

**REVIEW PROCESS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AT
BELOIT COLLEGE**
prepared by the
FACULTY STATUS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

I. Overview

The review process for tenure-track faculty at Beloit College is intended to be both developmental and evaluative in its approach. Our review process gives tenure-track faculty, their senior department/program colleagues, the members of the Faculty Status and Performance Committee (FS&P), and the dean of the college insight into areas of strength and areas of concern. By engaging in early and regular reviews, pre-tenured tenure-track¹ faculty have the opportunity to respond to feedback in productive and creative ways that serve our students, strengthen the academic program, and build the foundation for fulfilling and successful careers as teacher-scholars.

Included in this document is logistical information tenure-track faculty, their mentors, and departments/programs will find useful as candidates prepare their materials for the review process. The more important intent of this document, however, is to articulate what we (the members of FS&P after consulting with the faculty at large) understand to be the expectations for faculty members deserving permanent tenure, which include excellence in teaching, a sustained pattern of scholarly/artistic productivity, a demonstrated commitment to contribute to the life of the college beyond their department/program, and a commitment to serving our students as effective, knowledgeable, and understanding advisors.

As tenure-track faculty define and pursue their strategies for meeting the expectations for tenure, it is important for them and the senior colleagues who mentor them to keep the following two points in mind:

1. As is the case with a tenure-track faculty member's department/program colleagues, the members of FS&P and the dean of the college are committed to helping tenure-track faculty develop successful careers as teacher-scholars. Pre-tenured faculty are encouraged to consult with members of FS&P and the dean if they have questions, concerns, or ideas for how they can best achieve success as teacher-scholars. They are also invited to meet with the dean, an associate dean, or the chair of FS&P to discuss any questions or concerns regarding the mentoring and review process.
2. It is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty member under review to meet the expectations for reappointment and permanent tenure at Beloit College.

II. Standards and criteria for reappointment and tenure

In its evaluation of faculty, FS&P considers the following four areas of evaluation: teaching, professional development, college service, and advising. Candidates standing for tenure must establish excellence in all four areas; superior performance in one does not compensate for weaknesses in another.

¹ Subsequent references to "tenure-track" faculty refer to "pre-tenured tenure-track" faculty.

Because excellence in teaching is expected of all Beloit College faculty, FS&P considers a candidate's record of teaching to be the most important factor in determining the committee's recommendation. Because scholarly/creative engagement sustains the professional and intellectual vitality of faculty members and informs their teaching, a sustained pattern of scholarly/creative productivity is considered the second most important factor in the evaluation of a faculty member's performance. It is therefore appropriate for tenure-track faculty members to focus their efforts on teaching and professional development as the highest two priorities, respectively. The early sabbatical option should be seriously considered in consultation with senior colleagues, FS&P, and the dean of the college to strengthen the overall development and tenure potential of tenure-track faculty.

The pre-tenure years are a time to establish a pattern of consistent and diligent service to and engagement with the college community. By the fourth-year and tenure reviews, FS&P will be looking for signs that a faculty member has demonstrated a commitment to contributing to the life of the college beyond the classroom and his/her/their department/program. We realize that, typically, major contributions in the area of college service will take place in a faculty member's post-tenure years.

FS&P recognizes that strong advising and mentoring relationships between faculty and students are essential to the quality and value of a Beloit College education. Through these relationships, faculty members help students understand the college's liberal arts mission and achieve the goals of a Beloit College education.

Below we provide specific criteria for success within each of the four areas of evaluation.

Criteria for successful teaching. Successful teaching engages the intelligence, imagination, and curiosity of students, and results in the development of a passion for learning within and beyond the classroom, depth and breadth of knowledge, and a core of essential skills for productive, meaningful engagement with the world. A successful teacher challenges students and encourages them to produce work of high quality and to think critically and independently. A successful teacher works with students to create a learning environment that fosters respect for diverse learning styles, and one in which students feel free to raise perspectives that differ from the norm. Successful teachers are also well prepared, skillful, and respectful; in addition, they convey expectations clearly and provide valuable and timely feedback.

