

2019-2020 Guidelines for Rank and Tenure Review
College of St. Benedict/St. John's University

This information has been prepared by the CSB/SJU Rank and Tenure Committee and approved by the Provost to help candidates and Department Chairs prepare for review processes.

Note that beginning in AY2019-20, by action of the Joint Faculty Senate, there will be a single, unified Rank and Tenure Committee. The committee will be divided into two subcommittees to review files. (For AY2019-20, one subcommittee will review Tenure files, and the other subcommittee will review Third-Year and Promotion-only files.)

Nothing contained herein should be considered a replacement, substitution, or modification of any information contained in the Faculty Handbook. Consequently, candidates and Chairs must be familiar not only with the materials below but also with the contents of Handbook sections 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7.

Deadlines for 2019-2020 (2:00 pm on the date specified).

Notification of Intention to Apply.

1 May Applications due for Third-Year, Tenure and/or Promotion Review
[Form for Declaring Intent to Apply for Review](#) (open link)

Submission of Materials to the Department – so departmental colleagues can consult them prior to the departmental meeting and writing their letters.

The Department Chair sets a deadline of at least two weeks before the file is due.

Submission of Letters by Departmental Colleagues to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair must give a copy of his or her letter and the Departmental letter to the candidate. This letter is included with the candidate's "open file," referred to as File A. Department colleague letters do not need to be submitted to the candidate; these are emailed to Academic Affairs for insertion in the candidate's "closed" file, referred to as File B. Chair and Departmental letters are described in sections 2.6.5.2.1 and 2.7.2.3, respectively.

5 September Letters due for Tenure and Promotion
19 September Letters due for Promotion only
16 October Letters due for Third-Year Review

Submission of Review Materials by the Candidate to the Office of Academic Affairs. The candidate must provide all materials (saved as PDF documents) to Academic Affairs on a flash drive for

upload into the SharePoint site, along with a hard copy of the Table of Contents (**Candidates will provide and initial a complete Table of Contents of File A to provide assurance that no material has been placed in File A without the candidate's knowledge**). Candidates must bring the flash drive to Academic Affairs and assure that the file has been properly uploaded into SharePoint. Any supplementary artifacts that cannot be scanned and uploaded, such as an authored textbook, can be provided in hard copy to Academic Affairs.

12 September	Tenure and Promotion files due
26 September	Promotion-only files due
23 October	Third-Year Review files due

Preparation of the File

All candidates for third-year, tenure, or promotion review should read the relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook carefully when preparing their review files. Materials required to be included in the file are listed in the Faculty Handbook, sections 2.5, 2.6.5.2 (third-year and tenure review) and 2.7.2.3 (promotion apart from tenure review). It is important that candidates use the Faculty Handbook numbering and section headings in constructing their file, to assist the committee in locating relevant information for all sections.

It is the candidate's responsibility to make the case for a successful review. Candidates should therefore assemble a complete, well-written, well-documented, and well-organized and yet concise file of materials that demonstrates that they have met the criteria for a positive evaluation. Candidates applying for both tenure and promotion should submit a single file for both purposes, and clearly indicate ample evidence for advancement in rank as well as for the granting of tenure (2.6.5.1).

Compile the file as seven separate PDF documents, labeled as follows:

- Curriculum Vitae
- 2.5.1 Teaching Effectiveness
- 2.5.2 Scholarship and Creative Work
- 2.5.3 Advising
- 2.5.4 Service
- 2.5.5 Professional Identity
- Additional Materials (which should include):
 - Plan for Professional Development
 - Candidate-solicited letters (non-departmental/supplemental/those not required by the Committee)
 - Other additional materials

Bring the completed file to the Office of Academic Affairs on a usb drive for upload into a secured SharePoint site, along with a hard copy of the Table of Contents (**Candidates will provide and initial a complete Table of Contents of File A to provide assurance that no material has been placed in File A without the candidate's knowledge**). Academic Affairs will keep the usb drive for its records. Label the sections clearly as laid out above. The candidate is responsible for including all relevant materials and assuring these are

uploaded appropriately into SharePoint. Candidates can edit and change their files up until the deadline they are due in the Office of Academic Affairs. The Committee will base its recommendation strictly upon the materials in the file. The candidate may not add any materials after the deadline.

