
DRAFT March 2, 2017

AUGSBURG COLLEGE

FACULTY HANDBOOK

Revised May 2015

[5.3. Other Policies](#)

[5.4. Mail, and Telephone Service](#)

[5.5. Other Procedures](#)

[SECTION 6: APPOINTMENTS AND REVIEWS](#)

[6.0 General Policies](#)

[6.1 Appointments](#)

[6.2 General Statement on Review Processes of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.3 Criteria for Evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members](#)

[6.4 Documentation Submitted for Reviews of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.5 Annual Reviews](#)

[6.6 First Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.7 Third Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.8 Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.9 Post-Tenure Review of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.10 Review for Promotion to Professor of Tenure Track Faculty](#)

[6.11 Sabbatical and Academic Leaves](#)

[6.12 Reviews of Non-tenure Track Faculty Members \(NTTF\)](#)

[SECTION 7: COMPENSATION](#)

[7.1 General Statement](#)

[7.2 Salary](#)

[7.3 Insurance Options](#)

[7.4 Personal Leaves](#)

[7.5 Other Personal Leaves of Absence \(see 6.10 on Academic Leaves\)](#)

[7.6 Augsburg College Tuition Benefit policy](#)

[7.7 Faculty Reimbursements](#)

[7.8 Retirement](#)

[SECTION 8: CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY OF AUGSBURG COLLEGE](#)

[8.0 Preamble](#)

[8.1 Article I. The Purpose](#)

[8.2 Article II. Membership and Voting Rights](#)

SECTION 6: APPOINTMENTS AND REVIEWS

6.0 General Policies

This section of the Faculty Handbook describes general policies governing appointments and reviews of all faculty members.

6.0.1 Introduction and Fidelity to the Mission of the College

Comment [Office1]: Numbering Changed -

Members of the Faculty at Augsburg College are citizens of their departments, college, profession, and active participants in the greater community. As such, faculty members are passionate about their work and aspire to be superb teachers, active scholars, and valuable citizens who are engaged in the life of their department, the college, their profession, and the community. Faculty members of Augsburg College are expected to work toward the achievement of the Mission of the College:

Augsburg College educates students to be informed citizens, thoughtful stewards, critical thinkers, and responsible leaders. The Augsburg experience is supported by an engaged community, committed to intentional diversity in its life and work. An Augsburg education is defined by excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies, guided by the faith and values of the Lutheran Church, and shaped by our urban and global settings.

[Procedural note: the statement of the Mission is automatically updated in this Faculty Handbook if approved by the Faculty. The current version is dated 2010.]

6.0.2 Equal Opportunity Statement

It is the policy of Augsburg College to afford to all persons, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, public assistance status, or disability, equal opportunity for employment and equal opportunity to benefits from its educational programs, student personnel services, financial aid, housing and other services. Within the limits of its resources, it is the intent of the College to carry out an affirmative action program, by which is meant efforts to recruit and retain employees from diverse applicant pools, and to assure equal opportunity as a way of life on the Augsburg College campus. The College will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of physical or mental disability in regard to any position for which the employee or applicant for employment is qualified. The College agrees to take affirmative action to employ, advance in employment, and otherwise treat qualified individuals with disabilities without discrimination based upon their physical or mental disability in all employment practices such as

the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment, advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and selection for training. (See the College's affirmative action plan in Human Resources.)

6.0.3 Procedural Intent

The College intends to follow the guidelines and policies for appointments and reviews set forth in this section in as reasonable and fair a manner as is generally possible, although it is understood that exceptions and deviations are occasionally necessary. Policies governing revision to the Faculty Handbook are outlined in Section 8.10. In situations where significant revisions are made affecting appointments and reviews, the College will attempt to provide reasonable accommodations for persons imminently affected by the changes, normally through the inclusion of a temporary transition statement in this section.

~~6.0.4 Temporary Transition Statement (Note: This section will automatically be deleted in September of 2015.)~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

~~The guidelines and policies for appointments and reviews set forth in this section are effective immediately for all Non-tenure Track appointments and for all new appointments to Tenure Track positions beginning Fall 2010 or later. Candidates in Tenure Track appointments that began prior to Fall 2010 may choose between this newly revised Section 6 and the previous version of Section 6 for Third Year Review, tenure review, or review for promotion to Associate Professor occurring no later than Spring 2015. Those candidates who suspend the normal schedule for review (as described in Section 6.2.1.G) are also bound by the dates identified in this transitions statement. Eligible faculty members who choose to be reviewed using the previous version of Section 6 may still choose to frame their discussion of scholarship using the disciplinary standards of scholarship described in this newly revised version of Section 6. Candidates for promotion to Professor may choose between this newly revised Section 6 and the previous version of Section 6 for review during the 2010-2011 academic year. Beginning Fall 2011, all reviews for promotion to Professor will follow this newly revised Section 6.~~

~~For those faculty members tenured before the practice of concurrent promotion to Associate Professor was in effect and who continue to hold rank of Assistant Professor, the Dean will meet with the faculty member and his or her Department Chair during the 2010-11 academic year to determine if the faculty member should be nominated for promotion to Associate Professor in fall 2011. If nominated, the faculty member follows the process for Review for Promotion to Associate Professor, which is identical to the process for Tenure Review with Promotion to Associate Professor outlined in Section 6.8. If not nominated for fall 2011, the candidate follows the procedure as outlined in Section 6.10.1, i.e. nomination may occur at any time following a positive Post-tenure Review.~~

In accordance with the policies in this revision, each academic department will develop a Department Statement on Scholarship that will be kept on file in the Dean's office. All members of the faculty may view any Department's Statement. Each Department Chair will provide a current copy of their respective Statement to every tenure track member of their department. An appropriate faculty committee will review each statement for completeness and parity, ensure that all departments have submitted their statements, and forward these statements to the Faculty Senate for approval. The Faculty Senate will then announce to the Faculty that these Department Statements are now approved by the Senate and are publicly available. Departments will be responsible for periodically reviewing these statements to make sure they reflect the current scholarship standards within their discipline(s). In addition, an appropriate faculty committee will periodically review each statement.

The Department Statement on Scholarship must identify the full spectrum of scholarly activities recognized and encouraged within their department for all disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study represented in that department. These statements should be consistent with national disciplinary standards for what constitutes scholarship in that field. If the review committee deems it necessary, a department may be asked to provide documentation regarding national disciplinary standards regarding scholarship. The Statement must also discuss how the Criteria for Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4) apply to possible scholarly activities within each department and must specify the range of acceptable possibilities for each criteria.

6.1 Appointments

Augsburg College is committed to tenure and to the faculty teacher-scholar as the primary model for full-time faculty members. Tenure strengthens academic freedom, offers economic security, and ensures a strong foundation for faculty participation in shared governance. It fosters and helps sustain academic quality. As a consequence of this commitment, it is the goal of the College, subject to available resources and the needs of its academic programs, to have no more than 30% of undergraduate courses taught by faculty members in Non-tenure Track appointments.

At the same time, the College affirms the vital contributions of faculty members in Non-tenure Track appointments. The College's graduate and professional programs are supported by a wide range of faculty talent and expertise, not all of which is rooted in traditional forms of scholarship. The employment of faculty members who focus on establishing or supervising experiential components of the curriculum grows out of the College's commitment to experiential education. Also, in order to address short-term needs and to preserve a capacity for responding to evolving needs, including unanticipated shifts in enrollment, the College also acknowledges that some faculty appointments will necessarily be contingent on the needs of the College. All Non-tenure Track appointments are intended to be temporary and are subject to review. The different types of Non-tenure Track appointments, ranging from short term (Adjunct and Fixed Term

Appointments) to continuing contingent appointments (Special Appointments), are outlined in Section 6.1.2.

All members of the Faculty are afforded certain rights and responsibilities as outlined in Section 2 and Section 3 of this Faculty Handbook, including the right of Academic Freedom.

Faculty appointments may be full-time or part-time. The normal load for one full-time faculty member is referred to as one full-time equivalent (FTE). Faculty workload includes expectations beyond teaching that vary by position type. Typically, the teaching component of one full-time faculty FTE consists of 6 courses per year: the instructional component of full-time faculty FTE is thus often measured in sixths. Given Augsburg's commitment to a holistic model for full-time faculty, the tenure track faculty workload includes not only teaching but also scholarship, and all faculty are expected to participate in service, advising, and in shared governance, as appropriate to the specific position. Faculty members with significant non-teaching duties assigned by the College that extend well beyond the usual expectations for service or scholarship may be assigned reduced teaching duties. This is common, for example, for some Department Chairs and for some faculty in Special Appointments. Appointments of 5/6 FTE or greater are considered "full-time," whereas appointments of less than 5/6 FTE are considered "part-time."

For each type of appointment, the request for a position normally originates from the Chair, in consultation with the Department, to the Dean. Upon approval of the position, the Department Chair works with the Dean to conduct a search in accordance with guidelines provided by the Offices of Academic Affairs and Human Resources. For searches for full-time or part-time paid "on scale" appointments, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Department, works with the Dean to form the search committee. For all searches, the Department Chair or her or his designate(s), in consultation with members of their Department, recommends a candidate to the Dean. While the Dean has authority to appoint a candidate to a Non-tenure Track position, final authority for appointment to a Tenure Track position resides with the President. Exceptional circumstances in which a Non-tenure Track faculty member may be appointed to a Tenure Track position without search are outlined in Section 6.1.3. Hiring with Tenure may be done in exceptional circumstances and is outlined in Section 6.1.1.

By February 1 of each year the Dean's Office will provide the Faculty Senate with information on proportionality including head count and percentage of courses taught by faculty in part-time Non-tenure Track, full-time Non-tenure Track, and Tenure Track appointments, both of the Faculty as a whole and broken down by Departments/Programs or in other ways that the Faculty Senate might request so that the Faculty Senate can monitor the proportionality.

6.1.1 Tenure Track Appointments

Tenure Track positions are those that are intended to lead to a permanent, tenured position at the College, if the appointed candidate receives positive recommendations on all required reviews.

Comment [Office2]: Eventual updates of Dean/Provost language will occur. But the changes will not be requested in this round of updates.

Formatted: Highlight

Normally, Tenure Track appointments are the result of a national search and are for full-time positions. (Section 6.1.3 addresses circumstances in which a Tenure Track faculty appointment may be made without search.) In those rare, qualified cases in which a part-time Tenure Track position is granted, the fraction of full time of a final appointment will depend on the needs of the College and will normally be at least 3/6 FTE.

Within Tenure Track appointments there are two levels of status: Probationary and Tenured. Faculty members appointed to a Tenure Track position are granted Probationary Status during the period prior to their Tenure Review. During each year of the Probationary Period there is no guarantee of an appointment for the following year. Notification dates for non-reappointment are: March 1 in the first year, December 15 in the second year, and September 1 in the third and subsequent years of full-time appointments. Continuing appointment while in Probationary Status typically depends on receiving positive reviews, including the First Year Review and Third Year Review, as required. Faculty members are normally reviewed for Tenure after completing the appropriate probationary Tenure Track period. ~~In exceptional cases, a senior appointment may be to a Tenured position. (See Section 6.2.1.H.)~~ Final authority for appointment to Tenured Status resides with the President subject to subsequent approval by the Board of Regents.

Formatted: Not Strikethrough

Formatted: Not Strikethrough

In rare circumstances, a faculty member in a Tenure Track appointment might want to be converted to a Non-tenure Track appointment. Such a request must be based on a significant change in the needs of the Department, not a negative (or anticipated negative) performance review. Such a change must be requested by the faculty member, approved by a 2/3 majority vote of the other Tenure Track faculty members of the Department, and is subject to approval by the Dean.

6.1.2 Non-Tenure Track Appointments

The policies in this section are intended to articulate the College's commitment to its Non-tenure Track faculty and to provide as much stability as possible for those faculty members in long-term appointments, while maintaining the contingency on the needs of the Department and the College that define Non-tenure Track appointments. To acknowledge the distinctive expectations for Non-tenure Track faculty in different roles, the College identifies three categories of Non-tenure Track faculty appointments: Adjunct, Fixed-term, and Special. Faculty members in Fixed-term and Special Appointments may be hired full-time or part-time paid "on scale." Adjunct faculty members are part-time, paid "by the course."

6.1.2 A Adjunct Appointments

Adjunct Appointments are, by definition, part-time appointments whose duties are limited to teaching one or two courses per semester, up to a maximum of four courses (4/6 FTE) per academic year. Faculty members in Adjunct Appointments are paid "by the course." Continued

appointment is contingent on the needs of the Department and the College. While the College attempts to provide reasonable notice of non re-appointment, Adjunct Appointments are highly enrollment dependent and, therefore, may change on short notice.

6.1.2 B Fixed-term Appointments

Fixed-term Appointments enable the College to employ full-time, or nearly full-time, faculty members to meet short-term instructional needs. Fixed term appointments last one to three years, are intended to end on an established date, and carry no expectation of continued appointment beyond that time. Under exceptional circumstances, and subject to positive review at year three, up to six years may be arranged.

Fixed-term Appointments usually carry the titles “Visiting Instructor” or “Visiting Assistant Professor,” the latter for candidates holding the terminal degree and expected to be engaged in scholarship during the appointment. The titles “Visiting Associate Professor,” “Visiting Professor,” or “Visiting Distinguished Professor” may be used for distinguished visitors, including visiting faculty members holding tenure at another college or university.

6.1.2 C Special Appointments

Special Appointments carry the expectation of continued appointment, subject to the needs of the Department and the College and positive reviews. Continued appointment may also depend on factors such as external funding (e.g. grants). Depending on the needs of the Department and the College, the position might or might not be anticipated to extend beyond three years. (Normally, if a certain end date of three years or fewer years is known, then a Fixed-term appointment is more appropriate.) Notification dates for non-reappointment are: March 1 in the first year, December 15 in the second year, and September 1 in the third and subsequent years of full-time or part-time paid “on scale” appointments. These notification deadlines also apply to any proposed reduction or increase in required FTE associated with the position or any significant change in expectations for the position. Faculty members in Special Appointments may be offered renewable three-year appointments or renewable annual appointments, depending on the needs of the Department and the College. For the sake of continuity in staffing for the Department and job security for the faculty member, three-year appointments should be offered whenever reasonably supported by the needs of the Department and the College.

Special Appointments enable the college to employ faculty members who provide specific expertise or who establish or teach in programs where short-term need that may extend beyond three years is anticipated, but long-term need is uncertain. These faculty members serve in different roles from Tenure Track faculty members; expectations are outlined in Section 6.12. While one FTE corresponds to a teaching load of six courses, some faculty members in Special Appointments who support experiential components of the curriculum have a significant portion of their workload dedicated to collaborating with students or faculty in research or creative

projects; or establishing, coordinating, supervising, or mentoring student experiences such as internships, practica, preceptorships, student teaching, work study, service-learning, or study abroad. Thus, their teaching load might be significantly fewer than six courses, depending on the amount of administrative and other assignments, and may focus on teaching experiential courses such as science laboratories or studio courses in the fine arts.