Criteria for successful professional development. The ultimate goal of a faculty member's program of professional development is an ongoing life of intellectual, scholarly, and/or artistic growth. The natural means to achieve and evaluate this growth is the placement of results before an audience of peers for review, comment, and criticism. Without such placement, one's professional growth cannot be fully sustained or assessed.

Thus, at the point of the tenure decision, the members of FS&P will be looking for evidence of a sustained pattern of scholarly/creative engagement that generates outcomes (e.g., scholarly articles, creative works) that are subject to peer review. Publication of traditional scholarship in a peer-reviewed journal, creative work that is peer-reviewed, publication of a well-received peer-reviewed textbook, publication of a scholarly monograph or book with a well-respected press, and peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning are examples of clear signals that a faculty member is engaged in and contributing to his/her/their discipline. But it is ultimately the *pattern* of productive scholarly/creative activity that generates the peer-reviewed output that we hope to see at the point of the tenure decision.

Criteria for a successful record of college service and citizenship. Effective participation in governance and other forms of service to the college facilitates knowledge of and demonstrates commitment to the institution and its mission, and enables faculty members to forge professional relationships outside of their departments and programs. Whereas commendable work on college committees will likely be a part of a successful record of college service, activity within departments/programs that benefits the college as a whole, program and curricular development, contributions to all-college events and programs, on-campus public presentations/performances, and service to the offices of Admissions, Development and Alumni Relations, International Education, Communications and Marketing, Athletics, and the Liberal Arts in Practice Center are also considered to be aspects of a successful record of college service and citizenship. FS&P encourages tenure-track faculty to consult with their department/program chairs, mentors, and other senior colleagues to identify leadership opportunities that match their interests.

Criteria for a successful record of advising. Faculty members demonstrate a successful record of advising by being intentional, responsible, consultative, and responsive in helping students explore, set, and realize their academic and professional goals.

Successful advisors educate students about the mission of Beloit College and the goals of a liberal arts education. They assist students in setting self-aware, ambitious, and reachable educational goals, and in selecting and constructing curricular and co-curricular programs and experiences at Beloit and beyond that promote the accomplishment of those goals. Successful advisors provide opportunities for students to articulate, reflect upon, monitor, and revise their educational goals.

Advisors educate students about the Beloit College curriculum, and the major(s), minor(s), and program(s) in which they advise, as well as about other majors, minors, and programs. They guide and assist students as those students encounter academic opportunities and challenges, inform themselves and their students about the support services available on campus, and connect students with useful resources at Beloit College and beyond.

FS&P assesses a candidate's record of teaching, professional development, college service, and advising by reviewing his/her/their self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, annual reports, department/program letter, student evaluations, course materials (such as representative examples of syllabi, assignments, and exams), and representative samples of the candidate's scholarship or creative work. In the fourth-year and tenure reviews, FS&P also reviews previous letters from FS&P and the dean to the candidate and examines the candidate's record for signs of improvement if particular areas of concern were raised in a previous review. In the tenure evaluation, FS&P also reviews internal and external letters, and surveys of students who have taken a course with the candidate.

III. The elements of an effective self-evaluation

In the self-evaluation, review candidates should articulate and reflect upon their goals as teacher-scholars and develop strategies for achieving those goals. As part of this process, review candidates will want to reflect upon successes and challenges in their professional life, citing evidence from student evaluations, course materials, scholarship/creative works, and other appropriate material. In the fourth-year and tenure review, it is critical that candidates address any issues raised by FS&P in a previous review. The self-evaluation typically consists of the following sections:

1. Teaching²

The teaching section of the self-evaluation should be a thorough, concise, and thoughtful exploration of a review candidate's teaching. The candidate should discuss his/her/their teaching goals, methods, and measures of successful learning outcomes, with reference to specific examples drawn from the candidate's courses. Candidates are encouraged to present both qualitative and quantitative analyses of their course evaluations (and, in the case of tenure candidates, of the student surveys), in which they identify themes, patterns, and recurring concerns and comments. Candidates should reflect on the developmental trajectory of their teaching experience and aspirations—considering what has gone well, challenges identified and met, and areas where they seek to become more effective. Candidates should identify any linkages between their teaching and scholarship, as well as the relationship between their classroom teaching and broader concerns such as departmental, programmatic, and institutional needs and goals. Meaningful contributions to the Initiatives program (SPARK courses), Career and Community Engagement, and capstone courses can help demonstrate candidates' commitment to teaching beyond their discipline and serving all-college educational goals.

