

Post-Tenure review preparation guidelines for Associate Professors

You have already successfully made it through the tenure review process, so why bother with more reviews?

Tenure does not diminish the requirements of academic responsibility. Formal FWC assessment is the College's way to motivate all of its faculty to continue to be effective teachers and scholars (see <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>); hence the continuation of the review process after being awarded tenure and, if fact, throughout one's entire academic career.

Evaluating performance

In evaluating a tenured Associate Professor's performance, the Faculty Welfare Committee typically considers the same three prevailing performance criteria that it did during the tenure review.

The first of these criteria is *teaching effectiveness*, which also involves any student advising and mentoring done by the faculty member. FWC asks for the opinions of senior colleagues who observe the teaching of the faculty member, and looks at the clarity and specificity of course and advising syllabi, and the variety and difficulty of the courses taught. Another measure is student course evaluations (Student Ratings of Instruction, SRIs; currently the IDEA form). Evidence of student learning is the most important element of a case for teaching effectiveness but is often the hardest component to assess. None of these data provides a complete picture. Ultimately, it is up to the faculty member to put them into context and make the case for teaching effectiveness.

The second criterion is *professional activity*, an umbrella term used to signify all of those activities which reveal professional expression or development. Evidence of professional expression might include submission or acceptance of publications, either in one's field of expertise or in the scholarship of teaching and learning, professional presentations, public presentations of artistic creations and performances, the application for or receipt of research grants, and conference or other presentations. Evidence of professional development might include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, completion of professional certification, and continuing education in relevant areas.

The final criterion is *service to the College and to the community*. The College has always held that the responsibilities of its professionals extend beyond the limits of their classrooms and disciplinary interests, which means that FWC looks for evidence that faculty members enrich the communities in which they live and work in their capacities as experts within their profession or, more generally, as professors at Augustana College. Service to the College and one's profession is a central expectation for tenured, mid-career faculty. On-campus service includes departmental and campus-wide committee work, while pertinent off-campus activities could include service to professional organizations, journals or conferences, as officers, editors and reviewers, and organizers and session chairs. The distinctions between professional activity and professional service versus professional activity and scholarly activity are somewhat vague; FWC leaves it up to faculty members to decide what best suits their own needs and sensibilities and articulate those views in their case-making statements accordingly.

First Post-Tenure Review

The first review as an Associate Professor, four years after one's summative tenure review, is akin to the earlier pre-tenure reviews in that it is formative. Your portfolio should demonstrate growth in all areas and even more active participation in the governing of the academe.

Second Post-Tenure Review

The second review, typically eight years after the tenure review (unless one seeks early promotion) is summative, in that a faculty member usually is considered for promotion to full Professor at this time (unless a delay is requested), and is judged accordingly. Your portfolio should demonstrate continued growth and maturity as a teacher and scholar and active participation as a leader in the governing of the academe.

Promotion to full Professor is not an automatic, time-on-task eventuality; faculty must be meritorious in at least one of the three areas of consideration (see FH 4.2.3.1). For early promotion the Faculty Handbook (4.4.3) stipulates exceptional ability and contribution; FWC interprets this statement to mean that faculty must exceed departmental standards in all three areas of consideration; (in the case of Professional Faculty, for whom research is not part of the criteria, those who

seek early promotion must exceed departmental standards in both teaching and service).

An Associate Professor who is not promoted at the second (eighth-year) review will automatically be considered for promotion at subsequent FWC reviews, every two years, unless the faculty member chooses not to be considered (a not-for-promotion review will occur every four years nevertheless).

After an unsuccessful bid for early promotion, an Associate Professor will automatically be considered for promotion at the review during the eighth year after tenure, unless a delay is requested by the faculty member (only one early promotion bid may be made).

Guidelines for preparing a case for promotion to full Professor

The remainder of this document offers a list of suggestions which will help faculty members and their advocates generate the best possible evidence to strengthen their case-making narrative for FWC's consideration of the second post-tenure (for promotion to full Professor) review, but the suggestions should be generally followed in preparation for the first post-tenure (not-for-promotion) review, as well.