If you have supplemental artifacts that are not easily scanned, such as CDs or authored textbooks, these should be provided in hard copy to the Office of Academic Affairs and will be returned to the candidate upon completion of the review.

The Committee encourages candidates to review sample successful files kept in the Office of Academic Affairs and to seek advice from tenured departmental colleagues. The Chair of the appropriate Rank and Tenure subcommittee may also be consulted.

In the interest of obtaining valuable input from departmental members as well as producing a polished file, it is good advice for candidates to have all or parts of their files available to their colleagues before the two-week departmental deadline. Doing so will give the candidates ample time to revise any sections of the file in need of editing.

Information and Advice about Selected Parts of the Review File

Curriculum Vitae

A current *curriculum vitae* is a required part of the file (2.6.5.2 and 2.7.2.3).

- The *curriculum vitae* will be most useful to the Committee if it includes all teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
- The Committee recommends that the *curriculum vitae* give complete information about all publications and conference presentations.

Teaching Effectiveness (2.5.1)

The committee expects this section to include:

- A summary of teaching assignments and enrollments for the period under review.

Example: Summary of Teaching Assignments and Enrollments
J. L. Faculty, Department of Hieroglyphics

Year	Fall Term	Spring Term
2015-16	HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 30 HIER 325 Advanced Hieroglyphics: 19 FYS 100 First Year Seminar: 15	HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 32 HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 27 FYS 101: First Year Seminar: 15
2016-17	HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 30 HIER 353 Linguistics & Hieroglyphics: 16 FYS 100 First Year Seminar: 16	HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 27 HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 29 FYS 100 First Year Seminar: 15
2017-18	HIER 111 Intro to Hieroglyphics: 32 HIER 325 Advanced Hieroglyphics: 19 Hieroglyphics Lab I (Section 1): 12 Hieroglyphics Lab I (Section 2): 10	Study Abroad Director in South Africa

- A teaching philosophy and self-evaluative essay of teaching effectiveness, which includes:
 - Tables which clearly display summarized student course surveys (see example below).
 - **Academic Affairs provides the committee with course surveys for the period under review:
 - For third-year review, this includes all end-of-semester student course surveys.
 - For tenure review, this includes all end-of-semester student course surveys since the last Rank and Tenure review.
 - For promotion review apart from tenure, this includes course surveys from the previous three years, or from an equivalent number of the candidate's most recent courses.
 - Summaries of student comments related to each course.
 - Reactions to student course surveys and how teaching and/or the course was improved as a result of these surveys.
 - Representative syllabi and course materials as supporting evidence.

Sample Displays of Course Evaluation Data:

Fall 2015- DEPT 101: Your Mom and Society-04A (IA System Survey)

Response Rate: 22/22 (100%)

Overall Summative Rating (0-5): 4.4

Cognitive Engagement Index (CEI, 1-7): 4.6

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
Course as a Whole	32%	50%	18%				4.1
Course Content	27%	50%	23%				4.0
Instructor's Contribution to Course	64%	27%	9%				4.7
Instructor's Effectiveness in Teaching Subject Matter	59%	32%	9%				4.7

Another Example:

Fall 2005- Department X- 101: Your Mom and Society- Section 4, 9.40-10.50. (Previous Survey)

Response Rate: 27/30 (90%)

	<u>Question</u>	<u>Mean</u>
96%	Stated learning goals for this course were clear, or very clear	1.59
96%	Stated they learned a good or exceptional amount	1.22
96%	Rated the course very good or excellent	1.37
96%	Rated my instructorship very good or excellent	1.18

There is no formal policy by which a candidate's teaching in the Common Curriculum outside the home department is evaluated. Therefore, it is incumbent upon candidates to provide such information. This should include summaries of student course surveys (Academic Affairs will provide the committee with the course surveys) as well as letters from colleagues who have visited the candidate's FYS, Ethics Seminar, or other Common Curriculum classes.