Many faculty members consider advising to be an integral part of their pedagogy, philosophy of teaching, and record of accomplishment in the area of teaching. In this case, the faculty member under review may include a discussion of his/her/their advising activities, challenges, and accomplishments in the "Teaching" section of the self-evaluation.

2. Professional development

Review candidates should discuss their research agenda and its rationale, including past and current activities and the future trajectory of their research. Review candidates should describe the nature of their work and where it fits in their disciplines or fields of interest. Candidates should identify outcomes, including both those that were completed since coming to Beloit and those that they plan to pursue in the future, such as traditional scholarship in a peer-reviewed journal, creative work that is peer-reviewed, publication of a well-received peer-reviewed textbook, publication of a scholarly monograph or book with a well-respected press, and peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning. Other evidence of professional development such as conference papers, workshops, and grant proposals should also be included. Candidates are encouraged to frame future plans in relation to past accomplishments. Obviously, research agendas can shift, but such shifts should be explained. Candidates should also report any active participation in regional, national, and/or international professional associations.

Tenure-track faculty members are encouraged to consult with colleagues within and beyond their department/program and professional networks outside of Beloit College as to the specifics of what constitutes appropriate venues and professional standards for their discipline. Similarly, tenure-track faculty are encouraged to consult with members of FS&P and the dean as they progress toward the tenure decision to ensure that their expectations of what constitutes a successful professional development portfolio are compatible with college-wide expectations.

3. College service and citizenship

² FS&P suggests that candidates include a table that lists their courses (number, name, enrollment) chronologically. Where appropriate, candidates should provide a rationale for low enrollments. Candidates should remember to include special projects supervised and/or senior theses/projects directed.

In their self-evaluations, review candidates should discuss how they and the college have benefited from their active participation in college life beyond the classroom and their department/program. A successful record of college service is one in which a faculty member's interests are matched well with the needs of the college. Candidates should be thoughtful and proactive about finding their niche as a citizen of the college.

Opportunities to participate in the life of the college include membership on committees, activity within departments/programs that benefits the college as a whole, program and curricular development, contributions to all-college events and programs, on-campus public presentations/performances, and service to the offices of Admissions, Development and Alumni Relations, International Education, Communications and Marketing, Athletics, and the Liberal Arts in Practice Center. In addition, all candidates are expected to play an active role in college governance by attending department/program, deliberation group, and Academic Senate meetings.

4. Advising

The advising section of the self-evaluation should be a coherent and reflective exploration of a candidate's philosophy of and strategies for advising and mentoring. This section should include a discussion of the ways the candidate has helped students connect with the mission, goals, programs, and resources of Beloit College as well as a discussion about how they work with students to help them succeed, persist, and graduate.

Many faculty members serve the college through activities such as serving as advisors to campus organizations, fraternities and sororities, study abroad and/or off-campus domestic programs, or as faculty mentors to athletic teams. The advising section of the self-evaluation is an appropriate place for candidates to discuss these important advising and mentoring activities.

5. Conclusion

Review candidates are encouraged to provide a brief summary of the self-evaluation and/or a concluding statement.

IV. Deadlines and required application materials

As review candidates prepare their materials, they should be communicating with their department/program chair about the content of the self-evaluation and about the *timing* of submission of the self-evaluation and departmental/program letter (See section on departmental/program letter below).³ Many chairs start writing the department/program letter after receiving the candidate's self-evaluation; therefore, review candidates must complete this document at least two weeks before the submission deadline to FS&P. Once the chair has consulted with other tenured members of the department/program and has completed the department/program letter, the review candidate will receive a copy. The candidate may wish to respond to the departmental/program letter; accordingly, the candidate should have access to the departmental/program letter at least one week before the self-evaluation is due. See Table 1 for a summary of required materials and deadlines.