Departments are responsible for proposing titles for faculty members in Special Appointments that reflect the nature of the work, such as “scholar in residence,” “artist in residence,” “scientist in residence,” “clinical faculty,” “education specialist,” “lecturer,” etc. Such titles should be consistent with expectations for the position and in common use at other colleges, and are subject to the approval of the Dean.

6.1.3 Eligibility of Non-tenure Track Faculty for Appointment to Tenure Track Positions

If a Department is granted a new Tenure Track position, the Department will normally conduct a national search. Any faculty member in a Non-tenure Track position with the required educational preparation is eligible to apply. Any candidate currently appointed to a Non-tenure Track position who applies for the Tenure Track position is to be given comparable consideration to any external candidate.

While a search is the preferred mode of hiring into Tenure Track, the College recognizes that there might be exceptional circumstances in which it would be beneficial to the College to appoint a person into a Tenure Track position without conducting a new search. For example, hiring without search might be appropriate to retain a faculty member with a highly specialized area of expertise or in a Department where it has proved challenging to hire and/or retain qualified tenured faculty members. Such “conversions” must be proposed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the Department, and approved by the Dean; they require that the faculty member meet the requirements for the Tenure Track position (e.g. terminal degree, promise of scholarship).

On occasion, a search committee’s choice for a Tenure Track appointment may be a candidate who does not yet hold the terminal degree. The candidate may be hired into a Tenure Track position, with the usual expectation of completing the terminal degree by the end of the first year of the appointment as outlined in Section 6.3A. Alternatively, upon recommendation of the Department the Dean may offer a one-year Fixed-term, Non-tenure Track appointment, renewable for one additional year, with the understanding that the position will convert to Tenure Track at the beginning of the academic year following completion of the terminal degree, subject to the usual positive reviews. This alternative allows a faculty member up to two years to complete the terminal degree before assuming the full duties of a Tenure Track position.

6.2 General Statement on Review Processes of Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members are expected to regularly reflect on their performance, set goals for their work, and undergo evaluation by students, peers, and the leadership of the College. These reviews include Student Evaluation and Peer Review of teaching and Annual Reviews required of all faculty members; and required formal reviews of Tenure Track faculty members—First Year Review, Third Year Review, Tenure Review and Promotion to Associate Professor, Post-tenure Review, and, if nominated, Promotion to Professor.

This section outlines the expectations for performance and promise at each level of review; the procedures for reviews and appeals including timing and timelines; relevant criteria for evaluation; and detailed requirements for review materials. As such, this section is intended for many different audiences: the candidate undergoing review; department chairs who provide input to all reviews and conduct the First Year Review; the members of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP) who conduct Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews; the Dean who participates in all reviews and conducts Post-Tenure Reviews; the President and Board of Regents who have final authority on Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion decisions; and all other faculty members, staff, and students who provide input to various reviews.

Note: If the candidate has questions about the review process, she or he is encouraged to consult with her or his Department Chair or Dean. If the Department Chair has questions about the review process and the duties of the Chair in this process, she or he may consult with the Dean and/or her or his representative on the Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Personnel Policies. If the CTP has questions about the review process, they may consult with the Dean and/or the Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Personnel Policies. If the Dean, the President, or the Board of Regents has questions about the review process, they may consult with the Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Personnel Policies.

6.2.1 Timing and Nature of Reviews

All reviews of faculty members include both formative and summative elements. We define a review to be “primarily formative” if the primary purpose of the review is to provide feedback to the faculty member to assist in improving their performance. We define a review to be “primarily summative” if the primary purpose of the review is to decide on continued employment or rank.

6.2.1.A Timing and Nature of Annual Reviews

All members of the faculty are expected to engage in self, student, and peer evaluation of their teaching as part of their Annual Reviews (as outlined in Section 6.5). While these reviews are primarily formative, the findings may contribute to decisions about continuing appointment, especially in the case of Non-tenure Track faculty members, and also for Tenure Track faculty

members during the Probationary Period. The Annual Reports are used by the CTP and Dean in subsequent reviews, including summative reviews. For part-time, Non-tenure Track faculty members Annual Reviews are required biennially.

Departments may develop additional procedures for primarily formative reviews that are consistent with this Faculty Handbook.

6.2.1.B Timing and Nature of First Year Review

First Year Review (as outlined in Section 6.6) is required for all tenure track faculty members in their first year of a Tenure Track appointment. While First Year Review is primarily summative in nature, in the case of a positive First Year Review, feedback is provided to the candidate for primarily formative purposes

6.2.1.C Timing and Nature of Third Year Review

Third Year Review (as outlined in Section 6.7) is typically required for all tenure track faculty members in their third year of full-time employment in a Tenure Track position with the College who were hired at the rank of Assistant Professor. While the Third Year Review is primarily summative in nature, in the case of a positive Third Year Review, feedback is provided to the candidate for formative purposes. In limited cases of a positive Third Year Review, where significant concerns remain, there are additional expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews prior to a Tenure Review (as outlined in Section 6.7.5). These additional expectations are primarily formative.

6.2.1.D Timing and Nature of Tenure Review

Tenure Review (as outlined in Section 6.8) is typically required for all tenure track faculty members in their sixth year of full-time employment in a Tenure Track position with the College who were hired at the rank of Assistant Professor; in their third year of full-time employment in a Tenure Track position with the College who were hired at the rank of Associate Professor; and in their second year of full-time employment in a Tenure Track position with the College who were hired at the rank of Professor. The Tenure Review is primarily summative.

At the time of hiring a faculty member with significant prior relevant experience into a position at the rank of Assistant Professor, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, may negotiate with the candidate for earlier timing for the Tenure Review, typically subject to the expectation that the faculty member will complete at least six years of full-time employment in an academic position at the rank of Assistant Professor, at least three of which were at the College, prior to Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Any agreement for mandatory early Tenure Review must be given in writing by the Dean to the candidate and a copy provided

to the Department Chair. In the case of mandatory early Tenure Review, the Third Year Review may be moved earlier (or skipped) as specified in writing. Candidates hired at the rank of Assistant Professor with exceptional performance and promise may also elect to move their Tenure Review earlier in the Probationary Period, after consultation with their Department Chair and the Dean.

For faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor in a Tenure Track appointment, promotion to Associate Professor is awarded concurrent to a positive Tenure Review. Faculty members are not otherwise eligible for promotion to Associate Professor during the Probationary Period except by undergoing Tenure Review. That is, there is no separate review for promotion to Associate Professor prior to the Tenure Review (see Section 6.8).

For faculty members tenured before the practice of concurrent promotion to Associate Professor was in effect, and who continue to hold rank of Assistant Professor, the Dean nominates the faculty member for Promotion to Associate Professor if deemed appropriate following a Post-tenure Review of the faculty member and in consultation with the Department Chair. If nominated, the faculty member follows the usual process for Tenure Review and Review for Promotion to Associate Professor, except that his or her tenured status remains intact. In particular, the Areas for Evaluations in Section 6.3.1, Criteria for Evaluation in Section 6.3.2, and Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor in Section 6.8.2 are identical to the current standards for Tenure. If not nominated, the faculty member works with the Dean and his or her Department Chair to determine if and when the next Post-tenure Review should occur with an eye towards possible nomination for Promotion to Associate Professor at that time. No faculty member who continues to hold rank of Assistant Professor is required to undergo Review for Promotion to Associate Professor.

Comment [Office3]: Hyphen inserted

6.2.1.E Timing and Nature of Post Tenure Review

Post-tenure Review (outlined in Section 6.9) is required of all tenured faculty members. Normally the first Post-tenure Review occurs in the fifth year of a tenured appointment. Subsequently the Post-tenure Review occurs every seventh year, with the clock restarting if the candidate is promoted to Professor. A faculty member may request early Post-tenure Review subject to approval by the Department Chair and Dean, for example, to a year prior to anticipated Review for Promotion to Professor. While the Post-tenure Review is primarily formative, in cases where significant concerns arise, the Dean may require additional expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews including an accelerated schedule for the next Post-tenure Review (see Section 6.9.4).

6.2.1.F Timing and Nature of Review for Promotion to Professor

Review for Promotion to Professor (outlined in Section 6.10) requires nomination of the faculty member (see Section 6.10.1). Typically a faculty member will have completed at least six years

of full-time employment in a tenured position at the rank of Associate Professor, at least three of which were at the College, prior to promotion to Professor. While the Review for Promotion to Professor is primarily summative, a negative decision does not affect continued employment with the College. Faculty members who receive a negative decision at the time of Review for Promotion to Professor may be nominated for consideration again in subsequent years. In such cases, candidates are normally expected to have undergone Post-tenure Review between Reviews for Promotion to Professor. As indicated in Section 6.2.1.E, faculty members may request early Post-tenure Review subject to approval by the Department Chair and Dean for this purpose. No faculty member is required to undergo Review for Promotion to Professor.

6.2.1.G Suspending the Normal Schedule for Review

A candidate has the right to suspend the normal schedule for Third Year Review or Tenure Review during any year in which the candidate in the Probationary Period of a Tenure Track Appointment holds a part-time appointment. In qualified circumstances, a candidate may request to suspend the normal schedule for Third Year Review or Tenure Review for up to two years in cases where the candidate in the Probationary Period of a Tenure Track Appointment holds a full-time appointment. Such postponement is subject to approval by the Dean, with notification to the Department Chair. In either case, suspension of the normal schedule is typically for, but not limited to, situations discussed in Section 7.4 on Personal Leaves. Under such circumstances, the College may not allow such a delay to have a negative effect upon the candidate's consideration for review. This provision does not apply if the candidate's leave is of such length that her or his appointment may warrant termination. Nothing within this, or any provision of the Faculty Handbook, alters the requirements of the FMLA or any other Federal or State law.

6.2.1.H Timing and Nature of Review for Hiring with Tenure

Senior appointments at the rank of associate or full professor may be eligible, when such appointments meet the needs of the College, for tenure at the time of hiring. The potential hire seeking tenure with advanced rank should submit an abbreviated portfolio to the appointing Department and the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, consisting of written materials submitted as part of the application, a curriculum vitae, and written responses to any additional requested materials. Tenured faculty from the departmental home and the Committee on Tenure and Promotion will review the candidate's portfolio to determine whether the candidate meets Augsburg's tenure and promotion criteria. As part of its review, the Department and Committee on Tenure and Promotion will make a recommendation regarding appropriate rank in consultation with the Provost and/or President in the context of Augsburg's standards for tenure and promotion. The recommendations from the Department and the Committee on Tenure and Promotion are advisory to the hiring officials.

6.2.2 Substitution for the Department or Division Chair or Other Members of the Department in Review Processes

Deleted:

In qualified circumstances, substitutions for the Department or Division Chair or other members of the candidate's department are necessary in the review process. In subsequent sections of Section 6, any reference to the Department or Division Chair and members of the department is intended to apply to their substitutes, if appointed. This section outlines the circumstances requiring substitution and process for appointing substitutes.

6.2.2.A Substitution for the Department Chair

When the Department Chair is not eligible to participate in that role for a review (for example, if the Department Chair is the candidate or if the Department Chair does not hold sufficient Status or Rank), the Dean appoints a substitute for the role of Department Chair, typically a faculty member of the Department who meets the eligibility for the particular review (in terms of rank and/or status), often a previous Department Chair.

6.2.2.B Substitution for the Division Chair

When the Division Chair is ineligible to participate in that role for a review (for example, if the Division Chair is the candidate, the Department Chair, or in the candidate's department or if the Division Chair does not hold sufficient Status or Rank), the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair, appoints a substitute for the role of Division Chair, typically a senior faculty member from the candidate's Division who meets the eligibility for the particular review (in terms of rank and/or status), often another Department Chair or previous Division Chair.

6.2.2.C Substitution for Other Members of the Department

When there is not a sufficient number of department members eligible to participate in that role for a review (for example, in a very small department or in a department in which few faculty members hold sufficient Status or Rank), the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the Division Chair, appoints substitutes for the role of members of the department, typically senior faculty members from the candidate's Division who are eligible to participate in the review. When possible, priority is given to substitutes knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise.

6.2.3 Timelines for Review

In most cases, unless the Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP) needs more information, or an extension is approved by the Provost, the following timelines will be followed.

NOTE: When date indicated below falls on a weekend, the first business day after is understood to be the deadline.

First Year (Section 6.6)

Date

Documents to Department Chair (Section 6.6.4).....January 15
 Dept. Chair forms Dept. Review Committee (Section 6.6.5).....Completed by January 15
 Documents to Dept. Review Committee (Section 6.6.5).....January 29
 Department Chair Schedules Department Review
 Committee Meeting (Section 6.6.5).....Completed by January 29
 Department Review Committee Meeting (Section 6.6.5).....Completed by February 15
 Submit Recommendation to Dean (Section 6.6.5).....February 22
 Dean informs Candidate and Department Chair
 of the Decision (Section 6.6.6).....March 1
 Dept. Chair Provides Draft of Review Letter to the
 Dept. Review Committee Members (Section 6.6.6).....Completed by March 8
 Department Review Letter to the Dean
 and the Candidate (Section 6.6.6).....March 15
Department Chair conversation with faculty member.....Completed by May 15

Third Year (Section 6.7)

Candidate Informs Dean of Letter Writers (Section 6.7.3).....September ~~1~~ 15
 Dept. Chair Notifies Dean & Candidate of the members of the
 Third Year Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.7.4).....September ~~1~~ 15
Dean Approves Committee and Notifies Chair and Candidate.....September 15
 Documents to Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.7.4).....~~January 15~~ February 1
 Departmental Review Committee Meeting (Section 6.7.4).....Completed by February ~~1~~ 15
 Dept. Chair Provides Draft of Departmental Report to the
 Review Committee Members (Section 6.7.4)Completed by February ~~15~~ 22
 Departmental Report to CTP (Section 6.7.4).....~~February 22~~ March 1
 Materials to CTP (by candidate) (Section 6.7.3).....~~February 22~~ March 1
 Reference Letters to CTP (Section 6.7.3).....~~February 22~~ March 1
Dean's Report due to CTP.....February 28
 CTP Interview and Decision (Section 6.7.5).....Completed by April 20
 Dean Notifies Candidate (Section 6.7.5).....~~May 1~~ April 30

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Appeal of Negative Decision (Section 6.2.4)

Request of Subjects Discussed.....May 5
 Letter of Subjects discussed due to Candidate.....May 15
 Reply and Invoke Right to Reconsideration.....May 22
 CTP Resubmits Decision to the Dean & Candidate.....June ~~10~~ 8
 Written Appeal Submitted to Dean and President.....June ~~15~~ 13
 President Notifies Candidate and Dean.....~~July 1~~ June 23
Notification of Terminal contract (if necessary; could be rescinded if appeal prevails)...May 15

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Section 6.8)