Scholarship and Creative Work (2.5.2)

The committee expects this section to include:

- A self-evaluative essay of the quality and quantity of scholarship and creative work-designate which artifacts are peer-reviewed.
- Copies of relevant scholarship and creative work (as mentioned above, if these cannot be uploaded, please bring them along with the usb drive to Academic Affairs when submitting the file).
- Their department’s scholarship guidelines used to evaluate scholarship and creative work. These guidelines are helpful in describing the forms scholarly or creative work in your discipline, especially within disciplines that have distinctive practices. But it should also be noted that, “These departmental guidelines supplement but do not supersede the criteria and forms of evidence stipulated” in 2.5.2.
- When evaluating scholarship and creative work, the Committee seeks to answer four questions.
 - Does the work qualify as scholarship or creative work in the candidate’s discipline?
 - What is the quantity and quality of the work?
 - To what extent has the work been available for public conversation and judgment by peers?
 - What is the direction or trajectory of scholarly or creative work, especially in recent years?

The candidate must ensure that answers to these questions are clearly explained in the file. When non-traditional forms of scholarship are involved, the candidate may want to include a statement about the nature of scholarship in the discipline. The testimony of peers can also help the Committees to judge the quality of your work.

Professional Development (2.5.5.2)

Faculty are expected to address all subsections of Professional Identify (2.5.5) including a plan for professional development (PPD). In the PPD, the candidate describes specific goals and plans for continued growth in teaching, scholarship, advising, service, and professional growth overall. All candidates must address all areas listed in the PPD form. The committee offers one possible format (the charts included in each section of the PPD form, appended to these guidelines) that some colleagues have found helpful in organizing their thoughts, and even in presenting their PPD. If this format is restrictive, rather than helpful, or if it makes it difficult for you to reflect on and discuss your work and professional goals in an integrated way, feel free to organize your PPD responses in the way that best fits your discipline and your individual development and goals. Be sure to cover all areas listed in the Faculty Handbook for Rank & Tenure review. A quality PPD will identify specific projects on which the candidate intends to work, but will also explain the rationale for those projects, how they build from and develop the candidate’s training and past work. Equally important, the PPD should explain the steps that these projects will undergo, the intended path to completion and how these steps build upon each other.

Support of the Missions of the College and University (2.5.5.3)

“Candidates are expected to include a statement describing ways in which the different aspects of his or her professional life (see Section 2.5) as a faculty member of the college [university] contribute to intellectual life and learning and other aspects of the missions of the college and university and the Academic Commitments to the Missions.” (2.5.5.3). Though a candidate may refer to the mission in multiple sections of the file, it is important to include a statement specifically responding to the missions and the academic commitments to the mission.

Letters for Third-Year, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews

Candidates should invite colleagues, especially those who are tenured and therefore required to review and write letters, to visit classes and review scholarly work so that the colleagues' letters will be based on direct observation of the candidate's performance and capabilities.

Required letters are submitted directly to the Office of Academic Affairs and are not included by the candidate in their file:

- Individual letters of evaluation from all ranked colleagues in the candidate's department. These letters, saved as a PDF, are emailed by the authors directly to the Office of Academic Affairs (2.6.5.2.2 and 2.7.2.3). These letters are not required to be shared with the candidate.
 - Non-tenured departmental colleagues may abstain from submitting an evaluation if they wish (2.6.5.2.2 and 2.7.2.3), but the Committee should be notified about the decision to abstain. An email to the chair of the committee with cc. to Karlyn Forner or Mary Jo Waggoner is the best way to relay this information.
- A letter from the Department Chair (and/or the Dean of the School of Theology), saved as a PDF, and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. The letter from the Department Chair should conform to Section 2.6.5.2.1 or 2.7.2.3, as appropriate. A copy should be provided to the candidate at least a week before the file deadline in case the candidate would like to respond to the letter in their file (Sections 2.6.5.2.1 and 2.7.2.3).
- A Departmental letter written by someone other than the Chair (see Section 2.6.5.2.1 or 2.7.2.3), saved as a PDF, and submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Departmental letter should be prepared according to the procedures outlined in Handbook Sections 2.6.5.2.1 or 2.7.2.3, as appropriate. Normally, this letter includes a summary of perceptions in the department and addresses each of the criteria in 2.5. All department members who attend the meeting should sign the Departmental letter to indicate their agreement with the accuracy of the letter's representation of the department meeting. A copy should be provided to the candidate at least a week before the file deadline in case the candidate would like to respond to the letter in their file (Sections 2.6.5.2.1 and 2.7.2.3).

