaching or to respond to questions raised during the review process. All of this written material should be submitted to the FRB as part of the report. You should request that the candidate submit materials documenting scholarly work at the beginning of the first week of classes of the term in which he/she is to be evaluated. In order to complete your report in a timely fashion, these materials should be sent out to the referees by the third week of the term. External reviewers should be asked to complete reviews in four weeks.

When your committee interviews faculty members in the candidate's department, the ad hoc committee member from that department should excuse him or herself from the interviews. After all interviews are concluded, that member should have access to the substance of the testimony (unattributed to individuals). All members of the candidate's department 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.

This brings us to the question of 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"). It is strongly recommended that the important comments of a given student be reported (anonymously) in one place - either as a small paragraph or a series of quoted phrases or that each student's comments be identified by a letter or number code throughout the report. This will provide later readers a context for students' remarks - especially when a single student provides both negative and positive comments. Such a synopsis may be provided as supporting material along with the ad hoc committee report. 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 copies are made 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 on copies.

Before choosing outside reviewers, the chair of the committee should consult with the candidate in order to obtain a definition of the candidate's area of research and scholarship. In choosing outside reviewers the ad hoc committee is expected to consult experts in the candidate's discipline to create a "list" from which the final reviewers are selected. Candidates have a right to review this list and to note the reviewers they consider unsuitable. Candidates should not however, rank the possible reviewers. Although the committee is not bound by the candidate's notes, the committee should take them into serious consideration. Therefore, the committee should ensure that a sufficient number of quality reviewers (minimum of 12, aim for around 20 or more) is available to assess the candidate's scholarship. Normally, the committee should seek the advice of prominent scholars (with no personal relationship with the candidate), editors of quality journals or officers of professional associations in gathering names for potential reviewers. If at all possible, your committee should attempt to obtain one referee from a major research university and one referee from a school comparable to Union. The third referee can be from either type of institution, but usually is from a major research university.

The committee should write the first section on procedures and methods in such a way as to fully describe the work of the ad hoc committee without compromising confidentiality. This sec-

tion will be provided to the candidate for review. Further, the committee expects that the second interview will take place when its information gathering is complete so as to provide the candidate with an opportunity to reply to all possible criticisms. The ad hoc committee is expected to use this interview to ask questions that will give the candidate a chance to reply to issues that may affect the committee's recommendation.

In advance of its second meeting with the candidate, the ad hoc committee must provide him or her with a written list of questions regarding any important perceived deficiencies in the candidate's record that have been found in the course of the ad hoc committee's review. The candidate will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to these questions before the second interview, and orally at the interview itself. 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.

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.

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.

A file shall be kept of all materials received or generated by the Ad Hoc committee that it will send to the FRB. The candidate shall be given a list of all materials in this file at the time the file is sent to the FRB, together with the procedures used by the Ad Hoc committee in obtaining the information submitted to the FRB. Prior to the submission of the Committee's report to the FRB, a list of all the materials in this file should be submitted to the Chair of the FRB, who shall review this list to ascertain whether the file is complete. Upon submission of the report to the FRB, all the materials in the file will also be sent to the FRB. At this time, the list of these materials will be given to the candidate together with the procedures used by the Ad Hoc committee in obtaining the information submitted to the FRB. Confidential documents in the file shall be identified only as to their nature (e.g., "letter from referee"). The candidate will be given three days to respond in writing to the procedures used by the Ad Hoc committee. The candidate will respond directly to the chair of the FRB.

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 secretary 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.

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 re-

viewed 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.