Candidate provides the Dean with a list of potential disciplinary external reviewers..... May 1
 (the spring *prior* to colleagues who are in a position to conduct an external tenure review) review
 of scholarship (Section 6.8.3)
 Candidate Informs Dean of Letter Writers (Section 6.8.3)..... May 1
 (the spring *prior* to
 tenure review)
 Dept. Chair Notifies Dean & Candidate of the members of the May 1 (the spring *prior* to
 Tenure Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.8.4) tenure review)
 Reference Letter on Scholarship to the Dean’s Office September ~~1~~ 14
 (Section 6.8.3)
 Dean’s Office Forwards Reference Letter on Scholarship September ~~5~~ 21
 to the Departmental Review Committee and CTP
 (Section 6.8.3; see also Sections 6.4.5 and 6.4.6.B)
 Documents to Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.8.4)..... September ~~10~~ 21
 Departmental Review Committee Meeting (Section 6.8.4)..... Completed by September 25
~~October 8~~
 Dept. Chair Provides Draft of Departmental Report to the Completed by October ~~5~~ 15
 Review Committee Members (Section 6.8.4)
 Departmental Report to CTP (Section 6.8.4)..... October ~~15~~ 22
 Materials to CTP (by candidate) (Section 6.8.3)..... October ~~15~~ 22
 Reference Letters to CTP (Section 6.8.3)..... October ~~15~~ 22
Dean’s Report due to CTP.....October 20
 CTP Interview and Decision (Section 6.8.5)..... Completed by January 15
CTP Notifies Provost.....Completed by January 15
~~Dean CTP~~ Notifies Candidate (Section 6.8.5)..... Completed by ~~January 20~~ February 1
 Board of Regents Approves or Disapproves (Section 6.8.5)..... Completed by May 30

Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough

Appeal of Negative Decision (Section 6.2.4)

Request of Subjects Discussed. ~~February 5~~ five business days after notification of CTP decision
 Letter of Subjects discussed due to Candidate February ~~1~~ 15
 Reply and Invoke Right to Reconsideration February ~~8~~ 22
 CTP Resubmits Decision to the Dean and Candidate March ~~1~~ 15
CTP Notifies Candidate.....March 6
 Written Appeal Submitted to ~~Dean Provost~~ and President March ~~15~~ 20
 President/Provost Notifies Candidate and Dean March ~~31~~ 30
Board of Regents Ratification.....May 15
Notification of Terminal Contract (if necessary; rescinded if appeal prevails).....May 15

Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough
 Formatted: Strikethrough

Review for Promotion to Professor (Section 6.10)

Nominating letter to the Dean, Chair, and/or Candidate February 1 (the spring *prior* (see Section 6.10.1) promotion review)

Candidate provides the Dean with a list of disciplinary May 1 (the spring *prior* to colleagues who are in a position to conduct an external promotion review) review of scholarship (Section 6.10.3)

Candidate Informs Dean of Letter Writers (Section 6.10.3)..... May 1 (the spring *prior* to promotion review)

Dept. Chair Notifies Dean & Candidate of the members of the May 1 (the spring *prior* to Promotion Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.10.4) promotion review)

Reference Letter on Scholarship to the Dean’s Office September ~~1~~ ¹⁴
(Section 6.10.3)

Dean’s Office Forwards Reference Letter on Scholarship September ~~5~~ ²¹
to the Departmental Review Committee and CTP
(Section 6.10.3; see also Sections 6.4.5 and 6.4.6.B)

Documents to Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.10.4)... September ~~10~~ ²¹
Departmental Review Committee Meeting (Section 6.10.4)..... Completed by ~~September 25~~
~~October 8~~

Dept. Chair Provides Draft of Departmental Report to the Completed by October ~~5~~ ¹⁵
Review Committee Members (Section 6.10.4)

Departmental Report to CTP (Section 6.10.4)..... October ~~15~~ ²²

Materials to CTP (by candidate) (Section 6.10.3)..... October ~~15~~ ²²

Reference Letters to CTP (Section 6.10.3)..... October ~~15~~ ²²

~~Dean’s Report due to CTP..... October 20~~

CTP Interview and Decision (Section 6.10.5)..... Completed by January 15

~~CTP Notifies Provost and President Completed by January 15~~

~~Dean CTP Notifies Candidate and President (Section 6.10.5)..... Completed by January~~
~~20 February 1~~

Board of Regents Approves or Disapproves (Section 6.10.5)..... Completed by May 30

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Appeal of Negative Decision (Section 6.2.4)

Request of Subjects Discussed February ~~5~~ ^{five business days}
~~after notification of CTP decision~~

Letter of Subjects Discussed due to Candidate February ~~1~~ ¹⁵

Reply and Invoke Right to Reconsideration February ~~8~~ ²²

CTP Resubmits Decision to the ~~Provost, Dean and Candidate~~ March ~~1~~ ¹⁵

~~CTP Notifies Candidate..... March 6~~

Written Appeal Submitted to ~~Dean, Provost~~ and President March ~~15~~ ²⁰

President Notifies Candidate and Dean March ~~31~~ ³⁰

~~Board of Regents Ratification..... May 15~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Sabbatical and Academic Leaves (Section 6.11)

Letter to Dept. Chair and Dean (Section 6.11.56)..... ~~September 1~~ ~~May 15~~ (of the year ~~prior to sabbatical decision~~ ~~the year prior to the anticipated leave~~)
Dept. submits FTE leave plan to Dean if requesting ~~exceptional situation resources (Section 6.11.4)~~..... ~~October 1~~ ~~May 15~~ (of the year of ~~prior to sabbatical decision~~ ~~the year prior to the anticipated leave~~)
~~Dean recommendation to Provost~~.....~~October 15~~
~~Provost acts on Dean’s recommendation, prepares materials for Board~~.....~~November 15~~
Board of Regents Approves Leave (Section 6.11.56).....~~Winter~~ ~~Fall~~ Meeting
Dean notifies Candidate of leave decision (Section 6.11.56).....~~one week following Board of Regents’ Winter meeting~~ ~~November 1~~
Faculty Member Makes Formal, Public Presentation~~during the academic year~~ of his or her Work (Section 6.11.67)~~following sabbatical leave~~ ~~May 1~~ (of the ~~year~~ ~~subsequent to the sabbatical~~)

Formatted: Strikethrough
Comment [Office4]: Not added, just moved due to formatting.
Deleted: -exceptional situation resources (Section 6.11.3)
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough
Deleted: May 1 (of the year
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough

Annual Review (Section 6.5)

Dept. Meeting Focusing on Annual Review (Section 6.5.3)..... Completed by May 30
Faculty Members Submit Annual Report to the August 1
Dean and Department Chair (Sections 6.5.3 and 6.5.4)
Probationary Tenure Track Faculty Have Annual Review Completed by August 1
Meeting With the Department Chair (Section 6.5.3)

Post-Tenure Review (Section 6.9)

Documents to Dean and Department Chair (Section 6.9.3)..... ~~July 1~~ ~~end of first week of~~ ~~term when review is held~~
Review Meeting with the Dean (Section 6.9.4)..... ~~Completed by July 29~~ ~~four weeks later~~
Dean Informs Candidate of his or her Evaluation (Section 6.9.4) ... ~~August 15~~ ~~four weeks later~~

Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough
Formatted: Strikethrough

6.2.4 General Appellate Rights and Procedures

Candidates undergoing Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews have (1) the right to request a Statement of Subjects Discussed by the CTP, (2) the right to reply to the Statement of Subjects Discussed and the right to reconsideration of a negative CTP recommendation, and (3) the right to appeal the recommendation of CTP upon its reconsideration.

Candidates have a right to a written Statement of Subjects Discussed during the CTP’s consideration of their review. Candidates must make this request in writing to the CTP no later

than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. CTP must supply the candidate with a written statement of subjects discussed no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. This statement must not indicate how individual committee members voted.

Candidates have a right to reply to the Statement of Subjects Discussed and to have the CTP reconsider its recommendation. If candidates choose to reply and invoke their right to reconsideration, they must do so in writing no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. This written reply should be in the form of a letter to CTP. The Statements of Subjects Discussed, the candidate's written reply, and all subsequent written records of reconsideration and other documentation become part of the materials on the candidate kept by the Dean's office.

The membership of CTP for reconsideration and subsequent deliberations should be the same as during the original review, whenever possible. The CTP must decide on whether or not to change the original recommendation no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. Within the same time limitations, the CTP must also inform the candidate and the Dean in writing regarding the final recommendation.

Candidates have the right to appeal the results of CTP reconsideration. If candidates wish to appeal, they must inform the Dean and President in writing no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. This written notice of the candidate's appeal must also include the reasons why the candidate wishes to appeal the CTP recommendation upon reconsideration. The President subsequently will consider the candidate's appeal in consultation with the Dean. By the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews, the President will notify the candidate and Dean of the results of the appeal.

6.3 Criteria for Evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members

6.3.1 General Statement on Areas for Evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members

In accordance with the By-Laws of the Faculty Constitution (as it appears in Section 9 of this Handbook, see 9.1.1 Article I), the qualifications of Tenure Track faculty members will be judged by performance in the following areas.

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service
4. Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College
5. Educational Preparation
6. Employment History and Time in Rank
7. Professional Qualities

Given Augsburg's fundamental commitment to teaching and learning, Teaching is of utmost priority in evaluation of faculty performance and, thus, expectations for performance in the area of Teaching are very high. Performance in Scholarship and Service are of high priority and, thus, expectations for performance in the areas of Scholarship and Service are high. In most reviews, Scholarship and Service are considered of equal importance, but the College recognizes that over the career of a faculty member, there may be periods during which the faculty member focuses more attention on one of these areas over the other.

6.3.2 General Statement on Criteria for Defining and Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Three major criteria for the evaluation of Tenure Track faculty members are Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. This section provides criteria that both define what the College considers "Teaching," what the College considers "Scholarship," and what the college considers "Service;" and how the College evaluates the quality of those activities in the review of Tenure Track faculty members.

Faculty members engage in a variety of activities, often including activities that overlap these separately defined categories. In fact, the College encourages activities that bridge these categories such as scholarship that informs teaching, or service work that builds on a candidate's scholarship. For the purpose of review, however, activities are separated into these categories.

The College intends for these criteria to apply to a wide range of disciplines. However, the College interprets these criteria as applying to each candidate under review. As such, they are quite general. In addition, it is recognized that the terminology used in the criteria are necessarily qualitative and subjective.

6.3.3 Criteria for Teaching

Augsburg faculty members aspire to be excellent teachers, both in and out of the classroom. The overarching goal is student learning. We recognize that teaching occurs in courses, independent studies, the Augsburg Seminar, advising, mentoring, and the direction of student research, internships, practicums, and study abroad. We expect all faculty members to be engaged in advising and mentoring activities, in addition to their assigned courses. Teaching is evaluated on the quality of performance in each of the following areas:

1. Design and On-going Development

- a. Current perspective on subject matter and pedagogies in the discipline.
- b. Student learning objectives, incorporating departmental and general education objectives, if relevant.

- c. Content knowledge level appropriate to the student learning objectives and level of the course (100, 200, 300/400, graduate).
- d. Overall organization of the course, which includes clarity in defining student responsibilities, expectations for assignments and examinations.
- e. Readings, experiences, and other resources appropriate to the student learning objectives and level of the course.
- f. Assessment of student learning (i.e. course grading practices) appropriate to the student learning objectives and level of the course.
- g. Course design that reflects the diverse needs of our students

2. Teaching Practice

- a. Knowledge of the subject matter.
- b. Class/studio/lab delivery including the ability to use a variety of teaching techniques as needed to meet course objectives and diverse student needs and learning styles, encouraging student participation, exhibiting passion and enthusiasm, clarity in presentation.
- c. Organization including effective use of time, preparedness, flexibility, etc.
- d. Timely feedback, availability to students outside of class (e.g., for office hours), responsive to assessments and evaluations.
- e. Interaction with students demonstrating respect, fairness, objectivity, integrity, open-mindedness, and nurturing a supportive yet challenging environment.

3. Student Learning

- a. Knowledge of content as outlined in student learning objectives.
- b. Engagement during class and in classroom/studio/lab activities.
- c. Work and engagement outside of the classroom.
- d. Level of critical thinking.
- e. Ability to communicate through speaking, writing, creative performance, etc.

4. Advising and Mentoring

- a. Availability to students.
- b. Knowledge of college and major degree requirements.
- c. Guidance and advice.
- d. Letters of recommendation on behalf of students and alums.
- e. Effort and engagement in the advising and mentoring process.

Professional Development in the Area of Teaching: In addition to these four criteria, the College recognizes the importance of professional development in the area of teaching as a critical component of every faculty member's responsibility. Such professional development

includes a pattern of participation in Augsburg, discipline-sponsored, or additional professional development activities intended to improve one's performance in the area of teaching.

On an on-going basis, the areas of Design and On-going Development, Teaching Practice, Student Learning, and Advising and Mentoring are documented in peer reviews (see Section 6.5.2) and the reflective portion of the Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4). The areas of Teaching Practice and Advising and Mentoring are also documented through the Student Course Evaluations (see Section 3.2.8). The area of Professional Development in the Area of Teaching is documented in the factual and reflective portions of the Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4).

At the point of review, all four criteria, as well as professional development in the area of teaching, are documented by the candidate in the Written Personal Statement (see Section 6.4.4) and subsequently evaluated by the Departmental Review Committee in the Departmental Report (see Section 6.4.5), by the reviewers focusing on teaching in their letters of reference (see Section 6.4.6.A), and by the CTP.

6.3.4 Criteria for Scholarship

Augsburg faculty members aspire to be active scholars. The overarching goal is contributing to the discipline/profession. We recognize that scholarship takes many forms including scholarship of discovery, application, integration, and the scholarship of teaching and learning (see Ernest Boyer's book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, 1997, as well as Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff's book *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, 1997). While Augsburg values professional activity, not all such work is considered Scholarship.

Each academic department has a Department Statement on Scholarship that is kept on file in the Dean's office. All members of the faculty may view any Department's Statement. Each Department Chair provides a current copy of their respective Statement to every tenure track member of his or her department. Departments are responsible for periodically reviewing these statements to make sure they reflect the current scholarship standards within their discipline(s). In addition, an appropriate faculty committee periodically reviews each statement.

The Department Statement on Scholarship describes the spectrum of scholarly activities recognized and encouraged within their department for all disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas of study represented in that department. These statements should be consistent with national disciplinary standards for what constitutes scholarship in that field. The Statement discusses how the Criteria for Scholarship (see below) apply to scholarship within each department and must specify the range of acceptable possibilities for each criteria.

Augsburg defines a project (body of work) to be scholarship if it meets *all* of the following elements. The quality of each piece of scholarship is evaluated with respect to each of these elements:

1. Presentation to an Audience

“Presentation” includes, but is not limited to, exhibition, performance, paper, speech, publication, workshop, and documentation. In evaluating the quality of presentation, we include the content, organization, delivery of the presentation itself as well as the audience. For example, an audience of experts might be more impressive than a lay audience or a larger/national audience might be more impressive than a smaller/local audience.

