

# Tenure Review Preparation Guidelines

This document explains the tenure review process at Augustana and offers suggestions that may result in more effective case preparation for candidates and Chairs. The tenure process is described in Chapter 3 of the [Faculty Handbook](#).

## Overview of the tenure process

According to the Faculty Handbook, when the College considers a candidate for tenure, at least four factors are taken into account: the demonstrated performance of the candidate, the current staffing and future needs of the department(s) involved, the likelihood that the College could attract a more qualified candidate, and the financial situation of the College.

It is important to be aware that while any of these factors may influence the decision to award tenure or not, the performance of the candidate is the only factor that the FRC considers in reviewing materials and making a recommendation to the President. Factors such as how the financial condition of the College might affect a tenure decision are within the purview of the administration and the Board of Trustees only and are not addressed or considered at the tenure hearing.

## Timeline for submission and reviews

Tenure reviews are scheduled for the fall semester.

- Summer (usually June or July): Academic Affairs sends a letter via email with information about your upcoming review.
- Start of fall semester: You, your chair, and members of the faculty review committee are invited to the review hearing via Google Calendar invite. The Academic Affairs Office will schedule reviews to take place no earlier than one week after the materials are due to the FRC.
- Monday of week 3: Submit all materials to your chair and all tenured members of your department for their consideration in writing your departmental letter.
- Monday of week 5: Materials due to FRC.
  - You should submit all materials electronically in a Google Drive folder that is shared with your Department Chair, all tenured members of your department and BOTH [facultyreview@augustana.edu](mailto:facultyreview@augustana.edu) AND [facultyreviewcommitteegroup@augustana.edu](mailto:facultyreviewcommitteegroup@augustana.edu). Please label the shared main folder with the following information, formatted as specified: “Tenure Review portfolio for first name last name date” as mm.dd.yyyy (example: “Tenure Review portfolio for Gustav Mauler 09.01.1860”).
  - Your chair should submit the departmental letter to the same two email addresses by the same date.
  - Please deliver to Academic Affairs a packet including one hard copy of the “Checklist for Tenure Reviews” form and six hard copies each of your CV and case-making statement.
- Before your hearing: Your Chair should share the departmental letter with you and give you an opportunity to discuss its contents.

## Performance criteria for tenure

In evaluating a tenure candidate's performance, the committee considers these performance criteria:

The first is *teaching effectiveness*, which also involves any student advising and mentoring done by the candidate. FRC considers course design and delivery as evidenced by the opinions of colleagues

who observe the candidate's teaching; the design, clarity and specificity of syllabi and selection of relevant learning outcomes; the appropriateness of assignments and grading methods; and methods of course delivery, among other factors. Another component of teaching effectiveness is student learning, as measured both by student achievements (faculty-assessed) and student course evaluations (student-assessed). Evidence of student learning is an important element of a case for teaching effectiveness and candidates are encouraged to think carefully about how to demonstrate what student achievement looks like in their courses. None of these kinds of data provide 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, conference or other presentations, or community-engaged scholarship. Evidence of professional development might include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, completion of professional certification, and continuing education in relevant areas.

A third 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 FRC looks for evidence that the candidate has enriched 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 tenure-track 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, respectively. The distinctions between professional activity and professional service versus professional activity and scholarly activity are sometimes difficult to define; FRC leaves it up to faculty members to consult with their chair and their department's statement of expectations for tenure, decide how to align their own needs and sensibilities with those expectations, and articulate those views in their case-making statements accordingly.

Finally, successful candidates for tenure should incorporate evidence of and reflection on their efforts to contribute to the college's mission with respect to *diversity, equity, and inclusion* in the classroom, on campus, in their professional lives, and or/in the broader communities to which the candidate belongs. Candidates should address one or both of these questions:

1. How is a commitment to diversity and inclusion apparent in your work at Augustana?
2. How have you developed your skills and abilities related to diversity and inclusion?

Faculty might address this criterion separately or reflect on these questions throughout the statement. For more information, please refer to the college's [rationale for including DEI in tenure cases](#), the list of [examples of DEI practices](#), and the Office of Student Inclusion and Diversity's [definitions of terms](#).

## **Review materials**

Required and supplementary components of tenure review portfolios are described in section 5.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook. The primary responsibility for preparing an effective tenure case rests with the candidate, not with the Department Chair. Do not presume that your past successes are self-evident; this is not the time to be humble – you must detail your accomplishments and make a persuasive

argument as to their relevance to your case. Just because you may have achieved standards for tenure doesn't mean that the FRC will come to that conclusion if your portfolio is not convincing.

**Required materials:** A current curriculum vitae (CV), and a case-making statement of approximately 15 pages, and IDEA form summary reports from all classes taught at Augustana.

- 1) The ~15-page, single-spaced case-making statement should reflect on and assess your teaching and advising, scholarship, service, and DEI efforts since you arrived at Augustana. You should describe your growth as a teacher, scholar, and community member; provide evidence of your achievements in these areas; and reflect upon your approach to DEI efforts (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion). If FRC has suggested areas for improvement at a prior review, please include how you have addressed those concerns. You should submit your statement in hard copy and in your Google Drive e-portfolio.

Student evaluation data are just one source of evidence of your teaching effectiveness, but they are important to consider. Please recognize that subtle changes in scores from section to section are often not statistically significant; identifying trends in particular measures over time is often more valuable than focusing on small variations. Consider quantitative score results as data to reflect on: how do you make sense of the results when read against your teaching objectives and strategies? Where are your areas of strength? Areas of challenge? Think critically about what these trends represent.