IN JULY

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

- _____ Four copies of a full and up-to-date vita.
- _____ A concise description (no more than a paragraph) of the candidate's scholarly specialty and/or subfields.
- _____ The candidate is encouraged to supply, by July 15, a list of appropriate journals that could be contacted for the purpose of generating lists of potential external reviewers.
- _____ 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.
- _____ You and the committee must create a list of potential reviewers (minimum of 12, typically around 20). In addition to the list of suggested journals from the candidate, the departmental representative on the ad hoc committee may provide the names of initial contacts (typically journal editors), but another member of the committee should, if at all possible, call and from the initial contacts elicit names of possible reviewers. The chair of the department should not be the source of contacts. Professional associations are also useful sources of names. Potential reviewers should be senior scholars (Associate or full Professors). Please try to obtain at least one reviewer from a comparable liberal arts institution.
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 may comment, in writing, on the suitability of any of the referees 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 referee because of extreme ideological, theoretical, or philosophical differences 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 referees. The Ad Hoc committee has the final authority to select the referees. The candidate's comments on the list of potential referees must be part of the Ad Hoc committee's report. The letter to referees 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.) Be sure that the po-

tential 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.

(the list for July is continued on the next page)

- _____ Inform the candidate that the following must be submitted by September 5:
 - _____ All published scholarly and/or creative materials (articles, papers, books, manuscripts, scores, etc.) must be submitted to the Ad Hoc committee by the first day of fall term classes. Drafts of materials intended for professional review may also be included.
 - _____ Copy of dissertation.
 - _____ Four copies of a full and up-to-date vita if necessary to reflect changes since July.

At the beginning of the term in which the tenure review will take place, you will receive from the Dean of the Faculty's Office:

- _____ Four copies of the candidate's reappointment review
- _____ Four copies of the FRB response to that review
- _____ An e-mail attachment with the copies of the letters to use (revised, with the approval of the FRB chair, if revision seems necessary) for the referees, alumni, and students, and a copy of the standard student interview form.
- _____ Four copies of 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

Announcements of the formation of your committee will be placed in the Chronicle and Condordiensis by the Dean of the Faculty's Office.

The following documents will be submitted by the first day of fall term classes from the candidate to the ad hoc committee.

- _____ One copy of the dissertation
- _____ One copy of the syllabi, exams, homework, course portfolios, etc. from courses taught by the candidate
- _____ Four copies of an explanation of what actual work was done by the candidate in articles published by more than one author
- _____ Four copies of a list of consulting work that is to be considered as scholarly activity
- _____ Four copies of a statement of the candidate's teaching goals
- _____ Four copies of a statement of the candidate's research goals
- _____ Four copies of a full and up-to-date vita that includes 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
- _____ Seven copies of all published scholarly and creative materials and whatever unpublished materials he or she 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.

_____ Any other material the candidate wishes to make available

From the Office of Institutional Studies:

_____ The Dean of the Faculty's office will request that you be sent reports with grades from all classes (and course lists of all labs, where appropriate) taught by the candidate since the reappointment review, including those taught during the term of the reappointment review.

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

From the chair 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.

_____ The candidate's performance evaluations (including annual reviews, peer reviews of teaching, etc.)

_____ 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)

From the Dean of Studies:

_____ 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:

_____ 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.

Four copies of certain items are provided so that everyone on your committee can have a copy. When seven copies are provided, it is because the outside referees will or may also need a copy. The primary tasks of your 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 (see e-mail attachment) that includes the reminder that their evaluation is due four weeks from

the date of your letter. (Request vita and social security number of each reviewer in these letters. See attached.)

- _____ Have an initial meeting of the committee to distribute material.
- _____ 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.

During the second week of the tenure review term:

- _____ Have the first meeting with the candidate.
- _____ The department representative should develop a schedule for faculty interviews (to be conducted during the third and fourth weeks).
- _____ The letters to alumni (see e-mail attachment) should be mailed in the envelopes provided by Kathy McCann of the Records Department, and with the self-addressed envelope 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 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. Students interviewed should be strongly encouraged to submit a letter in addition to their oral remarks. At least two faculty from the ad hoc committee should be present at each interview. If students have graduated, contact Kathy McCann of Records (call her to request this - 6093). With each alumni letter, you should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope for their reply. If you supply the letterhead and envelopes, Kathy will print the letter and address the envelopes. This takes about five working days.
- _____ 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 written evaluation or an interview about the candidate from them.
- _____ The ad hoc committee should review the teaching and scholarly material of the candidate before interviewing members of her/his department. Even if the scholarship is outside of an individual committee member's discipline, each member should be aware of its nature.
- _____ The other committee members should conduct the faculty interviews. The ad hoc committee should make every effort to interview all faculty in the candidate's department. Faculty interviewed should be asked if they have read the candidate's scholarship and have observed the candidate's teaching. One of the questions asked should be how they

feel the candidate would perform as department chair. Comments from colleagues are summarized for the report, with names removed.