2. External Review

Scholarship is considered to be “subject to external review” at the time it is submitted for publication, such as a paper or grant proposal, or performed or exhibited, such as for creative works. Clearly, work receiving a positive review (e.g., accepted for publication, awarded a grant, winning a prize, honor, or recognition, being “well reviewed”) is of much higher value.

3. Creativity/Originality

Scholarship is understood as representing a creative and/or original contribution to one’s discipline. Such contributions produce and advance the discipline. Thus, work that makes significant contributions to the discipline is of much higher value.

4. Expertise Within the Discipline

Scholarship is a means by which to demonstrate one’s expertise within the discipline, demonstrating knowledge and further learning about the subject matter and professional practice. Such scholarship also produces and advances the knowledge of the individual. Thus, work that demonstrates and/or advances a candidate’s expertise, knowledge and learning is of much higher value.

Involvement in the Life of the Discipline: In addition to these four criteria (applied to completed research projects), the College recognizes the importance of involvement in the life of the discipline as a critical component of every faculty member’s responsibility. As such, the College values scholarly works in progress, staying current in one’s field or area(s) of expertise, and engagement within one’s discipline (such as attending conferences).

On an on-going basis, the four criteria for scholarship, as well as involvement in the life of the discipline, are documented by the candidate in the factual and reflective portions of the Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4).

At the point of review, all four criteria, as well as involvement in the life of the discipline, are documented by the candidate in the Written Personal Statement (see Section 6.4.4). These criteria also are evaluated by the external reviewer in the reference letter on scholarship (see Section 6.4.6.B). All four criteria, as well as involvement in the life of the discipline, are evaluated by the Departmental Review Committee in the Departmental Report (see Section 6.4.5) and by the CTP.

6.3.5 Criteria for Service

Augsburg faculty members aspire to excellence in service. Service is expected to reflect a balance between service to the Department, the College, the profession, and the community. We expect members of the faculty to be fully engaged in their departments, the College, their professions, and the wider community beyond the College. Within this overall framework, excellence in service is defined in terms of four dimensions that are the basis of evaluation:

1. Quality and Significance of Contribution

Service activities may be evaluated in terms of the quality of the candidate's performance in those activities as well as in terms of the significance of the candidate's contributions to the group (i.e. committee, task force, team, etc.)

2. Time and Effort

Those service activities that are more demanding in terms of time and effort on the part of the candidate are valued more highly.

3. Centrality to the Mission and Work of the College

For service activities both within and outside the College, priority is given to those that further some aspect of the Mission and/or the work of the College.

4. Involvement in the Life of the College and the Department

Such involvement includes, but is not limited to, regular attendance at department and faculty meetings; attending convocations, graduations, and college events such as theater, sports, and student/faculty/staff-sponsored activities; and attending departmental events such as speakers, events for majors, etc.

On an on-going basis, all four criteria are evaluated by the candidate in the factual and reflective portions of the Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4).

At the point of review, all four criteria are documented by the candidate in the Written Personal Statement (see Section 6.4.4) and subsequently evaluated by the Departmental Review Committee in the Departmental Report (see Section 6.4.5), by the reviewer focusing on service in the reference letter on service (see Section 6.4.6.C), and by the CTP.

6.4 Documentation Submitted for Reviews of Tenure Track Faculty

6.4.1 General Statement on Documentation Submitted for Reviews

At the time of each review, there are two types of documentation submitted: Required and Supporting. In either case, documentation might include written materials provided by the Dean's Office, written materials provided by the candidate, and letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean. All written materials must be submitted by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3).

"Required" documentation refers to those written materials listed as required under the specific requirements for each level of review as outlined in the corresponding section governing that review (see Sections 6.7.3, 6.8.3, 6.9.3 and 6.10.3). "Supporting" documentation are materials that provide evidence in support of claims made by the candidate and, thus, any Supporting Documentation submitted should, at minimum, be specifically referenced within the Written Personal Statement provided by the candidate. Supporting Documentation should be limited to materials the candidate believes are potentially critically important to the review. Supporting Documentation is truly optional and the College should not expect any Supporting Documentation to be submitted. Conversely, the College may place reasonable restrictions on the amount of Supporting Documentation submitted. Candidates are generally discouraged from submitting any materials beyond Required and Supporting Documentation.

Documentation that is required to be provided by the Dean's Office for reviews may include: Student Course Evaluations; reports from the Department Chair from First Year Review or Annual Reviews; letters from the CTP from Third Year Review or Tenure Review and all written materials related to any appeal proceedings; applications for approved sabbatical and academic leaves; written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews; letters from the Dean from Post-tenure Review and any Annual Reviews mandated following Third Year Review or Post-tenure Review. Thus, the Dean's Office maintains a file on each faculty member that includes these materials.

Documentation that is required to be provided by the faculty member for reviews may include: Peer Review reports, Sabbatical Reports, Annual Reports to the Dean including the Cumulative Reports for Post-tenure Review, the official (i.e. approved and available for public review)

Department Statement on Scholarship, a Curriculum Vitae, and Written Personal Statement. Thus, each faculty member is expected to maintain a file that includes these materials.

Documentation also includes letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean and might include a Department Report, Department Minority Report, Required Reference Letters, and Supporting Reference Letters requested by the candidate.

6.4.2 Quick Reference to Descriptions of Documentation

This section provides a quick reference to where descriptions of Documentation appear in this Faculty Handbook.

Annual Report to the Dean Section 6.5.4
Candidate's Curriculum Vitae
Candidate's Written Personal Statement
Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review
Peer Review Reports
Required Reference Letters
Sabbatical Reports
Student Course Evaluations

6.4.3 Candidate's Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae provides the reviewers with a summary of information about the candidate and, thus, should be presented in a manner that makes clear how the candidate's education, experience, and activities fit with the areas for evaluation (See Section 6.3.1) and the standards by level of review (see Sections 6.7.2, 6.8.2, 6.9.2 and 6.10.2). While the candidate's Curriculum Vitae may be organized in any reasonable manner determined by the Candidate, this Curriculum Vitae must list the following information. Candidates are encouraged to follow this ordering when possible.

1. Areas of Interest, Areas of Expertise, or Career Goals
2. Educational Preparation. Includes all degrees earned with institution and date. May include other professional qualifications such as relevant licensure. May include other skills relevant to the position.
3. Employment History. Includes all academic appointments, research or professional appointments, and any other employment history relevant to the position. Time in rank must be clearly identifiable.
4. Teaching
 - a. Courses taught, including names.
 - b. Activities related to course design, development, and improvement.

- c. Advising and mentoring activities. Includes academic advising experience; supervision of internships, practica, undergraduate research, study abroad, or service-learning experiences; and advising to the Augsburg Seminar, student groups including Honor Societies, and other programs for students.
- d. Professional development activities related to teaching.
- e. Honors or awards for teaching, including grants.
- 5. Scholarship
 - a. Scholarly projects and, for each project, activities and products (such as publications, presentations, exhibitions, and performances) related to the project.
 - b. Professional development activities related to scholarship and activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the Discipline/Profession.
 - c. Honors or awards for scholarship, including grants.
- 6. Service
 - a. Formal College service activities. Includes service on committees and other working groups organized by the College that meet on a regular basis.
 - b. Other College service activities.
 - c. Additional activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the College.
 - d. Departmental service activities at the College.
 - e. Additional activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the Department.
 - f. Activities in service to the Profession or Discipline.
 - g. Activities in service to the surrounding community.
 - h. Honors or awards for service, including grants.
- 7. Other information relevant to the position.
- 8.

6.4.4 Candidate's Written Personal Statement

The candidate's Written Personal Statement provides the reviewers with the candidate's vision of his or her vocation, reflection on and evaluation of his or her accomplishments in reference to the areas for Areas for Evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members (See Section 6.3.1) and the Expectations by Level of Review (see Sections 6.7.2, 6.8.2, and 6.10.2), and his or her vision for the future. The Written Personal Statement should be presented in a manner that helps the reviewers get to know the candidate as a professional; interpret the educational preparation, employment history, and activities listed on the candidate's Curriculum Vitae in a broader context; and learn about the candidate's future plans.

While the Written Personal Statement may be organized in any reasonable manner determined by the Candidate, this Written Personal Statement must address the following areas of evaluation:

- 1. Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College and Department: The personal statement must address the candidate's perception of his or her fit with the mission and goals of the College as well as the mission and goals of the Department.

2. Teaching: The personal statement must address teaching, including an overall discussion of the candidate's teaching philosophy, approach to course design and ongoing development, teaching practice, student learning, advising and mentoring, and professional development (see Section 6.3.3).
3. Scholarship: The personal statement must address the candidate's scholarship. This includes a descriptive account of the candidate's scholarly projects, including the steps the candidate has taken and the types of products developed. It should include a statement on how the candidate's scholarship meets the disciplinary standards for scholarship as described in the Department Statement on Scholarship. The candidate should explain how each project demonstrates the criteria for scholarly activity (see Section 6.3.4). The candidate should also assess her or his progress/performance on these projects in terms of these criteria. In addition, the candidate should discuss her or his ambitions for projects currently under way and how they fit within the overall trajectory of the candidate's scholarship and academic career. This narrative statement should also include a discussion of the candidate's scholarship plan for future activity.
4. Service: The personal statement must address the candidate's service activity. This is a descriptive account of the candidate's service activity. The candidate should explain how these activities demonstrate the criteria for service activity (see Section 6.3.5) in the areas of service to the department, the College, the profession, and the community. The candidate should discuss how his or her record of service fits within the overall trajectory of the candidate's academic career.
5. Professional Qualities: The personal statement must include a self-reflection on professional qualities as relevant to the Areas of Evaluation. In the Review for Promotion to Professor, these qualities include Leadership, Citizenship, Initiative, and Promise of Future Contributions (see Section 6.10.2).

If the candidate believes that she or he needs to discuss her or his educational preparation, employment history, and time in rank, this may also be incorporated into the Written Personal Statement.

6.4.5 Department Report and Department Minority Report

The Department Report, written by the Department Chair, summarizes clearly states the recommendation of the Departmental Review Committee. The Report also includes the Departmental Review Committee's and evaluates evaluation of the candidate's performance at the College as it relates to all areas for evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members (See 6.3.1). When evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service, the Department Report must frame the discussion in terms of the criteria for each of these areas as outlined in Sections 6.3.3 through 6.3.5. In the case of evaluating scholarship, the Department Report must also frame the discussion in terms of the Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4). If the Departmental Report includes concerns of the candidate's performance or in connection with review criteria outside of teaching, scholarship and service, those issues should normally be discussed in the meeting so that the candidate has the chance to respond or potentially withdraw

- Formatted: Strikethrough
- Deleted: and
- Formatted: Strikethrough
- Deleted: es
- Formatted: Strikethrough

from the process. The Department Report may also include a response to the Reference Letter on Scholarship written by the outside reviewer (see Section 6.4.6.B; see also Sections 6.8.3 and 6.10.3).

Faculty members eligible to vote on the recommendation and required to participate in the Departmental Review Committee Meeting are identified under each specific review (see Sections 6.7.4, 6.8.4, and 6.10.4). Each member of the Departmental Review Committee must sign the report testifying to its accuracy in relaying the majority consensus of the discussion at the Departmental Review Committee Meeting and may add comments to the report.

In situations where there is considerable disagreement among the members of the Departmental Review Committee about the evaluation of the candidate, any Committee members in the minority about the department's recommendation (including potentially the Chair him or herself) may collaborate to submit a single, written Department Minority Report. Unlike the Department Report, the Department Minority Report is shown only to its voluntary signatories. The Department Chair must be informed of the intent to write a Department Minority Report. If there is a case where a minority letter will be written and the department chair concurs with the minority, the majority can designate an alternate writer of the departmental letter, and the chair need not sign both.

6.4.6 Required Reference Letters

Reference Letters provide the CTP with an evaluation of the candidate's performance in relation to one or more of the Areas for Evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members (see Section 6.3.1). Depending on the review, reference letters may be required to address Teaching, Scholarship, or Service, as described below. All Reference Letter writers are encouraged to include evaluation of any of those Areas for which they have a basis for evaluation. Specifically, letter writers from a candidate's department are typically expected to address the candidate's approach to teaching and advising in the department; the candidate's scholarship as it relates to the Department Statement on Scholarship; the candidate's service within the Department and Discipline/Profession; and other professional qualities of the candidate as relevant to the review.

6.4.6.A Required Letter on Teaching

A Letter on Teaching must discuss the candidate's teaching performance and promise in light of the Criteria for Teaching (see Section 6.3.3), including: course design and on-going development, quality of teaching practice, evidence of student learning, and quality of advising and mentoring. This letter should include concrete examples reflecting each of these criteria. Thus, the faculty member selected to write this letter should have conducted multiple peer reviews both in and out of the classroom in the years prior to this review (see Section 6.5.2).

6.4.6.B Required Letter on Scholarship

A Letter on Scholarship must discuss the scholarship of the candidate in light of the Criteria for Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4), including: presentation to an audience, external review, creativity/originality, and expertise within the discipline. In addition, the disciplinary or professional colleague who writes this letter should be familiar with the College's Criteria for Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4), the College's Expectations for Scholarship for that level of review (see Sections 6.8.2.B and 6.10.2.B), and the Department Statement on Scholarship and be able to evaluate the candidate's scholarship in light of those expectations and that statement. This letter should include concrete examples reflecting each of the criteria for scholarship. Thus, the letter writer should be provided with: (1) examples of products of the scholarship completed by the candidate with ample time to review them, (2) the College's Criteria for Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4), (3) the College's Expectations for Scholarship for that level of review (see Sections 6.8.2.B and 6.10.2.B), and (4) the Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4).

6.4.6.C Required Letter on Service:

A Letter on Service must discuss the candidate's service performance outside the candidate's Department and professional qualities in light of the Criteria for Service (see Section 6.3.5), including: quality and significance of contribution, time and effort, and centrality to the mission and work of the College. This letter should include concrete examples reflecting each of these criteria. Thus, the faculty member selected to write this letter should have served with the candidate in a significant capacity outside of the candidate's department. Typically, this letter is written by a faculty member outside the candidate's Department. In the case of Third Year Review, this letter may necessarily include service within the candidate's Department and may be written by an eligible member of the candidate's Department (see Section 6.7.3).

6.4.7 Confidentiality of Report and Letters

All written materials submitted by someone other than the candidate for review by the Dean or the CTP are confidential, and the candidate permanently waives his or her right to read them. Letter and report writers are discouraged from showing the letters to the candidate or to anyone outside the Dean and CTP, with the exception for asking for feedback on the content or writing from the Dean, Department Chair or any other eligible faculty member of the candidate's department. Reference Letters on Scholarship and written by the outside reviewer may be seen by the Dean, the members of CTP, and the members of the Departmental Review Committee, but the candidate permanently waives his or her right to read them. Letter and report writers are welcome, but not required, to discuss any concerns discussed in the letter with the candidate at the writer's discretion as part of formative discussions with the candidate. Candidates are discouraged from asking writers about the specific content of Reference Letters and Reports and have no right to be informed of any concerns raised in letters or reports by the writer. While maintaining the confidentiality of the writers, the CTP must inform the candidate of all issues

discussed by the CTP in the Statement of Subjects Discussed if requested by the candidate as outlined in Section 6.2.4.