Additional letters not required by the Committee should be submitted directly to the candidate for inclusion in the file and not sent to the Office of Academic Affairs or the Rank and Tenure Committee.

- If a candidate wishes to include letters from outside of his or her department – e.g., from extra-departmental colleagues, from colleagues at other institutions, or from others knowledgeable about the candidate's work – then it is the candidate's responsibility to solicit those letters, inform the letter writers of the deadline for submission, and submit the letters along with the continuous PDF file marked "Additional materials" (this section includes the PPD, candidate-solicited letters, and any other additional relevant material provided by the candidate).

Procedures for Reviews

The candidate's department chair (and/or the dean of the School of Theology) and the Academic Dean will be interviewed by the Rank and Tenure Committee as a routine part of the process for third-year and tenure review. They will not routinely be interviewed for promotion-only reviews.

Notification of the Rank and Tenure Committee's recommendation for the candidate will consist of a letter from the Chair of the Committee to the Provost with a copy to the candidate. The subsequent steps of the

review process are outlined in sections 2.6.5.4 for third-year review, 2.6.5.5 for tenure review, and 2.7.2.4 for promotion-only review.

For *third-year review only*, after the review is complete the candidate will meet with the Dean of Faculty, the Department Chair (and/or the dean of the School of Theology), and a representative of the Rank and Tenure Committee for a summary discussion of the review and clarify anything in the letter that would benefit from explanation (2.6.5.4.1).

COLLEGE OF SAINT BENEDICT / SAINT JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
Plan for Professional Development (PPD)

NAME _____ DATE _____

Advanced Degrees _____

Please write a clearly labeled response to each question. Your total number of pages should not exceed five.

- A. Please summarize your strengths as a member of the CSB/SJU faculty and areas that you believe need improvement. *2.5.5.2.a Reflection on roles and responsibilities in the department and the College/University*

- B. What characteristics of CSB/SJU are especially appealing to you as you plan your professional growth?

- C. Long Range Goals and Plans

Within the categories listed below please write a short statement of your objectives for the next *three to five years* and how you plan to achieve them. *2.5.5.2.b Identification of goals targeted for professional growth during the next 3-5 years . 2.5.5.2.c frequent engagement in activities appropriate to the achievement of goals targeted.* Where your plans depend upon elections, appointments, and circumstances beyond your control, state your aspirations. In short, indicate your interests, as well as your specific plans. Use additional sheets as necessary.

Teaching effectiveness: Faculty handbook section **2.5.1** Examples could include development of pedagogical skills, planning of new, revision of existing courses

Teaching Effectiveness Goals: (2.5.5.2.b)	Time Frame:	Achievement Plan:	Progress made in [year1]	Progress made in [year2]
Pedagogical skills				
Course/curriculum development-revision				

Scholarship: Faculty handbook section **2.5.2** Examples could include scholarship, research, publications, performances, exhibits and creative works

Scholarship Goals:	Time Frame:	Achievement Plan:	Progress made in [year1]	Progress made in

--	--	--	--	--

Advising: Faculty handbook section 2.5.3 Examples could include development of skills or opportunities to assist in student development (advising, organizations, counseling, etc.)

Advising Goals:	Time Frame:	Achievement Plan:	Progress made in [year1]	Progress made in [year2]

Service: Faculty handbook section 2.5.4 Examples could include departmental, college, university and community service

Service Goals:	Time Frame:	Achievement Plan:	Progress made in [year1]	Progress made in [year2]
College				
Department				
Professional/Community				

Professional development: Faculty handbook section 2.5.5.2 Examples could include advanced study in your specialization, certification

Professional Development Goals:	Time Frame:	Achievement Plan:	Progress made in [year1]	Progress made in [year2]