_____ 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 or faculty who request an opportunity to speak to them.

_____ The student interviews may begin. 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:

_____ Conduct the student interviews.

_____ Prepare a summary of course evaluation scores and comments, and 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 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.**

A sample procedures section is attached.

Procedural Section:

This section should clearly describe the procedures without compromising confidentiality.

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.)

_____ 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.

Teaching Section:

To be included:

_____ discussion of courses: types, student population

- _____ detailed summary of student interviews and student and alumni letters
- _____ 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 in-class student evaluations and senior thesis evaluations, including reference to departmental averages over the period reviewed
- _____ First-year Preceptorial evaluations should be 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 sustainability of the candidate as a potential future departmental chair

FINAL STEPS IN PREPARING THE REPORT:

- _____ 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 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. Give the list to the candidate and schedule the second interview. This list should be included in the report.

_____ Interview the candidate a second time.

_____ Invite the candidate to respond within three days in writing to the second interview. If there is a written response, it 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.

_____ Compile appendices in the order laid out near the end of this document in the section describing the layout of the report. Please separate appendices clearly with sheets of colored paper

_____ 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.

_____ Prepare a cover sheet with signatures. The cover sheet should include the name and department of the candidate, the term and year of the review, and the signatures 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 12 copies of the report and the appendices (four Ad Hoc Committee members, five senior faculty members of the FRB (Janet Anderson, Brad Lewis, Judith Lewin, Gary Reich, and Mohammad Mafi), the President (Stephen Ainlay), the Affirmative Action Officer (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 Ainlay to Judy Ludwig in Feigenbaum Hall. Please deliver all other copies to Carol Cichy in S&E S-100.**

_____ Any supporting material not included in the report (books, articles, course evaluation forms, etc.) should be taken to the Dean of Academic Departments Office in S-100.

- _____ Make out payment requests for the honorarium for the outside reviewers. The honorarium is \$150. Include the social security number of the outside reviewer on the payment request. Send the payment requests to the Dean of the Faculty's Office for approval and processing.
- _____ 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 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 recognized 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 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. _____ deserves to be judged 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 sample of alumni invited to participate in a formal review of the teaching capability of _____, Assistant Professor of _____. 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 information that you believe is pertinent to the evaluation but that is not covered in the guide questions. 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 REFEREES

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 _____. The honorarium we provide is \$150. Will you please send us your vitae and social security number? 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 6 terms of teaching (12 classes, not including the two independent studies) from the Winter Term of 2005 through the Spring Term of 2007. One of the three sets of college supplied random numbers was assigned to each of 12 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 students. Six of the interviewed students 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 who 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 12, 2007), and the *Concordiensis* (September 13, 2007) 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."

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, 2007, can be found in Appendix XXX. Appendix XXX also contains a letter we received on November 15, 2007, 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 2007 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 4 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, 2007 and the second meeting was held on November 6, 2007. Prior to the second meeting, the *ad hoc* committee gave Professor Dumbledore a list of questions (November 2) 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.

Pomona Sprout
Professor of Herbology

Severus Snape
Professor of Potions

Minerva McGonagall
Professor of Transfiguration

Sybil Trelawney
Assoc. Professor of Divination

APPENDICES

Please note that a copy of these appendices should be included with each copy of the report

- 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
- 2. End-of-Term Student Course Evaluations—full sets of individual forms AND summary sheet printouts for courses covered by the tenure review
- 3. Notes from student interviews

Sample Cover Page

TENURE REPORT

Professor _____

Department of _____

Fall 2009

Prof. _____, chair _____ (agree/disagree)

Prof. _____ _____ (agree/disagree)

Prof. _____ _____ (agree/disagree)

Prof. _____ _____ (agree/disagree)