6.5 Annual Reviews

6.5.1 General Statement on the Annual Review

Faculty members are expected to regularly reflect on their performance, set goals for their work, and undergo evaluation by students, peers, and the leadership of the College. Thus all faculty members are required to participate in an Annual Review each year as described in this section. The precise timing and more about the nature of the Annual Review are described in Section 6.2.1.A.

This section describes the expectations for the Peer Review of Teaching, the procedure for Annual Reviews, and the contents of Annual Report to the Dean.

6.5.2 The Peer Review of Teaching

The College places great priority on high-quality teaching by its Faculty. The intent of the Peer Review of Teaching is to create a culture of collaboration in developing teaching skills. The College supports a climate in which faculty members can learn from their colleagues, both in their department and beyond, by observing and being observed teaching, and by reviewing additional course materials.

Participation in the peer review process, both as an observer and the observed, is expected throughout the career of a faculty member, usually on an annual basis, and not just at the time of formal review by the College. Thus, a faculty member's engagement in the Peer Review of Teaching process should be documented in the Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4).

A Peer Review of Teaching includes observing a class session taught by the faculty member. In this context, a "class session" may be laboratory, studio, or other experiential sessions or it may be an advising or mentoring session. The typical observation is for sixty to ninety minutes, which may be only a portion of an extended time class session.

Prior to the observation, the faculty member should provide the Peer Reviewer with objectives for the class session and sample test questions or other means of evaluation for the material covered in that class session so that the Peer Reviewer can assess the execution of planned intentions and if the method of evaluation of student learning is appropriate. Also, if the faculty member and Peer Reviewer want to focus on specific criteria from the Criteria for Teaching listed in Section 6.3.3, they should discuss this focus prior to the observation.

In addition to observing a class session, the Peer Reviewer is expected to review course materials including, but not limited to: the course syllabus, identified course objectives and student learning outcomes, assignments, exams/quizzes, feedback on student work, and online course materials.

Following the observation, the Peer Reviewer is expected to communicate her or his findings to the faculty member either in writing or orally. The Peer Reviewer should provide the feedback in writing if requested by the faculty member. Written feedback is encouraged but not required. Written feedback may be included with the faculty member's Annual Report to the Dean (see Section 6.5.4). The Peer Reviewer is not required to use any particular format for conducting and/or documenting the Peer Review of Teaching, but she or he is encouraged to consult with the Center for Teaching and Learning for the information on Peer Review practices.

At the time of formal review of a faculty member, the College often requires input from other faculty members who have conducted Peer Review of Teaching of the candidate under review. In that context, the Peer Reviewer must:

- a. Have observed at least two class sessions taught by the candidate, ideally more;
- b. Have communicated her or his findings to the candidate in writing or orally; and
- c. Be qualified from those observations to address all (or at least most) of the Criteria for Teaching in Section 6.3.3 in evaluating the candidate's teaching.

Department chairs play a critical role in encouraging and coordinating the Peer Review of Teaching, but faculty members bear the responsibility for arranging for Peer Review of their own teaching on a regular basis and with sufficient notice of any formal review. Typically Peer Review of Teaching in anticipation of a formal review should be scheduled at least the term prior to any formal review.

A Department may develop additional Peer Review of Teaching practices if consistent with this Faculty Handbook.

6.5.3 Process for Annual Reviews

In the spring of each academic year (see Section 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews), each Department devotes one (or two) meetings for Annual Review discussion. At least one week prior to the meeting, each faculty member in the Department is expected to provide access to a draft of the faculty information that will appear in his or her Annual Report to all of the faculty members in the Department and Division Chair (or his or her substitute if the Division Chair is in the Department). This/these meeting(s) are an opportunity for colleagues to share the factual information that will appear in their Annual Report to the Dean; discuss Scholarship and Service activities and plans; and share teaching innovations and experiences from that year. The goal of this/these meeting(s) is to strengthen department Teaching and attention to Scholarship and Service. The Division Chair attends these meetings to serve as a resource and outside consultant

for the department. After this/these Department meeting(s), each faculty member completes his or her Annual Report to the Dean and provides access to a copy to his or her Department Chair by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3).

Each Probationary Tenure Track faculty member then should schedule an individual Annual Review meeting with the Department Chair to discuss the faculty member's progress toward Tenure. This meeting should be completed by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3). The Department Chair may invite the Dean to attend the meeting. In cases following a First Year Review or Third Year Review where there were serious concerns, it may be required that this Annual Review include the Dean (see Sections 6.6.6 and 6.7.5).

Any Tenured faculty member who is nominated for Promotion, is intending to apply for a Sabbatical, or is required to meet with the Department Chair and Dean subsequent to a Post-tenure Review with serious concerns, should schedule this Annual Review meeting soon after the Department meeting and completing his or her Annual Report to the Dean (see Sections 6.9.4 and 6.11).

6.5.4 Annual Report to the Dean

In the Annual Report to the Dean, each faculty member summarizes his/her activities and accomplishments from the year; reflects on his/her performance; and plans for the future. The Annual Report to the Dean is due by the date indicated in Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3). The Annual Report to the Dean is used by the Department in the Annual Review and subsequently provided to the CTP, Department Chair, and Dean in formal reviews as required (see Sections 6.6.4, 6.7.3, 6.8.3, 6.9.3, and 6.10.3).

Faculty members in the year of their First Year Review or Third Year Review are expected to complete the Annual Report to the Dean as usual. Faculty members in the year of their Tenure Review or Review for Promotion to Professor may omit the Reflective portion of the Annual Report to the Dean. Faculty members in the year of a Post-tenure Review submit the Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review instead of the usual Annual Report (see Section 6.9.3).

The Dean's Office maintains templates that faculty members may use for the Annual Report to the Dean. Since the expectations are slightly different for Non-tenure Track, Probationary Tenure Track, and Tenured faculty members, different templates are available. Except where noted otherwise, the Annual Report to the Dean should include the following factual information and reflections. The Dean may request further information or clarification if problems or potential difficulties are revealed through the Annual Review process.

- I. General information
 - A. Summary
 - B. Name and department

- C. Type of current appointment, status, and rank
- D. Date of each of the following (if applicable): initial appointment to the College, initial appointment to a Tenure Track position, First Year Review, Third Year Review, Tenure Review, Review for Promotion to Associate Professor, most recent Sabbatical, most recent Post-tenure Review, and Review for Promotion to Professor (if positive).
- E. For the report year: Teaching FTE in the Department, teaching FTE in other programs, FTE for administrative duties, FTE release for other duties (i.e. service, scholarship, etc. Explain).

II. Teaching

- A. Courses taught, including names. Identifies first time teaching a course.
- B. Activities related to course design, development, and improvement.
- C. Advising and mentoring activities. Includes number of academic advisees and list of students or student groups advised or mentored in other capacities.
- D. Includes name of faculty member(s) undergoing Peer Review(s) of Teaching of or by the faculty member.
- E. Professional development activities related to teaching.
- F. Honors or awards for teaching, including grants.

III. Scholarship

- A. Description of current scholarly projects and, for each project, activities and products (such as publications and presentations) related to the project.
- B. Professional development activities related to scholarship and activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the Discipline/Profession. C. Honors or awards for scholarship, including grants.

IV. Service

- A. Formal College service activities. Includes service on committees and other working groups organized by the College that meet on a regular basis.
- B. Other College service activities.
 - a Additional activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the College.
 - b Departmental service activities at the College.
 - c Additional activities illustrating engagement in the Life of the Department.
 - d Activities in service to the Profession or Discipline.
 - e Activities in service to the surrounding community.
 - f Honors or awards for service, including grants.

Formatted

The following represents the reflective portions of the Annual Report. Those faculty members with Probationary Tenure Track appointments are required to include these reflective portions in addition to the factual information in their Annual Report (with the exceptions noted above). Those Tenured faculty who anticipate being nominated for Promotion to Professor are strongly encouraged to include the reflective portions of the Annual Report.

V. Reflections and goals

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

- A. Summary (optional), such as an overview of special circumstances during the year, reflection on areas not listed below.
- B. Teaching
 - 1. Student course evaluations: Summary of and comment on student evaluations of those courses, responding to concerns and patterns indicated by the student evaluations.
 - 2. Peer reviews: This includes a reflective statement identifying (a) who conducted peer reviews *and* what one learned from that experience and (b) for whom one has conducted a peer review *and* what one learned from that experience. Copies of the reviews of one's teaching done by peer(s) should also be provided if the candidate requested written copies of these peer reviews.
 - 3. Assessment of student learning: Focuses on one or two learning objectives. This reflection should discuss the relevant course design and on-going development, relevant teaching practices, and the pattern of student performance in the areas of these learning objectives. The focus is not on the grades received but on what students have learned.
 - 4. Goals: Identify the goals one has for furthering one's expertise as a teacher.
- C. Scholarship
 - 1. Progress on projects: A descriptive account of progress on scholarship projects and how these projects demonstrate the Criteria for Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4); a self-assessment of progress and performance on these projects in terms of these criteria; and ambitions for the projects currently underway.
 - 2. Professional development: Assessment of professional development activities and participation in the life of the discipline.
 - 3. Goals: Identify the goals one has for furthering one's scholarship and professional agenda.
- D. Service
 - 1. One should explain how these service activities demonstrate the criteria for service activity (see Section 6.3.5). Given one's record of service, how does it fit within the overall trajectory/journey/progress of one's academic career?
 - 2. Self-assessment of professional qualities.
 - 3. Goals: Identify the goals one has for further developing one's service activities and professional qualities.

6.6 First Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty

6.6.1 General Statement

The purpose of the First Year Review is to evaluate the performance and promise of future performance of a Tenure Track faculty member, typically halfway through the first year of his or her Probationary Period, in order to decide whether to continue appointment to the position. The First Year Review is intended to be a check on the hiring and screening procedure and is not meant to be onerous, burdensome, or inordinately time-consuming for the new faculty member.

A negative First Year Review typically results in non-renewal of appointment. The precise timing and more about the nature of the First Year Review is described in Section 6.2.1.B.

This section outlines the orientation process for new faculty members, the procedure for the First Year Review, the expectations in each area of evaluation of faculty members at the time of First Year Review, and the required written materials submitted for review.

6.6.2 Orientation of First Year Tenure Track Faculty Members

At the time of initial appointment to a Tenure Track position, a faculty member might have varying degrees of experience as a professor. He or she might even have taught at Augsburg College in a Non-tenure Track position. In every case, a priority for the faculty member in his or her first year of appointment to a Tenure Track position should be the development of his or her teaching ability to meet the needs of the College and an orientation to the College and Department.

Prior to the start of the first term, the College arranges an initial orientation to the College for the new faculty member. This orientation is typically run by the Center for Teaching and Learning in coordination with the Dean's office. This orientation includes information on the history and Mission of the College. Each new tenure track faculty member receives a copy (or information on accessing an electronic copy) of: this Faculty Handbook, a copy of the Department Statement on Scholarship, a copy of the Department Mission and Goals, the current Student Catalog(s), the Student Guide, and additional information on campus support programs and professional development opportunities. Faculty members in their first year of a Tenure Track appointment are strongly encouraged to take part in on-going orientation or mentoring programs offered by the Center of Teaching and Learning.

Prior to the start of the first term, the Department Chair provides the new faculty member with information that includes:

- a. Teaching assignment for the first term and tentative teaching assignment for the year;
- b. Information on books ordered for the first term or ample time to order books and information on placing orders;
- c. Classroom assignments, an orientation to classroom technology, information about online access to student information, and an orientation to online course management tools (or information on available Information Technology sessions);
- d. Departmental and College requirements for the courses assigned in the first term, such as general education requirements, catalog descriptions, attendance policy, use of the academic alert system, or other expectations;
- e. Information on office space, office supplies, computer, and other materials provided;
- f. Minimum requirements for office hours, e-mail access, attending meetings and events, and presence on campus;

- g. Expectations for departmental service in the first year, if any;
- h. Any special expectations of the position beyond teaching; and
- i. A schedule of regular meetings with the Department Chair during the first year.

These regular meetings of the Department Chair and the new faculty member typically address:

- a. Reminder of policies and expectations for faculty members outlined in Section 3;
- b. Schedule of College faculty meetings and events and Department meetings and events;
- c. Due dates for critical administrative activities such as Annual Review Reports, book orders, course evaluations, and grades;
- d. Outline of the formal First Year Review Process and Expectations by the First Year Review in Section 6.6.3;
- e. Plans for Peer Review of teaching of the new faculty member during each term;
- f. Plans for Student Course Evaluation including optional midterm (formative) evaluation;
- g. Evaluation of teaching performance of the first term based on discussion with the Department Chair and faculty member, peer review, and student course evaluations;
- h. Plans to prepare for assuming advising and mentoring responsibilities in later years;
- i. Opportunities for teaching improvement activities;
- j. Plans for scholarship, resources available (such as travel funding), and discussion of the Department Statement on Scholarship;
- k. Discussion of the Mission of the College, the Mission of the Department, and fit with faculty member and Department;
- l. Plans for assuming service responsibilities at the College and additional responsibilities in the Department in later years;
- m. Opportunities to participate in the life of the College, the Department, the profession, and the community; and
- n. Progress on completion of the terminal degree (if not in hand at the time of appointment).

6.6.3 Expectations of Faculty Members by the First Year Review

In the First Year Review, the candidate is evaluated on both her or his performance and promise of future performance in the areas of Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College; Educational Preparation; Employment History and Time in Rank; Teaching; Scholarship; Service; and Professional Qualities. See Sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.5 for Criteria specific to the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

Specific expectations in the areas of Educational Preparation, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are outlined in the following subsections. Candidates in their first year of appointment should focus on developing their teaching ability to meet the needs of the College, becoming oriented to the College and Department, developing a Scholarship Plan, and completing the terminal degree, if not already in hand. Thus, the expectations in those areas are more demanding than those for

Service. The expectations are also intended to encourage new faculty members to begin looking ahead, laying the foundation for a successful career in teaching, scholarship, and service.

6.6.3.A Expectations for Educational Preparation by the First Year Review

If a faculty member in their first year of appointment to a Tenure Track position does not already hold the terminal degree for his or her discipline, she or he is expected to have earned the terminal degree before the end of the first year of appointment. If the degree is not already earned by the time of the First Year Review, the candidate is expected to present specific and realistic plans for earning the terminal degree before the end of the first year of appointment.

