

Associate Professor NOT-for-Promotion Review Preparation Guidelines

Post-Tenure review preparation guidelines for Associate Professors who are NOT seeking promotion to full Professor at this FRC review (i.e., this is either your first post-tenure review or a subsequent review for which you are delaying the promotion to full Professor decision).

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 FRC 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 Review 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. FRC 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 FRC 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; FRC 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.

Reflecting upon Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Issues

Now that the Augustana Faculty has passed the DEI tenure and promotion expectations (May 12, 2021 full faculty meeting; see minutes in Sept. 1, 2021 meeting documents), we would like you to address one or both of these questions (based on the DEI document) in your narrative:

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?

The work on diversity, equity, and inclusion takes time. We understand that some of you may have just begun to think about it and may not have had the time to implement your ideas yet. Some of you already have a framework since that is an integral part of your teaching at Augustana. We welcome a variety of reflections.

Your 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.

Subsequent Post-Tenure Reviews

The second review typically occurs eight years after the tenure review (unless one seeks early promotion or a delay). It usually is summative in that a faculty member usually is considered for promotion to full Professor at this time and is judged accordingly. However, promotion to full Professor is not an automatic, time-on-task eventuality; faculty must be meritorious (i.e., exceed expectations) in at least one of the three areas of consideration, while meeting expectations in the other areas (see FH 4.2.3.1). There are various reasons why one might not want to be considered for promotion during this review, as there are numerous reasons why you might not be able to adequately demonstrate continued growth and maturity as a teacher and scholar and active participation as a community leader; you might want just a few more years to build a truly compelling case.

An Associate Professor who is not promoted at the second (eighth-year) review will automatically be contacted by Academic Affairs every two years and be asked whether they want to be considered for promotion at subsequent FRC reviews. Regardless of whether or not one stands for promotion (as frequently as every two years), a not-for-promotion FRC review will occur every four years nevertheless.

Guidelines for preparing for your post-tenure reviews

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 FRC's consideration of any Associate Professor's review, whether it be for promotion or not.

- 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-review/review-preparation/departments>) and the information in sections 4.4 and 4.6 of the Faculty Handbook.
- FRC encourages all faculty to continue to participate in Center for Faculty Enrichment (CFE) and FRC 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, and you will present FRC with all of the IDEA forms since your tenure review.
- 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 (i.e., you meet expectations) – but to be promoted to Professor requires rising to higher standards.** There are many reasons why you might choose to delay being considered for promotion.
- 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 FRC representatives 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.
- Create a Google Drive folder containing your portfolio material, named as specified: “Last name, First name FRC Portfolio date” as mm.dd.yyyy (example: “Mauler, Gustav FRC Portfolio 09.01.1860”). Files and subfolders within this main folder can be labeled and organized any way you see fit.
- Share your FRC Portfolio Google folder with your Departmental Chair, all tenured faculty in your department and *BOTH* facultyreview@augustana.edu *AND* facultyreviewcommitteegroup@augustana.edu. Note that, even though this review is not for promotion, the tenured members in your department need to be kept apprised of your progress, since their input is required in the Department Chair's letter of support.
- In addition to the electronic submission of your portfolio, complete and submit a hard copy of the “**Checklist for Associate Professor NOT-for-Promotion Reviews**” form to the Academic Affairs Office along with **six** hard copy sets of your core documents (see below) – one for each faculty member of the FRC and one for the Dean.
- **The deadline for this official NOT-for-Promotion submission is Monday of week three 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 FRC review materials, but you really need to spend part of the summer updating and recrafting your portfolio.

Checklist for Associate Professor Not-for-Promotion Review Materials:

1. Six 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 FRC-suggested areas for improvement; include analysis of IDEA score trends since tenure, ideally with tables and/or graphs (with $n=\#$ respondents/total students).

(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 electronic copy of supplemental materials, in well-organized and clearly labeled folders within your main Google Drive portfolio folder. As a subfolder within your main portfolio folder, your supplemental materials can be labeled and organized any way you see fit. Include an inventory of your supporting materials (i.e., a table of contents list); in addition, 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 a reviewer the ability to draw a full and accurate picture of your career. This outcome is rarely accomplished in fewer than fifty pages but rarely requires much more than a hundred. A few exemplars are always preferred to an overabundance of repetition.

- Complete IDEA forms with student comments for all courses taught (the summarizing tables, graphs and analysis of these data must be part of your case-making statement). Please recognize that the standard deviation of most IDEA scores (for $n>10$) lies between 0.5-1.0, so subtle changes in scores are not significant and should not be fretted over or touted (i.e., with an average score of 3.9 ± 1.0 , we are confident that two-thirds of all student responses lie between 2.9 and 4.9).

- 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 (e.g., an advising syllabus and assessment surveys)
- A representative sample of your professional work which 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 vary 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 Review Committee, and assure them that their letters are absolutely confidential and that you will not have access to them.

Role of the Departmental Committee in a NOT-for-Promotion Review

- The department plays a role in both the first and subsequent post-tenure reviews. For all NOT-for-Promotion reviews before reaching full Professor, the Department Chair solicits feedback from all tenured members of the department (for For-Promotion reviews to full Professor, the Department Chair solicits feedback from all full Professors in the department).
- Share your compiled portfolio with your Dept. Chair and all tenured faculty in the department. This step should occur early enough in (or before) the fall semester to allow any concerns to be conveyed to and addressed by the reviewee.
- Your Dept. Chair or another senior department member (if you're Chair) will consult with your department's review committee to write a letter of support. A separate committee may be formed in the case of departments with fewer than three tenured faculty, in consultation with the reviewee and the Dean of the College.
- The review committee should read the faculty member's portfolio and then meet with the Dept. Chair to discuss the report. The Chair should summarize the findings of the department members in the Chair's letter of support.
- The Dept. Chair's letter states the level of departmental support for the faculty member and summarizes 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 tenured members of the department. This departmental report should be treated as confidential and should be shared only with the reviewee, the departmental review committee members, and the Faculty Review Committee.

- The Department Chair will share the committee's written report with the faculty member well in advance of the review, and should address any questions and concerns the faculty member has about the report before the review.
- 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 FRC. 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 at all stages of our review process.
- The deadline for submission of the Chair's report to FRC is Monday of week three of the fall semester. The Department Chair should electronically submit the written report (the Department Chair's letter, as a pdf file) to *BOTH*:
facultyreview@augustana.edu

AND

facultyreviewcommitteegroup@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 Review

Generally in person (in the Dean's office) but potentially via Google Meet if conditions warrant a virtual meeting, the review lasts approximately one hour. The first part of each review 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, such as the acceptance of a submitted paper.
- 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 FRC 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 Review Committee, and to answer any questions they may have. A few weeks after your meeting, you will receive a letter summarizing FRC's evaluation of your portfolio and review.