- You've done this before. There's even a good chance that you've helped your junior colleagues prepare their own case-making statements.
- You should be fully aware of your department's statement of expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service (<https://www.augustana.edu/academics/faculty-welfare/review-preparation/departments>) and the information in sections 4.4 and 4.6 of the Faculty Handbook.
- FWC encourages all faculty to continue to participate in Center for Faculty Enrichment (CFE) and FWC activities that are designed to help you learn about, adjust to and navigate the rules and norms of the promotion review process. There are always new tricks to learn.
- You should have continued to administer the required IDEA course evaluations in every appropriate course taught.
- The primary responsibility for preparing an effective case rests with you, not with the Department Chair. Do not presume that your past successes are self-

evident; this is *not* the time to be humble – you must detail your accomplishments and make a persuasive argument as to their relevance to your case. Just because you have been granted tenure doesn't mean that you are guaranteed another promotion, if your portfolio is not complete or convincing. You might be a perfectly adequate teacher and scholar – a valuable and valued member of the Augustana community – but to be promoted to Professor requires rising to higher standards. You should take the initiative whenever necessary to make sure that your Chair and senior department members are well informed about the progress of your career. Work with your Chair to address legitimate and appropriate differences of opinion, suggestions or criticisms that you may have received from your senior departmental colleagues. If you need advice or counsel, any of the Division Chairs or the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee would be pleased to offer assistance or guidance.

- The College's decision about your promotion candidacy reflects judgments about what you have accomplished after being tenured; have you fulfilled the promise of your previous case-making statements? Will you still be vital and flexible for another 10 or 20 years at Augustana?
- In this sense, then, you are well-advised to build a case that projects the constructive role you *have* played as a member of your home department, your past growth and maturation as a teacher and advisor, an academic professional, and a contributor of service as an Augustana faculty member, but also how those roles will continue to evolve in the future.
- Upload the well-organized materials comprising your portfolio onto your Google Drive folder and share them with your Departmental Chair, all full Professors of your committee and *BOTH* facultywelfare@augustana.edu AND facultywelfarecommitteegroup@augustana.edu. You must label the shared main folder with the following information, formatted as specified: “Promotion portfolio for first name last name date” as mm.dd.yyyy (example: “Promotion portfolio for Gustav Mauler 09.01.1860”). Files and subfolders within this main folder can be labeled and organized any way you see fit.
- In addition to the electronic submission of your promotion portfolio, complete and submit a hard copy of the “Checklist for Post-Tenure Associate Professor Reviews” form to the Academic Affairs Office along with seven hard copy sets of your core documents (see below).
- If you are *not* going up for promotion (1st post-tenure review), the deadline for this official submission is Monday of week three of the fall semester, but if you

are going up for promotion (2nd post-tenure review), the deadline for this official submission is Monday of week five of the fall semester; however, note that, in order for your department to submit its support letter by this date as well, you should probably begin the internal department review process by or even before the beginning of the fall semester (see below). Remember, you've already done much of the work building your case with your submissions of prior FWC review materials.

Checklist for Post-Tenure Review Materials:

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

- Your updated curriculum vitae
- Your ~15-page case-making narrative on your teaching and advising, scholarship and service since you were tenured at Augustana. Address prior FWC-suggested areas for improvement; for the first post-tenure review, this narrative could be an extension and embellishment of the pre-tenure review suggestions. Include analysis of IDEA score trends, ideally with tables and/or graphs.

(NOTE: copies of IDEA forms themselves should only be electronically submitted; see below)

2. In addition, please provide one electronic version of the primary review materials (CV & Case-Making Narrative) and IDEA Folder with all IDEA forms since tenure. See above for submission and folder name instructions.

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

subfolders within this main folder can be labeled and organized any way you see fit.

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

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

reproductions of creative work (e.g., pictures, audio and/or video formats of creations or performances). In selecting material for inclusion, remember that the background and training of the members of the committee varies widely. Include items that have been published or submitted/accepted for publication.