6.6.3.B Expectations for Teaching by the First Year Review

At the point of First Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Promise in the quality of teaching practice.
- b. Engagement in assessment of student learning.
- c. Engagement in the process of peer review and evaluation of course design and teaching practice.
- d. Reflection on teaching with an eye toward on-going course development, design, or redesign.
- e. Participation in professional development activity with the goal of strengthening or developing overall teaching skills and quality.

There are no advising or mentoring expectations for faculty members in their first year of appointment. Such responsibilities typically begin in the second year of appointment.

6.6.3.C Expectations for Scholarship by the First Year Review

At the point of First Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Involvement in the life of the discipline through attending professional conferences.
 - b. Promise as a scholar as reflected in a written Scholarship Plan.
- There are no expectations for productive Scholarship by faculty members in their first year of appointment. Such expectations typically begin in the second year of appointment.

6.6.3.D Expectations for Service by the First Year Review

At the point of First Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Participation in Orientation to the College and regular meetings with the Department Chair.
- b. Involvement in the life of the Department and College.

There are no additional service requirements during the first year of appointment. While service expectations increase in the second and third year of appointment, the candidate is expected to focus on Teaching and Scholarship in order to begin to establish a record of performance in those areas in advance of the Third Year Review.

6.6.4 Required Documentation for the First Year Review

Required documentation for the First Year Review includes written materials provided by the candidate and written materials provided by the Dean's Office. Deadlines for providing documentation to the Department Chair are listed in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

Written materials provided by the candidate for the First Year Review:

- a. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, usually just a copy of the CV from the search. This may be an updated version of the CV if the candidate prefers.
- b. A list of the candidate's professional activities either completed or planned during the first year of appointment that includes, at minimum, a list of professional development activities and activities demonstrating involvement in the life of the Department, College, and discipline. This list may be presented in the form of a draft of the factual (nonreflective) portion of candidate's Annual Report to the Dean as described in Section 6.5.4 if the candidate prefers.
- c. Candidate's Written Scholarship Plan that outlines specific plans for Scholarship for the next few years. This statement is intended to be brief, usually no more than one page in length.
- d. Student Course Evaluations from the first term of teaching, as described in Section 3.2.8.
- e. Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

Written materials provided by the Dean's Office for the First Year Review:

- a. Written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews, if any.
- No personal statement (beyond the Scholarship Plan) is required for the First Year Review. No letters are required for the First Year Review.

6.6.5 Departmental and Decision Process for First Year Review

The Departmental Review Committee consists of the Department Chair, a faculty member of the Department selected by the Department Chair, and another faculty member of the Department selected by the candidate. Usually these selected faculty members of the Department will be tenured, or at least past Third Year Review. When possible, the selected faculty members will have conducted Peer Review of the candidate, have worked with the candidate closely in some capacity, and/or be familiar with the candidate's area of expertise. In this context, all references refer to Substitutes for the Department or Division Chair or Other Members of the Department in Review Processes as outlined in Section 6.2.2 as necessary. The Department Chair and candidate must form this committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

By the date specified in the Timeline for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the candidate provides the Departmental Review Committee members with the documentation listed in Section 6.6.4. By that same date, the Department Chair schedules the Departmental Review Committee meeting. The Department Chair is expected to inform all of the faculty members in the Department of the date of the review meeting in order that the faculty members may provide input on the First Year Review candidate to the Department Chair in advance of the meeting.

By the date specified in the Timeline for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the Departmental Review Committee meets to discuss the progress of the candidate in meeting the expectations outlined in Section 6.6.3; the promise of future performance of the candidate in all areas with particular attention to Teaching and Scholarship; and plans for any additional assistance, support, or information for the new faculty member. The candidate is present at the start of this review meeting to answer questions and concerns of the committee. The Department Chair should raise any concerns brought forth by faculty members of the Department not on the Committee. Then the new faculty member will be excused and the Departmental Review Committee members vote on a recommendation to the Dean.

The Department Chair notifies the Dean in writing by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3 of the recommendation.

6.6.6 Decision Process for First Year Review

Final decision on whether the First Year Review is positive or negative rests with the Dean. The Dean will notify the candidate and Department Chair in writing of the decision by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

If the First Year Review is positive, then the Department Chair writes a First Year Review Letter that summarizes the evaluation of the candidate's performance and promise of performance as relates to all areas for evaluating Tenure Track Faculty Members (see Section 6.3.1), with particular attention to Teaching and Scholarship; summarizes expectations at the time of hire and any adjustments to those expectations; and identifies plans for any additional assistance, support, or information for the candidate. Each faculty member on the First Year Departmental Review Committee must sign the report testifying to its accuracy in relaying the majority consensus of the discussion at the First Year Review Meeting and may add comments to the letter. The Department Chair submits this letter to the Dean no later than the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. By that same date, the Department Chair gives the candidate a copy of this letter and, thus, this First Year Review Letter is not confidential to the candidate. A copy of this letter is provided by the Dean's Office in subsequent reviews of the candidate. The Department Chair will also meet with the faculty member following a positive First Year Review no later than the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. The purpose of this meeting is to allow the Chair to communicate to the faculty member particular strengths or

areas of concern, to assist the faculty member in documenting progress, and to ensure the Department's attention to the faculty member's progress.

In unusual cases where the First Year Review is positive although some serious concerns about the candidate's performance or promise of future performance remain, the Dean may impose additional expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews prior to the Third Year Review. These expectations must be communicated to the candidate and Department Chair by the Dean in the decision letter. Such additional expectations typically include mandatory meetings of the candidate with the Dean and Department Chair each year as part of the review.

If the Dean decides that the First Year Review is negative, no departmental letter is written. A candidate receiving a negative First Year Review is not re-appointed to a Tenure Track position. The Dean, after consultation with the Department Chair, may elect to offer the candidate a second year terminal contract, i.e. appointment to one year in a Non Tenure-track position.

6.7 Third Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty

6.7.1 General Statement on the Third Year Review

The purpose of the Third Year Review is to evaluate the performance and promise of future performance of a Tenure Track faculty member, typically halfway through his or her Probationary Period, in order to decide whether to continue appointment to the position. The Third Year Review is intended to determine if the faculty member is making appropriate progress toward becoming a Tenured faculty member. Thus, the expectations of faculty members at the time of Third Year Review include both evaluation of performance and promise for future performance. The precise timing and more about the nature of the Third Year Review is described in Section 6.2.1.C.

A positive Third Year Review does not carry any guarantee of a positive Tenure Review. Although some areas of concern might be identified during the Third Year Review process, there is no guarantee that addressing those concerns will result in a positive Tenure Review.

A positive Third Year Review does not change the faculty member's Probationary Status. It does confer new rights and responsibilities including the expectation that the faculty member past Third Year Review have a more active role in the activities of the Department and in the College.

The candidate who receives a negative Third Year Review retains the right to a one-year terminal non-renewable, non-tenure track contract for the next academic year by the date listed in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.2.3).

This section outlines the procedure for the Third Year Review, the expectations in each area of evaluation of faculty members at the time of Third Year Review, and the required written materials submitted for review.

6.7.2 Expectations of Faculty Members by the Third Year Review

In the Third Year Review, the candidate is evaluated on both his or her performance and promise of future performance in the areas of Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College; Educational Preparation; Employment History and Time in Rank; Teaching; Scholarship; Service; and Professional Qualities. See Sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.5 for Criteria specific to the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

Regarding Educational Preparation, the candidate is expected to have earned the terminal degree in his or her discipline. The terminal degree is typically required at the time of Third Year Review.

Specific expectations in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are outlined in the following subsections. The College expects candidates to focus on establishing a strong track record of teaching and scholarship during the first few years and, thus, the expectations in these areas are more demanding than those for service.

6.7.2.A Expectations for Teaching by the Third Year Review

At the point of Third Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. A developing pattern of high-quality teaching practice.
- b. Collaboration with other members of the department on course design and/or has modified courses to fit departmental mission, goals, learning objectives, and standards.
- c. Engagement in on-going reflection on teaching with an eye toward course development.
- d. A high level of student learning as measured through assessment.
- e. Engagement in the process of peer feedback and evaluation of course design and teaching practice.
- f. Consistent availability to students and a pattern of working with students outside of the classroom in advising and mentoring capacities.
- g. An emerging pattern of professional development in the area of teaching with the goal of strengthening/developing overall teaching skills and quality.
- h. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of teaching.

6.7.2.B Expectations for Scholarship by the Third Year Review

At the point of Third Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Significant progress on one or more projects (which may have more than one product) and makes a clear and realistic case that a substantial project will be completed prior to the tenure review. This substantial project clearly demonstrates excellence in scholarship based on all four of the following: (1) presentation to an audience, (2) external review, (3) creativity/originality, and (4) expertise within the discipline.
- b. An emerging pattern of presenting scholarship to an audience.
- c. An emerging pattern of providing scholarship for external review.
- d. Creativity/originality in scholarly activity.
- e. Clear development of a high level of expertise within the discipline.
- f. An emerging pattern of involvement in the life of the discipline.
- g. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of scholarship as reflected in an updated scholarship plan.

Candidates should consult their Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4) for a description of what is considered scholarship within the department and how the Criteria for Scholarship—Presentation to an Audience, External Review, Creativity/Originality, and Expertise Within the Discipline—apply to scholarship within the Department.

6.7.2.C Expectations for Service by the Third Year Review

At the point of Third Year Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. An emerging pattern of quality service within the Department. Such service should clearly demonstrate excellence in service based on all three of the following: (1) quality and significance of contribution, (2) time and effort, and (3) centrality to the mission and work of the Department.
- b. Engagement within the life of the Department.
- c. An emerging pattern of participation in an ad hoc capacity within the College.
- d. Willingness to serve on a standing committee, extra-departmental committee, task force, team, etc.
- e. A continued pattern of involvement in the life of the College.
- f. Promise and interest in development within the area of service.

Note that there are no requirements for service within the discipline/profession or surrounding community for the Third Year Review. This is done in order to allow the candidate to devote more time to scholarship in preparation for the Tenure Review.

6.7.3 Required Documentation for the Third Year Review

Required documentation for the Third Year Review includes written materials provided by the candidate, written materials provided by the Dean's Office, and letters and reports provided by

persons authorized by the Dean as listed below. Deadlines for submitting documentation are listed in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

Candidates are responsible for checking with the Dean's office that documents provided by the Dean's Office, Reference Letters, and the Department Report are submitted to the CTP by the deadlines established in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3). If any materials are missing by the due date, the candidate must immediately notify the Dean and Department Chair.

Written materials provided by the candidate for the Third Year Review:

- a. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Candidate's Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.
- c. Candidate's Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for all years of employment at Augsburg College.
- d. The Official (i.e. approved and available for public view) Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

Written materials provided by the Dean's Office for the Third Year Review:

- e. Report from the Department Chair from the First Year Review and reports from the Department Chair based on Annual Reviews, if any.
- f. Written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews, if any.
- g. Student Course Evaluations, as described in Section 3.2.8.

Letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean for the Third Year Review

- h. Department Report and, if needed, the Department Minority Report.
- i. Dean's Report to Committee on Tenure and Promotion.
- j. Four reference letters from faculty members at Augsburg College who are themselves past Third Year Review, whenever possible. As the Department Chair writes the Department Report, the candidate should not normally ask the Department Chair to write a separate Reference Letter for the Candidate. The candidate must notify the Dean of these letter writers by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. These letters must include:
 1. A Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
 2. A second Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.

3. A Reference Letter from a faculty member outside the candidate's department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
4. A Reference Letter from a faculty member inside or outside the candidate's department who has served with the candidate in a service role inside or outside of the candidate's department. This letter must address Service as described in Sections 6.3.5 and 6.4.6.C.

6.7.4 Department Process for Third Year Review

The candidate's Department Chair convenes a Departmental Review Committee for the candidate consisting of all of the members of the Department past Third Year Review and the candidate's Division Chair. (In this context, all references to Department Chair and Division Chair include Substitutes as outlined in Section 6.2.2 as necessary.) The Department Chair notifies the Dean and the candidate of the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the candidate provides the following written materials to the Departmental Review Committee members:

- a. Draft of the Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Draft of the Candidate's Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.
- c. Candidate's Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for all years of employment at Augsburg College.
- d. Student Course Evaluations (the candidate's own copies are acceptable), as described in Section 3.2.8
- e. Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the candidate and the Departmental Review Committee. The candidate is present at the start of the meeting to answer questions and address concerns. Then the candidate is excused and the Departmental Review Committee discusses the candidate's qualifications relative to the Expectations for Faculty Members by the Third Year Review outlined in Section 6.7.2. Next, the members of the Departmental Review Committee, excluding the Division Chair, vote on whether to recommend the candidate for positive Third Year Review. (Note: The Division Chair's role is to represent the Faculty outside the candidate's Department and to offer guidance as needed. As such, the Division Chair attends the meeting, but does not chair it, and counts votes.)

Following the meeting, the Department Chair writes the Department Report as described in Section 6.4.5. The Department Chair distributes a draft of the Department Report to the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3) to allow feedback from committee members and time for the preparation of a

Department Minority Report as described in Section 6.4.5 if appropriate. After the finalized Department Report is signed by the members of the Department Review Committee, the Department Chair submits this report to CTP by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

6.7.5 Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP) and Decision Process for Third Year Review

The CTP reviews the documentation provided by the candidate for Third Year Review and conducts a personal interview. The purpose of the personal interview is to give the candidate an opportunity to clarify for the CTP or elaborate on any issues or questions raised in the candidate's documentation. The candidate should be prepared to summarize information presented in his or her documentation as the interview is an opportunity for CTP members get to know the candidate better. The purview of the CTP is not limited except by the provisions of this Faculty Handbook and other pertinent legal guidelines, and questions asked of the candidate must be tailored to the candidate's individual Third Year Review. The personal interview must be completed by the deadline in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

The Department Report is part of the documentation considered by the CTP and is typically an important part of their considerations, but the Department's recommendation is not binding on the CTP. The CTP reviews the candidate based on the documentation provided and the personal interview. Note that the Dean does not vote, is not present for the vote, and is informed only of the final recommendation.

By the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews, the CTP informs the Dean of their recommendation. The Dean's Office notifies each candidate when his or her letter of recommendation from CTP is available no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The time schedule for appeals begins when the Dean's Office notifies the candidate, not when the candidate receives the letter. The candidate's appellate rights and procedures are outlined in Section 6.2.4.

The Dean forwards the CTP's recommendation to the President for his or her approval by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The CTP recommendation is not binding on the President who has final authority on the Third Year Review.

In unusual cases where the CTP recommends a positive Third Year Review of a candidate although some serious concerns about the candidate's performance or promise of future performance remain, the CTP may impose additional expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews prior to the Tenure Review. These expectations must be communicated to the candidate and Department Chair in CTP's Third Year Review Letter. Such additional expectations typically include mandatory meetings of the candidate with the Dean and Department Chair each year as part of the review.

