

Division of Natural Sciences
Procedure for Pre-Tenure Third-Year Reviews
Adopted March 23, 2012

For faculty who come to PLU with no previous credit toward tenure, reviews will be conducted during the third tenure-stream year. For faculty members who were hired with years of credit toward tenure, the timing of the third-year review shall be as follows: (1) with one year of credit toward tenure, the review shall take place in the third year of tenure eligibility (i.e., the second tenure-stream year at PLU), (2) with two years of credit toward tenure, the review shall occur in the fourth year of tenure eligibility (i.e., the second tenure-stream year at PLU), and (3) with three years of credit toward tenure, the review shall occur in the fourth year of tenure eligibility (i.e., the first tenure-stream year at PLU).

Note: All deadlines in this document that fall on a weekend should be moved to the business day preceding the deadline.

By October 15, the department will convene a review committee. The process by which the committee is selected is up to the discretion of each department; however, a few conditions must be met. The review committee will include a faculty member from outside the person's division, appointed by the provost after consultation with the dean. The dean will solicit recommendations from the department chair. The role of the outside committee member shall be to provide a pan-university perspective to the review process. This person shall participate fully according to the third-year review procedures set forth by the department/division. In addition, the review committee should consist of at least three individuals, including the outside member.

By November 1, letters from colleagues, specifically for the review process, are to be solicited by the department chair. This should include letters from all department colleagues, all team-teaching colleagues, and the chairs or directors of any cross-disciplinary programs in which the faculty member teaches. It is especially important to have letters from those who can provide input based on direct observation of teaching. In addition, the candidate may designate other colleagues (including individuals outside of PLU) to provide input for the review on any aspect of his/her performance that he or she wishes. If the candidate chooses this route, he or she should provide to the department chair a list of names, including contact information, by November 1.

By January 15, a candidate's file providing evidence of past and current performance is due to the department. The file should include each of the following items:

1. CV
2. Self-assessment statement (see "Notes" at end of this document)
3. Raw course evaluations and statistical summaries
4. Annual activity reports
5. Other documents including but not limited to copies of publications and other scholarly work, selected syllabi and other course materials, and evidence of service activities.

These materials should be placed in a location such that they are easily accessible to the department colleagues and the outside committee member. This file is to be used solely for the purpose of providing background information for letter writers in the third year review process. The file is strictly confidential.

Between the time the committee is convened and the time the committee report is submitted to the department chair, committee members and the department chair should arrange with the candidate to visit classes.

Between the time the committee is convened and when individual letters are due, department members not serving on the committee may arrange to visit classes, as well.

By February 4, the review committee will submit to the department chair a written report and all supporting documents upon which the report is based. The committee report will not be shared with the candidate.

By February 8, those individuals writing letters on behalf of the candidate and not serving on the review committee should submit their comments directly to the department chair. These letters are not required to be shared with either the candidate or members of the review committee. However, the letter writer may choose to do so.

By February 18, the department chair will give a draft of the final review to the candidate, which synthesizes information from the various materials (e.g., committee report, colleagues' letters, yearly self-assessments, annual reviews, student evaluations, personal observations of teaching, etc.) and provides feedback on his/her strengths and areas for improvement.

By February 26, after consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, the department chair will construct and sign the final review. The candidate will also sign the review, indicating receipt but not necessarily agreement. Copies of the signed review will be sent to the provost and the dean. In addition to the final review, the department chair will also provide all other materials (i.e., committee report, individual letters and other supporting documents) relevant to the review to the dean to ensure that his/her review accurately reflects those materials.

If it is the opinion of the dean that the chair's review does not accurately reflect the available materials, the dean may take one of two courses of action:

- a. The dean may request that the department chair write a new review that in the opinion of the dean is more representative of the submitted materials; or
- b. The dean may write a second assessment that is more representative of the submitted materials, and his/her review would be shared with the department chair.

Regardless of the course of action, both the candidate and the letter writer(s), whether it is the dean and/or the department chair, will confer and sign the final review as noted above. All documents written by the chair and dean (if any) shall become part of the final review.

The chair should keep supporting documents related to the review for six months, after which the letters and committee documents should be destroyed.

Note to the Candidates

Self-Assessment

Your self-assessment should cover at least the previous years at PLU, and should include a statement of your priorities for the coming years. Organize the reflective statement around the criteria for tenure, **Faculty Handbook pages 24-25**. Provide assessment and reflection, do not simply narrate or list what you have done. Describe, interpret, and explain the meaning and significance of your teaching, scholarship and service. Make clear their significance and how they fit within your discipline, your department or school and the university.

In the section on teaching, you should explain your teaching goals, how they fit within or complement your department's goals, the university Integrated Learning Objectives, and the methods you use to achieve those goals/objectives. Discuss what has worked well, how you know that it has worked well, what you hope to improve, and how you plan to improve it. Also discuss patterns you have observed in your student evaluations (both in the comments and numerical data), what these patterns mean to you, and how you have responded (or plan to respond) to them.

In the section on scholarship, as you write you should keep in mind that your colleagues are not specialists in your particular area and that your committee includes a person from outside your division. Include a summary of your scholarly work. Provide a context by explaining what you have done, what you plan to do, how this relates to broader research questions and problems in your field, and how it fits in with your teaching.

In the section on service, you should address your past and current activities, potential for future involvement, and how your activities contribute to your professional goals and growth. Explain how your service has contributed to the university, your profession, and the community.

Responding to a report with which you disagree

If you disagree with the final report, you may direct written comments to the provost, with copies to the department chair and dean.

Note to the Department Chair

The following wording is suggested for the end of your report:

I have read the above and will submit a written reply to the provost with copies to the departmental chair and divisional dean if I am in disagreement.

Signature of Candidate

Date