- Reviews of your professional work or other evidence of its quality.
- Evidence of the quality and effort of your contributions in the area of departmental, campus, professional, and/or community service, beyond a mere list of service items.
- Letters from former students who may be able to attest to your role in their personal and professional growth. These letters commonly are unsolicited and usually are sent from students directly to faculty members; you may include them in a folder within your supplemental materials folder.
- Letters of support from colleagues on campus, including those with whom you have served on committees and those who have observed your teaching. If they have been shared with you, you may include them in a folder within your supplemental materials folder -- otherwise ask your colleagues to send their confidential letters directly to the two email submission sites.
- Letters of support from colleagues at other institutions who may be able to attest to the role of your contribution to your discipline. In order to guarantee the greatest level of candor and credibility, you should *not* have the opportunity to read individual letters. Ask your writers to email their letters directly to the Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and assure them that their letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.

Role of the Departmental Committee

- The department plays a role in both the first and second post-tenure reviews. For the first post-tenure (not-for-promotion) review, the Department Chair solicits feedback from all tenured members of the department; for the second post-tenure (for promotion) review, the Department Chair solicits feedback from all full Professors of the department (see below in the case of small departments).

- Share your compiled portfolio with your Dept. Chair and all full Professors in the department. This step should occur early enough in the fall semester to allow any concerns to be conveyed to and addressed by the faculty member before the departmental vote (in the case of the promotion review).
- Your Dept. Chair or another senior department member (if you're Chair) will consult with your department's promotion committee (usually all of the full Professors in your department or a separate committee in the case of departments with few or no senior faculty) and write a letter of support.
- The promotion committee should review the faculty member's portfolio and then meet with the committee Chair to discuss the report compiled by the faculty member for promotion and any information gathered by the Chair. The Chair should take notes of the discussion to help in the writing of the Chair's letter. Following the meeting, each member of the committee should vote in a secret ballot whether or not to support the faculty member's bid for promotion.
- The report (Chair's letter) states the level of departmental support for the faculty member, including the number of senior faculty members who support the granting of promotion, the number who are opposed and the number of abstentions. Further, this report will summarize the evidence for whether or not the faculty member meets the performance criteria as established in the departmental statement of promotion expectations and in the Faculty Handbook. The report may include actual individual committee members' assessments or the Chair's summary of those assessments. The report should also assess the indications of promise for continued growth in effective teaching and advising, scholarly and professional achievements, and service, as well as the ways the interests, training, and capabilities of this individual continue to meet the long-range needs of the department and College. The report will reflect the collective assessment of the committee, and must be vetted by all members of the promotion committee. All committee members should sign the letter, indicating their agreement with its contents. This departmental report should be treated as confidential and should be shared only with the promotion committee, the faculty member for promotion, and the Faculty Welfare Committee.
- The Department Chair will share the committee's written report with the faculty member well in advance of the promotion review, and should address any questions and concerns the faculty member has about the report before the review. If the department is unable to give unqualified support to a faculty

member's case, or if the Chair learns of information that may affect the faculty member's case, the Chair must provide the faculty member with a verbal summary of areas of concern.

- If the department is unable to give unqualified support to a faculty member's promotion case, or if the Chair learns of information that may affect the faculty member's case, the Chair must document those concerns in the Department Chair's letter to FWC. During the hearing, the Chair will not be permitted to introduce new information – information that has not been discussed with the faculty member or written into the letter – only elaborate on the departmental letter or the discussion topics covered during the hearing. This restriction is intended to protect the faculty member from unsubstantiated hearsay, innuendo and rumor, which is why an honest, frank, thorough, and detailed written department report is so critical.
- The deadline for submission of the Chair's report to FWC depends on whether the candidate is standing for promotion or not; if they are ***not*** going up for promotion (1st post-tenure review), the deadline for this official submission is Monday of week three of the fall semester, but if they ***are*** going up for promotion (2nd post-tenure review) the deadline for this official submission is Monday of week five of the fall semester. The Department Chair should electronically submit the written report (the Department Chair's letter, as a pdf file) to **BOTH**: facultywelfare@augustana.edu

AND

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

The Promotion Review Hearing

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

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

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

Revised 5.19.21 mbw