³ FS&P suggests that candidates ask a faculty member who has recently gone through a Beloit College review to share his/her/their self-evaluation. Many faculty members would be happy to do so.

In each of the reviews, the candidate is asked to submit his/her/their self-evaluation, teaching portfolio (student course evaluations; selected examples of course syllabi, assignments, and exams), representative examples of scholarly/creative work (see next paragraph), curriculum vitae, and annual reports. Materials submitted other than the self-evaluation should provide specific evidence in support of statements in the self-evaluation; therefore, the candidate should be selective regarding these materials.

At the tenure review, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment & Planning will administer a survey to students who have completed a course with the tenure candidate. Full survey results shall be made available to the Faculty Status and Performance Committee, the provost, and the candidate's chair. It shall be the responsibility of the chair to share a written summary of student comments with the candidate and with other tenured members of the department; such a summary shall become part of the candidate's file.

Comments about the candidate's teaching and advising, without identifying information, shall be made available to the candidate. Confidential information, which survey respondents may choose to include, shall be made available to the candidate in the chair's summary only. The candidate will have the opportunity to address and respond to the survey results in his/her/their self-evaluation.

Materials submitted that document scholarly/creative work should be organized carefully and logically. For example, peer-reviewed publications should be separated from those materials that have not gone through peer review. Scholarly disciplines are highly variable in terms of order of authorship; therefore, the committee asks that candidates clarify any disciplinary conventions regarding order of authorship. One approach is illustrated in the following list of scholarly publications (where the candidate's name is **Austen**):

Austen, J., and Hardy, J., 2008, The running speeds of dinosaurs: *Journal of Victorian Studies*, v. 13, p.44-58. [Lead author, 80% of the writing effort]

Angelou, M., and **Austen, J.**, 2010, NASCAR culture deconstructed: *Interdisciplinary Reviews*, v. 103, p.59-102. [Co-author, 50% of writing effort]

Verdi, G., Cervantes, S., and **Austen, J.**, 2015, New approaches to immunotherapy: *Journal of the Croatian Medical Association*, v. 66, p. 98-140. [Co-author, 20% of writing effort]

Marx, K.*, Darwin, C.*, Huxley, T.H.*, and **Austen, J.**, in press, Hominids as highly derived tardigrades (water bears): *Science*, v. 331. [Lab director, writing coordinator; 40% of writing effort; *student co-author]

The tenure review also includes letters from on-campus colleagues (internal reviewers) and from off-campus scholars in the candidate's discipline or area of interest (external reviewers). It is best if tenure-review candidates begin thinking about the identity of their internal and external reviewers early. In the letter inviting candidates to apply for review, the dean will request the candidate submit the names of three internal colleagues and the names of six external reviewers. For internal reviewers, typically candidates should choose people who are not in their own department or program and whose letters, when considered together, broadly reflect their performance on campus from a range of perspectives. We recommend that candidates ask people with whom they have worked on a committee or major event or conference to write on their behalf. Candidates may wish to supply internal reviewers with some of their review materials. For

external reviewers, candidates should identify the status of each individual (e.g., tenured professor, tenure-track assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor, artistic director).

The dean shall solicit letters of evaluation from four of the six persons identified as potential external reviewers and shall also be responsible for facilitating their access to the materials the candidate has provided. The primary function of external reviewers is to evaluate the quality of the candidate's professional development and its contributions to the candidate's field.

A few further suggestions: A tenure-review candidate ought to avoid his/her/their primary dissertation advisor and friends. A co-author may be appropriate, but a tenure-review candidate should also include a person with expertise in his/her/their area of scholarship who has less direct involvement in his/her/their own work. At least one external reviewer with whom the candidate has not worked closely should be nominated. At least one external reviewer should have an established reputation in the candidate's field of expertise.