Effective statements often discuss how you have assessed your teaching (through course evaluations, other student feedback tools, classroom or group instructional visits by colleagues, and so on), what you have learned through that assessment, and what steps you have taken to grow as a teacher. You might also talk about notable student achievements (e.g., papers accepted at honors conferences or acceptances into graduate programs) and recognition of your own professional achievements (e.g., awards, invitations to guest lecture, lead faculty development sessions, or to teach summer institutes and workshops). Your statement should clearly explain the scope and impact of your professional achievements and how these contribute to your disciplinary and/or other stakeholder groups as well as the results of your PTPL, if taken. It should demonstrate your ongoing commitment to your department and to the life of the college.

- 2) Please submit IDEA course evaluation summary reports electronically only in your Google Drive review folder. Download reports at <https://augustana.campuslabs.com/faculty/#/>→choose course from dropdown→view results→print report. Include a table or graph of summative IDEA scores (include response rates) with your materials, either in the case-making statement or in the folder with your summary reports. More information about how to use and interpret IDEA reports can be found at Campus Labs→[Using Course Evaluations](#).

- 3) Please submit your current CV in both hard copy and in your Google Drive e-portfolio.

**Supplemental Materials:** While specific types of supplemental materials are not required, in order to recognize the different methods used by our faculty, these materials are essential in that they constitute the evidence upon which your case is based.

Supplemental materials should be submitted in well-organized and clearly labeled folders within your Google Drive review folder; these materials can be labeled and organized any way you see fit. Please

include an inventory/table of contents for your supporting materials. Candidates should carefully consider how each item functions as evidence for points made in the case-making statement; it is most useful when these connections are clearly made in the statement. The quantity of supporting materials should be enough to give an educated outsider the ability to draw a full and accurate picture of your career, but should also demonstrate your ability to discern what constitutes meaningful evidence. Carefully chosen and thoughtfully considered examples are thus preferable to an overabundance of examples that make your priorities and aims harder to decipher.

- 1) Syllabi constitute essential evidence to help the FRC understand the learning outcomes of your classes, the role your class plays in departmental and/or general education curricula, the design of your courses, the methods you use to achieve learning outcomes, and how you evaluate student learning. While you need not include a syllabus from each iteration of a course, it is important to include a representative syllabus from each class you have taught; you may also wish to include two from the same course to demonstrate productive evolution.
- 2) Evidence of student learning usually comes in the form of samples of graded and ungraded student work in a variety of forms that illustrate learning outcomes connected to your course objectives. Samples should display a range of student outcomes (e.g., not just "A" work, but a variety of performances). They should also illustrate growth or improvement in student performance over time (e.g., multiple paper drafts; your comments on student work or rubrics). It is helpful to include a brief cover statement on such samples, to explain 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.).
- 3) Evidence of formal and informal advising engagement and/or effectiveness often include an advising syllabus, record-keeping strategies, departmental or individual surveys of advisees, email interactions with advisees, or notes from former students who may be able to attest to your role in their personal and professional growth. Such notes commonly are unsolicited and usually are sent from students directly to faculty members.
- 4) A representative sample of your professional work 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. Please include the results of your PTPL, if taken.
- 5) Reviews of your professional work or other evidence of its quality.
- 6) 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 Review Committee, and assure them that their letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.
- 7) 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. This might include workshop programs, website links, committee accomplishments, emails, thank you notes, etc.
- 8) Letters of support from colleagues on campus or in the community, 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.

## **Responsibility of the candidate for tenure**

Candidates for tenure should also be familiar with the [Department Chair's Guidelines for Tenure Case Preparation](#) that are posted on the FRC website. Make sure that the Chair and other members of your review committee (both inside and outside your department) have the opportunity to observe your work. Especially in the semester before your materials are due, communicate with them about their responsibility to gather evidence as specified in the guidelines for Chairs (e.g., surveys of current students and alumni, feedback from departmental colleagues, etc.). You should take the initiative whenever necessary to make sure that your Chair is well informed about the progress of your career, including your contributions across the college. Remember that you are trying to become a permanent part of a team, and most of your senior team members have a say in that decision; thus, it behooves you to work with your Chair to address differences of opinion, suggestions or criticisms that you may have received from your senior departmental colleagues, and feedback from previous FRC reviews. If you need advice or counsel, please consult with your Division Dean.

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

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

The deadline for this official submission is Monday of week five of the fall semester; however, note that, in order to submit a final version that has been vetted by the department by this date, you should begin the internal department review process by or even before the beginning of the fall semester. Your department chair should share the letter of support with you and give you an opportunity to discuss it in advance of the tenure hearing.

## **The tenure review hearing**

Tenure hearings last approximately one hour and are attended by the full FRC and the Dean of the Faculty. Candidates are invited, but not required, to make a brief statement at the start of the review to include any information not already clearly addressed in the 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 statement the FRC members and Dean will ask you questions; these are based on the contents of your portfolio. We may ask you to elaborate on successes, consider possible solutions to concerns, or further reflect on student learning or your own growth. Your department Chair will attend and take notes, but generally will not speak. At the conclusion of this discussion, you will leave the hearing. Your Department Chair will remain to discuss your case with the Faculty Review Committee, and to answer any questions they may have. After your Chair leaves, the FRC votes by secret ballot and based on the vote, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the College for or against tenure.

### **After the review**

Unlike your pre-tenure reviews, you will not receive a letter after the hearing. Instead, the Dean of the College will contact you via email or phone (depending on what you selected on the Checklist) regarding your promotion only after all candidates who are standing for promotion that semester have undergone review by FRC, and after the Dean has consulted with the President of the College (who makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees at the May Board meeting). Your tenure and promotion becomes official at the beginning of the academic year following the Board of Trustees' acceptance of the President's positive recommendation.

