

**Policy on Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**  
**School of Teaching and Learning**  
**Approved 10/19/07**

## **I. Overview**

The goal of the retention, tenure, and promotion review process in the School of Teaching and Learning is to support faculty members' continuing professional growth and academic excellence. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to prepare Professional Development Plan (PDP) by the deadline specified by the administration. The plan is distributed to the faculty of the School through the chairperson. Other faculty members in the School are encouraged to provide feedback to the faculty member. At the end of the evaluation period, the faculty member prepares a Progress Report, which is distributed to the faculty via the chairperson, and places supporting documents in a location accessible to the School for their review.

The personnel committee of the School, which consists of all faculty members eligible to participate in personnel decision under the contract, reviews the faculty member's Progress Report and makes a formal written recommendation to the Dean. The chairperson of the School writes a separate letter of recommendation. Faculty members may also write letters independently. All recommendations are in writing; a copy of each is provided to the faculty member, who has an opportunity to respond.

The review process consists of four parts: (a) the selection of a 3-person ad-hoc subcommittee, which provides guidance in the review process and examines the Progress Report and supporting materials; (b) a discussion of the Progress Report by the School personnel committee; (c) the preparation of letters of recommendation, including one written by the subcommittee and one by the chair, with copies provided to the faculty member under review; (d) forwarding of the Progress Report, supporting materials, letters, and responses to the Dean. The steps in this process are described below in Section II.

Additional features of the policy related to review of fixed-term faculty members and a procedure for publicizing the standards of professional judgment that faculty members apply in their review are summarized in Section III.

## **II. Details of the review process**

### **(a) Ad-Hoc Subcommittee**

The responsibility of the subcommittee is to review the Report and materials and provide a detailed response to the faculty member and to the School. The subcommittee shares the departmental obligation to review the faculty member's material and is expected to provide an accurate, detailed, balanced evaluation to the School and the administration.

The subcommittee consists of three faculty members. Both probationary and tenured members of the faculty of the School are eligible to serve on subcommittees and are expected to do so as a normal part of service to the University. Fixed-term faculty members with at least a  $\frac{3}{4}$ -time appointment in the School are eligible to serve starting in the second year of fixed-term status but are not normally expected to do so.

**Policy on Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**  
**School of Teaching and Learning**  
**Approved 10/19/07**

The members of the subcommittee are chosen as follows:

1. The first member is chosen by the faculty member under review. The purpose of this choice is to ensure that someone on the committee is familiar with the faculty member's area of scholarship and/or teaching specialty. If the faculty member declines to make a selection, the choice falls to the chairperson of the School.
2. The second member is chosen by lottery from the list of tenured and probationary faculty members who have not yet been named to serve on a similar subcommittee during the current academic year.
3. The third member is selected by the chair after consultation with the candidate. The chair will appoint someone from the discipline of the faculty member under review if that discipline is not already represented on the subcommittee, and will work to make sure that in other respects the subcommittee is representative of the School as a whole.

To maintain equitable workloads, subcommittee membership will be distributed as evenly as possible among faculty members. All STL members eligible for the review committee will again be eligible for spring 2008 selection consideration because of the large number of STL faculty reviewed in the fall 2007 semester. Members who are selected may opt out at their discretion, but are expected to contribute to the departmental review process as mandated by the contract.

The members of the subcommittee will select a convener and will apportion work equitably among themselves by mutual agreement, ensuring all five evaluation criteria are covered for the 2007-2008 year. The subcommittee will meet with the faculty member being reviewed during the first two weeks of January 2008, to assist with the preparation of his or her own materials. In future years, the subcommittee will meet one month before the materials are due to the department. They will make suggestions and recommendations related to the format and content of the report and supporting materials and all members will be available for consultation by the faculty member under review. In all its deliberations and judgments, the subcommittee will adhere to provisions of the IFO contract currently in force, follow procedures outlined in School policy, and acknowledge the range of standards of professional judgment articulated in the public discussion of the School.

**(b) Discussion of the report by the School personnel committee**

Shortly after materials are due to be presented to the department and before the date they are due to be submitted to the Dean, the personnel committee will meet to discuss the Progress Report and supporting documentation. The faculty member under review will be invited to distribute a short written summary of the report. The faculty member will make a short oral presentation focusing on highlights of the period of evaluation and will answer questions from other faculty members in attendance. Subcommittee members are expected to attend and to address views expressed by other faculty members at the meeting in their letter. The total time for the presentation and discussion is limited to 30 minutes unless those present vote to extend it. To ensure adequate time for discussion, the candidate is encouraged to limit his or her presentation to 10 minutes.

**Policy on Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**  
**School of Teaching and Learning**  
**Approved 10/19/07**

**(c) Preparation of letters**

Following the discussion, the members of the subcommittee will prepare a letter summarizing the materials, their recommendations, and the comments and questions of other faculty members expressed during the meeting. The letter will be available for all faculty to review no later than two days following the review meeting. All letters will be available for 48 hours for STL faculty to review, and sign if they so wish. In accordance with the contract, the chairperson of the department will prepare an independent letter presenting his or her recommendation.

All eligible members of the School of Teaching and Learning may sign the letter prepared by the subcommittee or may decline to do so. In addition, any eligible member may prepare a separate letter. These letters constitute the complete response of colleagues to the Report and supporting materials. No vote is held. Copies of all letters are provided to the faculty member under review, who has the option to write responses and include them in his or her materials.

**(d) Forwarding of materials to the Dean**

On the day of the deadline for submission of materials to the Dean, the chairperson of the School will deliver the Progress Report, supporting documentation, and letters to the Dean's office. The School's role in the review process is thereby concluded, though the faculty member under review may continue to add to the materials up until the receipt of the letter announcing the president's decision.

**III. Additional provisions**

**(a) Review of progress reports of fixed-term faculty members**

Fixed-term faculty members are required to prepare annual Professional Development Plans as outlined in the IFO Master Agreement (Article 22 Section C and Section D). Progress reports are submitted to the STL department via the chairperson for review. The School reviews these progress reports, but does not make recommendations on retention or contract renewal. Fixed-term faculty may request an opportunity to present their report but no subcommittee will be assigned. The department chair is required to write a performance evaluation for fixed-term faculty. There is no faculty letter written.

**(b) Discussion of expectations in review retention, tenure, and promotion applications**

To avoid inconsistency in the review process, the School will set aside a portion of one of its regular meetings to discuss standards to be applied in personnel recommendations. The minutes for this meeting will reflect the range of beliefs of individual faculty members about appropriate standards for each of the five criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion. The published record of this discussion will document the range of standards that guide faculty members' professional judgment, and written recommendations on personnel issues are expected to acknowledge this range of standards, and judgments at the extremes will include an explanation for their divergence. This discussion is intended to promote consistency and transparency in the evaluation process and to help probationary faculty members understand and anticipate the judgment of their colleagues. Representatives of the administration and the IFO shall be invited to attend in order to clarify institutional expectations and to

**Policy on Review for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion**  
**School of Teaching and Learning**  
**Approved 10/19/07**

ensure that all understand that departmental expectations may not exceed, limit, or replace contract criteria.