FS&P has determined that to promote an equitable and fair review, the department/committee letter must:

- focus on the candidate, avoiding using the letter as a platform for other agendas,
- provide in the opening paragraph a clear and coherent expression of the department's/committee's decision: its support for or objection to the candidate's reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion,
- systematically evaluate and contextualize the candidate's performance in each of the four criteria (teaching, professional development, advising, and citizenship)
 - a. explain the trajectory of the candidate in all four areas of evaluation,
 - b. evaluate the evidence, both quantitative and qualitative,
 - c. clarify what peer review means within the candidate's discipline at a small liberal arts college, especially for non-traditional professional development,
- address concerns highlighted in previous reviews, in the case of fourth-year and tenure review candidates, with specific attention to the candidate's progress in addressing these concerns,
- summarize class visits from all tenured members who have been on campus during the review period,
- in tenure cases, summarize the student surveys,
- evaluate the development of the candidate by reflecting on successes, strengths, and challenges.

Table 1. Deadlines and Required Materials for Review Applications
--

	Deadlines		Required Materials	
	To tenured departmental colleagues and external reviewers	To FS&P /dean's office	Supplied by the review candidate (please be selective)	Supplied by department / committee chair or dean's office
Second-Year Review	Last Tuesday of August	Third Tuesday of September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation • Teaching portfolio (selected examples of course syllabi, assignments, and exams; course evaluations) • Representative samples of scholarship / creative work. • Curriculum vitae • Annual reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department/Committee letter
Fourth-Year Review	Last Tuesday of August	Third Tuesday of September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation • Teaching portfolio (selected examples of course syllabi, assignments, and exams; course evaluations) • Representative samples of scholarship / creative work • Curriculum vitae • Annual reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department/Committee letter • Previous review materials • Previous letters from FS&P and the dean to the candidate
Tenure Review	Last Tuesday of August	Third Tuesday of September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-evaluation • Teaching portfolio (selected examples of course syllabi, assignments, and exams; course evaluations) • Representative samples of scholarship / creative work • Curriculum vitae • Annual reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department/Committee letter • Previous review materials • Previous letters from FS&P and the dean to the candidate • Survey of all students who have completed a course with the candidate • Internal letters • External letters

V. What happens after the review materials are submitted

Ordinarily, FS&P will consider two-year review files first, then four-year review files, and then tenure-review files. After considering a candidate's second- and fourth-year review materials, FS&P will forward to the review candidate a letter addressing what the committee identifies as areas of strength and areas of concern. The dean will also send review candidates a letter suggesting what steps they should consider taking as progress is made toward the next review. The dean's letter invites review candidates to meet with him/her/they and the chair of FS&P to discuss the candidate's performance in more detail, to discuss strategies for setting and achieving appropriate goals by the candidate's next review, and to ensure clarity regarding the review process. Regardless of the recommendations set forth in the letters, FS&P strongly recommends that all review candidates meet with the dean and the chair of FS&P to gain more insight into their individual cases.

VI. What a candidate needs to do after the second- and fourth-year reviews

The review process is designed to give tenure-track faculty members critical feedback and guidance as they make progress toward their application for tenure. As part of this process, we recognize areas of strength and identify areas in need of improvement. FS&P and the dean are eager to help faculty as they develop strategies for achieving success as teacher-scholars. That said, it is ultimately the candidate's responsibility to find effective ways to meet the college's expectations for permanent tenure, which include excellence in teaching, a sustained pattern of scholarly/artistic productivity, a demonstrated commitment to contribute to the life of the college beyond one's department/program, and a commitment to serving our students as an effective, knowledgeable, and understanding advisor.

The following are some steps a review candidate can take to help navigate the journey toward the tenure decision:

§ Maintain regular communication with senior department/program colleagues about one's teaching goals and scholarly agenda. Such communication is essential in understanding Beloit College standards and expectations with regard to the teacher-scholar model and whether one is on track to meet these expectations.

§ Develop and maintain collaborative relationships with scholars in one's field of interest beyond the college campus. Such relationships can serve as valuable sources of advice for how one might best advance his/her/their research agenda.

§ At the end of each review period, the dean of the college and the chair of FS&P invite candidates to meet individually to discuss strategies for successfully meeting expectations for tenure. Review candidates are strongly encouraged to take them up on this offer. Such conversations are important not only for addressing areas of concern, but also for making the most of opportunities that might exist beyond the department/program level.