6.8 Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor of Tenure Track Faculty

6.8.1 General Statement

Tenure review is the process through which faculty attain tenure and promotion to associate professor at the College. Usually, candidates who are granted tenure are automatically conferred promotion to associate professor. Faculty are encouraged to review the AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom in Section 2.3 of this Handbook as they prepare for the Tenure Review. As outlined in Section 6.2.1, the tenure review is primarily summative in nature. Thus, the expectations of faculty members at the time of Tenure Review include both evaluation of performance and promise for future performance. The precise timing of the Tenure Review is described in Section 6.2.1.D.

A positive Tenure review changes the faculty member's status from Probationary to Tenured. It confers new rights and responsibilities including the expectation that the faculty member have a more active role in the activities of the Department and the College, including leadership in these activities. In those cases where a faculty member willfully neglects his or her duty or is incompetent in the pursuit of his or her duties, the College may pursue Dismissal for Cause as described in Section 9.1.5.D of this Handbook.

The candidate who has been denied tenure retains the right to a one-year terminal non-renewable contract for the next academic year [by the date listed in the Timelines for Reviews \(Section 6.2.3\)](#).

This section outlines the procedure for the Tenure Review, the expectations in each area of evaluation of faculty members at the time of Tenure Review, and the required written materials submitted for review.

6.8.2 Expectations of Faculty Members by the Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The rank of Associate Professor at Augsburg College is to be granted to faculty members who, over the course of their careers, up to the point of this review, demonstrate that they are committed to and fully engaged with their teaching, scholarship, and service. They have established a commendable record in each of these areas and show promise of becoming exemplary members of the Augsburg Faculty.

In the Tenure Review, the candidate is evaluated on both their performance and promise of future performance in the areas of Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College;

Educational Preparation; Employment History and Time in Rank; Teaching; Scholarship; Service; and Professional Qualities. See Sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.5 for Criteria specific to the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

Regarding Educational Preparation, the candidate is expected to have earned the terminal degree in his or her discipline. The terminal degree is required at the time of Tenure Review.

Specific expectations in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are outlined in the following subsections.

6.8.2.A Expectations for Teaching by the Tenure Review

At the point of tenure review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. A highly developed and expanded quality of teaching practice.
- b. Engagement in on-going reflection on teaching with an eye toward on-going course design, development, and improvement.
- c. Achievement of a consistently high level of student learning as measured through assessment.
- d. Engagement in the process of peer feedback and evaluation of course design and teaching practice.
- e. Consistent availability to students and a pattern of working with students outside of the classroom in advising and mentoring capacities.
- f. A continued pattern of professional development in the area of teaching with the goal of strengthening/developing overall teaching skills and quality.
- g. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of teaching.

6.8.2.B Expectations for Scholarship by the Tenure Review

At the point of tenure review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. One substantial project (which may have more than one product) that clearly demonstrates excellence in scholarship based on all four of the following: (1) presentation to an audience, (2) external review, (3) creativity/originality, and (4) expertise within the discipline.
- b. An established pattern of presenting scholarly work to an audience.
- c. An established pattern of providing scholarly work for external review.
- d. Creativity/originality in scholarly activity.
- e. A high level of expertise within the discipline.
- f. A continued pattern of involvement in the life of the discipline.
- g. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of scholarship as reflected in an updated scholarship plan.

Candidates should consult their Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4) for a description of what is considered scholarship within the department and how the Criteria for Scholarship—Presentation to an Audience, External Review, Creativity/Originality, and Expertise Within the Discipline—apply to scholarship within the Department.

6.8.2.C Expectations for Service by the Tenure Review

At the point of tenure review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Service to one standing committee or extra-departmental committee, task force, team, etc. Such service should clearly demonstrate excellence in service based on all three of the following: (1) quality and significance of contribution, (2) time and effort, and (3) centrality to the Mission and work of the College.
- b. An established pattern of quality service within the Department. Such service should clearly demonstrate excellence in service based on all three of the following: (1) quality and significance of contribution, (2) time and effort, and (3) centrality to the mission and work of the Department.
- c. Engagement within the life of the Department.
- d. On-going participation in an ad hoc capacity within the College.
- e. An emerging pattern of service within the discipline/profession or the surrounding community.
- f. A continued pattern of involvement in the life of the College.
- g. Willingness to devote the time and effort necessary to engage in quality service contributions.
- h. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of service.

6.8.3 Required Documentation for the Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Required documentation for the Tenure Review includes written materials provided by the candidate, written materials provided by the Dean's Office, and letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean as listed below. Deadlines for submitting documentation are listed in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

Candidates are responsible for checking with the Dean's office that documents provided by the Dean's Office, Reference Letters, and the Department Report are submitted to the CTP by the deadlines established in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3). If any materials are missing by the due date, the candidate must immediately notify the Dean and Department Chair.

Written materials provided by the candidate for the Tenure Review:

- a. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Candidate's Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.

- c. Candidate's Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for all years of employment at Augsburg College.
- d. The Official (i.e. approved and available for public view) Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.
- e. Candidate's evaluation of his or her progress on concerns delineated by CTP during Third Year Review.

Written materials provided by the Dean's Office for the Tenure Review:

- f. Report from the Department Chair from the First Year Review and reports from the Departmental Chair based on Annual Reviews, if any.
- g. Letters from CTP from the Third Year Review and all written materials related to any appeal proceedings.
- h. Written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews, if any.
- i. Student Course Evaluations, as described in Section 3.2.8.

Letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean for the Tenure Review:

- j. Department Report and, if needed, the Department Minority Report.
- k. [Dean's Report to Committee on Tenure and Promotion.](#)
- l. Four reference letters from tenure track faculty members at Augsburg College who are themselves past Third Year Review, whenever possible. As the Department Chair writes the Department Report, the candidate should not normally ask the Department Chair to write a separate Reference Letter for the Candidate. The candidate must notify the Dean of these letter writers by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. These letters must include:
 - 1. A Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
 - 2. A second Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
 - 3. A Reference Letter from a faculty member outside the candidate's department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
 - 4. A Reference Letter from a faculty member outside the candidate's department who has served with the candidate in a service role outside of the candidate's department. This letter must address Service as described in Sections 6.3.5 and 6.4.6.C.

m. A letter from a disciplinary or professional colleague from outside the College who is in a position to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Candidates should provide a list of possible disciplinary or professional colleagues to the Dean by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The Dean or the Dean's representative will then make arrangements for this outside reviewer. This letter must address Scholarship as described in Sections 6.3.4 and 6.4.6.B.

6.8.4 Department Process for Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate's Department Chair convenes a Departmental Review Committee for the candidate consisting of all of the tenured members of the Department and the candidate's Division Chair. (In this context, all references to Department Chair and Division Chair include Substitutes as outlined in Section 6.2.2 as necessary.) The Department Chair notifies the Dean and the candidate of the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the candidate provides the following written materials to the Departmental Review Committee members:

- a. Draft of the Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Draft of the Candidate's Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.
- c. Candidate's Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for all years of employment at Augsburg College.
- d. Student Course Evaluations (the candidate's own copies are acceptable), as described in Section 3.2.8.
- e. Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

[The Office of Academic Affairs will forward the external disciplinary reviewer's letter to the Department Review Committee.](#)

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the candidate and the Departmental Review Committee. The candidate is present at the start of the meeting to answer questions and address concerns. Then the candidate is excused and the Departmental Review Committee discusses the candidate's qualifications relative to the Expectations for Faculty Members by the Tenure Review outlined in Section 6.8.2. Next, the members of the Departmental Review Committee, excluding the Division Chair, vote on whether to recommend the candidate for positive Tenure Review. (Note: The Division Chair's role is to represent the Faculty outside the candidate's Department and to offer guidance as needed. As such, the Division Chair attends the meeting, but does not chair it, and counts votes.)

Following the meeting, the Department Chair writes the Department Report as described in Section 6.4.5. The Department Chair distributes a draft of the Department Report to the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see

Section 6.2.3) to allow feedback from committee members and time for the preparation of a Department Minority Report as described in Section 6.4.5 if appropriate. After the finalized Department Report is signed by the members of the Department Review Committee, the Department Chair submits this report to CTP by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

6.8.5 Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP) and Decision Process for the Review on Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The CTP reviews the documentation provided by the candidate for Tenure Review and conducts a personal interview. The purpose of the personal interview is to give the candidate an opportunity to clarify for the CTP or elaborate on any issues or questions raised in the candidate's documentation. The candidate should be prepared to summarize information presented in his or her documentation as the interview is an opportunity for CTP members get to know the candidate better. The purview of the CTP is not limited except by the provisions of this Faculty Handbook and other pertinent legal guidelines, and questions asked of the candidate must be tailored to the candidate's individual Tenure Review. The personal interview must be completed by the deadline in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

The Department Report is part of the documentation considered by the CTP and is typically an important part of their considerations, but the Department's recommendation is not binding on the CTP. The CTP reviews the candidate based on the documentation provided and the personal interview. Note that the Dean does not vote, is not present for the vote, and is informed only of the final recommendation.

By the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews, the CTP informs the Dean of their recommendation. The Dean's Office notifies each candidate when his or her letter of recommendation from CTP is available no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The time schedule for appeals begins when the Dean's Office notifies the candidate, not when the candidate receives the letter. The candidate's appellate rights and procedures are outlined in Section 6.2.4.

The Dean forwards the CTP's recommendation to the President for his or her approval by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The President will forward his or her recommendation to the Board of Regents to be ratified at the next regular meeting of the Board. The CTP recommendation is not binding on the Board of Regents who have final authority on the Tenure Review. The candidate will be notified in writing of the Board's decision no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews.

6.9 Post-Tenure Review of Tenure Track Faculty

6.9.1 General Statement on the Post-tenure Review

The College expects Tenured faculty members to continue to be passionate about their work and to continue to aspire to be superb teachers, active scholars, and valuable citizens who are engaged in the life of their Department, the College, their profession and the community. The purpose of the Post-tenure Review is to evaluate the performance and promise of future performance of a tenured faculty member on a regular basis in order to recognize the good work of the candidate and to identify areas in which the candidate might need improvement. The precise timing and more about the nature of the Post-tenure Review is described in Section 6.2.1.E.

Completion of the Post-tenure Review according to the timing described in Section 6.2.3 is required prior to application for Sabbatical Leave.

If serious concerns are raised during the Post-tenure Review, the Dean may suggest appropriate remediation and may impose additional expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews and/or an accelerated schedule for the next Post-tenure Review to check in on the candidate's progress in addressing these concerns. If the candidate does not work towards addressing these concerns in a timely manner or does not follow imposed additional expectations, the Dean may initiate corrective action, including initiating the lead to Dismissal for Cause process as described in Section 9.1.5.D—if there is adequate cause (as defined in Section 9.1.5.D).

This section outlines the procedure for the Post-tenure Year Review, the expectations in each area of evaluation of faculty members at the time of Post-tenure Review, and the required written materials submitted for review.

6.9.2 Expectations of Faculty Members by the Post-tenure Review

In the Post-tenure Review, the candidate is evaluated on both her or his performance and promise of future performance in the areas of Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College; Educational Preparation; Employment History and Time in Rank; Teaching; Scholarship; Service; and Professional Qualities. See Sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.5 for Criteria specific to the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

Tenured faculty members are expected to maintain performance in all areas throughout their career at a level equivalent to the expectations at the time of Tenure. Specific expectations in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are outlined in the following subsections. The College recognizes that over the career of a faculty member, there may be periods during which the faculty member focuses more attention on scholarship or service than on the other. At any point in her or his career, however, a Tenured faculty member is expected to be engaged in work on at least one significant project that focuses on teaching, on scholarship, on service, or on some combination of these areas.

Candidates at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor who anticipate subsequent review for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, respectively, should keep the expectations for that promotion review in mind when going through the Post-tenure Review process to determine if they are making adequate progress toward achieving those expectations.

6.9.2.A Expectations for Teaching by the Post-tenure Review

At the point of Post-tenure Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Highly developed, high quality teaching practice.
- b. Continuous reflection on teaching practice with attention to improvement in course development and expertise in course design.
- c. Consistently high level of student learning as measured through assessment.
- d. Engagement in the process of peer feedback and evaluation of course design and teaching practice.
- e. Consistent availability to students and a strong commitment to, and pattern of, working with students outside of the classroom in advising and mentoring capacities.
- f. A continued pattern of professional development in the area of teaching with the goal of strengthening/developing overall teaching skills and quality in the classroom.
- g. Continued interest in development within the area of teaching.

6.9.2.B Expectations for Scholarship by the Post-tenure Review

At the point of Post-tenure Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Continued engagement in scholarship as evidenced by on-going work on a substantial project (which may have more than one product) that clearly demonstrates excellence in scholarship based on all four of the following: (1) presentation to an audience, (2) external review, (3) creativity/originality, and (4) expertise within the discipline.
- b. A continued pattern of presenting scholarship to an audience.
- c. Establishment of scholarly credibility within her or his body of work through external review.
- d. Continued creativity/originality in scholarly activity.
- e. Maintains high level of expertise within the discipline, or develops new expertise.
- f. A continued pattern of involvement in the life of the discipline.
- g. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of scholarship as reflected in an updated scholarship plan.

Candidates should consult their Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4) for a description of what is considered scholarship within the department and how the Criteria for Scholarship—Presentation to an Audience, External Review, Creativity/Originality, and Expertise Within the Discipline—apply to scholarship within the Department.

6.9.2.C Expectations for Service by the Post-tenure Review

At the point of Post-tenure Review, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. A continuing pattern of quality service and leadership within the Department and the College. Such service should clearly demonstrate excellence in service based on all three of the following: (1) quality and significance of contribution, (2) time and effort, and (3) centrality to the mission and work of the department as well as the Mission and work of the College.
- b. Willingness to devote the time and effort necessary to engage in quality service contributions.
- c. Willingness to take on leadership roles for the Department and College.
- d. An established pattern of service within the discipline/profession or the surrounding community.
- e. An established and continuing pattern of involvement in the life of the Department and the life of the College.
- f. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of service.

6.9.3 Required Documentation for the Post-tenure Review

Required documentation for the Post-tenure Review, known as a Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review, includes written materials provided by the candidate and written materials provided by the Dean's Office as listed below. Deadlines for submitting documentation to the Dean and Department Chair are listed in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

Written materials provided by the candidate to the Dean and the Department Chair for the Post-tenure Review:

- a. Candidate's Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review, as described below.
- b. Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

The Dean may request a reasonable amount of additional material from the candidate such as a current Curriculum Vitae, copies of Annual Reports since the last Tenure, Post-tenure, or Promotion Review; and copies of Student Course Evaluations since the last Tenure, Post-tenure, or Promotion Review.

Written materials provided by the Dean's Office include:

- a. Reports from the Department Chair from First Year Review or Annual Reviews;
- b. Letters from the CTP from Third Year Review, Tenure Review, and Promotion Review and all written materials related to any appeal proceedings;
- c. Applications for approved sabbatical and academic leaves;
- d. Written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews;

- e. Letters from the Dean from Post-tenure Review and any Annual Reviews mandated following Third Year Review or Post-tenure Review; and
- f. Any other formal written records related to faculty performance kept on file by the Dean's Office.

The Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review includes:

- a. A summary of the candidate's activities since the last Tenure, Post-tenure, or positive Promotion Review, noting any major changes or trends. Typically, this summary is a consolidation of the previous Annual Review Reports along with information on the current year.
- b. A brief self-assessment, typically two to four pages total, of the candidate's performance in the Areas for Review of Tenure-track Faculty Members as appears in Section 6.3.1, especially Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, since the last Tenure, Post-tenure or positive Promotion Review. This self-assessment requires a thoughtful effort and candid reflection on the candidate's work over the past period. It is not intended to be onerous, but rather a natural extension of the Annual Review process and the faculty member's professional development.
- c. A brief statement, typically one page, of the candidate's future plans, including plans to address any areas identified in the self-assessment as needing improvement.

6.9.4 Decision Process for Post-tenure Review

The Post-tenure Review is conducted by the Dean, in consultation with the candidate's Department Chair (or his or her substitute as described in Section 6.2.2.A.) The process begins when the candidate submits the Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review to the Dean and Department Chair by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

The Dean schedules a Review Meeting with the candidate and the Department Chair to discuss the candidate's performance as identified in the documentation. This meeting occurs by the date indicated in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. This meeting is intended to recognize the good work of the candidate, but must also identify any serious concerns and plan for addressing those concerns.

In advance of the scheduled Review Meeting, the Dean or the Department Chair may request a meeting between the Dean and Department Chair to discuss any concerns about the candidate's performance. In this meeting, the Department Chair is expected to discuss any serious, on-going concerns revealed in his or her work with the candidate, Student Course Evaluations, Peer Review of Teaching, or other feedback provided by other faculty members in the candidate's Department.

By the date indicated in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3), the Dean informs the candidate in writing of his/her evaluation. If serious concerns remain, the Dean outlines those concerns in the letter and may suggest any appropriate remediation and may impose additional

expectations for subsequent Annual Reviews, and/or an accelerated schedule for the next Post-tenure Review.

6.10 Review for Promotion to Professor of Tenure Track Faculty

6.10.1 General Statement

Promotion review is the process through which tenured, Associate Professors attain the rank of Professor at the College. The precise timing and more about the nature of the Post-tenure Review is described in Section 6.2.1.F.

Promotion to Professor requires a nomination by a colleague or by the candidate him or herself.

1. **Nomination by Other Faculty Members:** Any faculty member may nominate an eligible colleague for promotion. Such nominations should occur only after consultation with all the tenured members of the department and the candidate in order to determine if the candidate meets the criteria for promotion. A nominating letter should be sent to the candidate, the Department Chair and the Dean by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The letter should simply state that the faculty member is eligible and is being nominated for promotion during the next appropriate period of review.

2. **Nomination by Eligible Faculty Member:** Eligible faculty may nominate themselves for promotion by submitting a nominating letter to her or his Department Chair, and to the Dean of the College, by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The letter should simply state that the faculty member is eligible and intends to apply for promotion during the next appropriate period of review.

Successfully completing promotion review confers new rights and responsibilities. The faculty member is expected to maintain an active role in the activities of the Department and the College. The candidate who has been denied promotion may be re-nominated following the nomination procedures above. In those cases where a faculty member willfully neglects his or her duty or is incompetent in the pursuit of his or her duties, the College may pursue Dismissal for Cause as described in Section 9.1.5.D of this Handbook.

This section outlines the procedure for the Review for Promotion to Professor, the expectations in each area of evaluation of faculty members at the time of Review for Promotion to Professor, and the required written materials submitted for review.

6.10.2 Expectations for Faculty Members by the Review for Promotion to Professor

The rank of Professor at Augsburg College is to be granted to faculty members when, over the course of their career, they exemplify the highest standards of the Academy. These individuals have made specific accomplishments for the benefit of the College and the Academy. As such, they serve as role models and leaders for the campus community. Thus, the rank of Professor is to be given in recognition of the impact these members of the faculty have had as well as their performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility from the inception of their career to the point of review for promotion to Professor.

Characteristics of the Professor:

Candidates aspiring to the rank of Professor must meet all of the standards for post-tenure review (see 6.10.2.A-C below). At the same time, we recognize that each candidate under review will have a unique career trajectory in terms of the specific blend of these three areas of faculty responsibility. Moreover, we recognize that there are points in a faculty member's career in which scholarship comes to the fore and other points when service is emphasized. Attention to quality teaching, however, must remain consistent throughout the faculty member's career. The intent is to view the faculty member's career holistically. As such, candidates must exemplify—again, over the course of their entire career—what it means to be a Professor, demonstrating excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

The successful candidate must demonstrate the following professional qualities:

- a. Leadership: Shapes opinions, creates knowledge, provides a professional example, and creates direction for initiatives that are campus-wide, regional, national, or international in scope.
- b. Citizenship: Embodies active engagement in the life of the department, the campus, the profession, the wider community and in teaching and scholarly activities across the academy.
- c. Initiative: Exemplifies recognition and response to institutional, disciplinary, or professional needs by means of independent or original activity.
- d. Promise of Future Contributions: Exhibits vibrant and dynamic membership within the department, the College, and the profession.

In the Review for Promotion to Professor, the candidate is evaluated on both her or his performance and promise of future performance in the areas of Commitment to the Mission and Goals of the College; Educational Preparation; Employment History and Time in Rank; Teaching; Scholarship; Service; and Professional Qualities. See Sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.5 for Criteria specific to the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

6.10.2.A Expectations for Teaching by Review for Promotion to Professor

At the point of review for promotion to professor, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Highly developed, high quality teaching practices.

- b. Continuous reflection on teaching practice with attention to improvement in course development and expertise in course design.
- c. Consistently high level of student learning as measured through assessment.
- d. Engagement in the process of peer feedback and evaluation of course design and teaching practice.
- e. Consistent availability to students and a strong commitment to and pattern of working with students outside of the classroom in advising and mentoring capacities.
- f. A continued pattern of professional development in the area of teaching with the goal of strengthening/developing overall teaching skills and quality in the classroom.
- g. Continued interest in development within the area of teaching.

6.10.2.B Expectations for Scholarship by Review for Promotion to Professor

At the point of review for promotion to professor, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. Continued engagement in scholarship as evidenced by on-going work on a substantial project (which may have more than one product) that clearly demonstrates excellence in scholarship based on all four of the following: (1) presentation to an audience, (2) external review, (3) creativity/originality, and (4) expertise within the discipline.
- b. A continued pattern of presenting scholarly work to an audience.
- c. Establishment of scholarly credibility within her or his body of work through external review.
- d. Continued creativity/originality in scholarly activity.
- e. Maintains high level of expertise within the discipline, or develops new expertise.
- f. A continued pattern of involvement in the life of the discipline.
- g. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of scholarship as reflected in an updated scholarship plan.

Candidates should consult their Department Statement on Scholarship (see Section 6.3.4) for a description of what is considered scholarship within the department and how the Criteria for Scholarship—Presentation to an Audience, External Review, Creativity/Originality, and Expertise Within the Discipline—apply to scholarship within the Department.

6.10.2.C Expectations for Service by Review for Promotion to Professor

At the point of review for promotion to professor, the candidate demonstrates:

- a. A continuing pattern of quality service and leadership within the Department and the College. Such service should clearly demonstrate excellence in service based on all three of the following: (1) quality and significance of contribution, (2) time and effort, and (3) centrality to the mission and work of the Department as well as the Mission and work of the College.
- b. Willingness to devote the time and effort necessary to engage in quality service contributions.

- c. Willingness to take on leadership roles for the Department and College.
- d. An established pattern of service within the discipline/profession or the surrounding community.
- e. An established and continuing pattern of involvement in the life of the Department and the life of the College.
- f. Promise and continued interest in development within the area of service.

6.10.3 Required Documentation for the Review for Promotion to Professor

Required documentation for the Promotion Review includes written materials provided by the candidate, written materials provided by the Dean’s Office, and letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean as listed below. Deadlines for submitting documentation are listed in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

Candidates are responsible for checking with the Dean’s office that documents provided by the Dean’s Office, Reference Letters, and the Department Report are submitted to the CTP by the deadlines established in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3). If any materials are missing by the due date, the candidate must immediately notify the Dean and Department Chair.

Written materials provided by the candidate for the Promotion Review:

- a. Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Candidate’s Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.
- c. Candidate’s Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for the years of employment at Augsburg College since the Tenure Review.
- d. Candidate’s Cumulative Report(s) for Post-tenure Review, as described in Section 6.9.3.
- e. Candidate’s Sabbatical Report(s), as described in Section 6.11.7.
- f. The Official (i.e. approved and available for public view) Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

Written materials provided by the Dean’s Office for the Promotion Review:

- g. Report from the Department Chair from the First Year Review or Annual Reviews.
- h. Letters from the CTP from the Third Year Review and the Tenure Review and all written materials related to any appeal proceedings.
- i. Letters from the Dean from Post-tenure review, as described in Section 6.9.4.
- j. Written agreements with the Dean regarding timing of reviews, if any.
- k. Student Course Evaluations, as described in Section 3.2.8.

Letters and reports provided by persons authorized by the Dean for the Promotion Review:

- 1. Department Report and, if needed, the Department Minority Report.

m. Dean's Report to Committee on Tenure and Promotion

n. Four reference letters from faculty members at Augsburg College who are themselves past Third Year Review, whenever possible. As the Department Chair writes the Department Report, the candidate should not normally ask the Department Chair to write a separate Reference Letter for the Candidate. The candidate must notify the Dean of these letter writers by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3. These letters must include:

1. A Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
2. A second Reference Letter from a faculty member in the candidate's Department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching (and, as appropriate, Scholarship and Service) as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
3. A Reference Letter from a faculty member outside the candidate's department who has conducted peer reviews prior to writing the letter. This letter must address Teaching as described in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.4.6.A.
4. A Reference Letter from a faculty member outside the candidate's department who has served with the candidate in a service role outside of the candidate's department. This letter must address Service as described in Sections 6.3.5 and 6.4.6.C.

o. A letter from a disciplinary or professional colleague from outside the College who is in a position to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Candidates should provide a list of possible disciplinary or professional colleagues to the Dean by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The Dean or the Dean's representative will then make arrangements for this outside reviewer. This letter must address Scholarship as described in Sections 6.3.4 and 6.4.6.B.

6.10.4 Departmental Process for Review for Promotion to Professor

The candidate's Department Chair convenes a Departmental Review Committee for the candidate consisting of all of the tenured members of the Department and the candidate's Division Chair. (In this context, all references to Department Chair and Division Chair include Substitutes as outlined in Section 6.2.2 as necessary.) The Department Chair notifies the Dean and the candidate of the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the candidate provides the following written materials to the Departmental Review Committee members:

- a. Draft of the Candidate's Curriculum Vitae, as described in Section 6.4.3.
- b. Draft of the Candidate's Written Personal Statement, as described in Section 6.4.4.
- c. Candidate's Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for the years of employment at Augsburg College since the Tenure Review.

- d. Candidate's Cumulative Report(s) for Post-tenure Review, as described in Section 6.9.3.
- e. Candidate's Sabbatical Report(s), as described in Section 6.11.7.
- f. Student Course Evaluations (the candidate's own copies are acceptable), as described in Section 3.2.8.
- g. Department Statement on Scholarship as described in Section 6.3.4.

The Office of Academic Affairs will forward the external disciplinary reviewer's letter to the Department Review Committee.

By the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3, the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the candidate and the Departmental Review Committee. The candidate is present at the start of the meeting to answer questions and address concerns. Then the candidate is excused and the Departmental Review Committee discusses the candidate's qualifications relative to the Expectations for Faculty Members by the Review for Promotion to Professor outlined in Section 6.10.2. Next, the members of the Departmental Review Committee, excluding the Division Chair, vote on whether to recommend the candidate for positive Promotion Review. (Note: The Division Chair's role is to represent the Faculty outside the candidate's Department and to offer guidance as needed. As such, the Division Chair attends the meeting, but does not chair it, and counts votes.)

Following the meeting, the Department Chair writes the Department Report as described in Section 6.4.5. The Department Chair distributes a draft of the Department Report to the members of the Departmental Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3) to allow feedback from committee members and time for the preparation of a Department Minority Report as described in Section 6.4.5 if appropriate. After the finalized Department Report is signed by the members of the Department Review Committee, the Department Chair submits this report to CTP by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

6.10.5 Committee on Tenure and Promotion (CTP) and Decision Process for the Review for Promotion to Professor

The CTP reviews the documentation provided by the candidate for Promotion Review and conducts a personal interview. The purpose of the personal interview is to give the candidate an opportunity to clarify for the CTP or elaborate on any issues or questions raised in the candidate's documentation. The candidate should be prepared to summarize information presented in his or her documentation as the interview is an opportunity for CTP members to get to know the candidate better. The purview of the CTP is not limited except by the provisions of this Faculty Handbook and other pertinent legal guidelines, and questions asked of the candidate must be tailored to the candidate's individual Promotion Review. The personal interview must be completed by the deadline in the Timelines for Reviews in Section 6.2.3.

The Department Report is part of the documentation considered by the CTP and is typically an important part of their considerations, but the Department's recommendation is not binding on the CTP. The CTP reviews the candidate based on the documentation provided and the personal interview. Note that the Dean does not vote, is not present for the vote, and is informed only of the final recommendation.

By the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews, the CTP informs the Dean of their recommendation. The Dean's Office notifies each candidate when his or her letter of recommendation from CTP is available no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The time schedule for appeals begins when the Dean's Office notifies the candidate, not when the candidate receives the letter. The candidate's appellate rights and procedures are outlined in Section 6.2.4.

The Dean forwards the CTP's recommendation to the President for his or her approval by the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. The President will forward his or her recommendation to the Board of Regents to be ratified at the next regular meeting of the Board. The CTP recommendation is not binding on the Board of Regents who have final authority on the Promotion Review. The candidate will be notified in writing of the Board's decision no later than the date specified in 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews.

6.11 Sabbatical and Academic Leaves

6.11.1 General Statement

Faculty may take sabbatical leaves on a seven-year rotation. Faculty may take other academic leaves on an irregular schedule as described below. Both types of leaves are distinct from personal leaves, which are taken for non-academic reasons and are unpaid (see Section 7.4).

During sabbatical or academic leaves, a faculty member suspends usual work in order to pursue study or research that will benefit the College and assist the professional development of the faculty member. This study or research may be in the faculty member's field of expertise or in a related area. The leave should provide the faculty member with the opportunity to produce reputable work in the chosen field free from the constraints of the academic calendar. Faculty members remain employees of the College while on leave. They retain the procedural rights and responsibilities of their positions, as described in this Handbook, while on leave. Leaves may not be merely recreational or an opportunity for alternative employment (see also Section 3.4.2 on outside employment). Leaves must create a demonstrable benefit for the College.

6.11.2 Sabbatical Leave Program: Normal Rotation.

Faculty members who successfully complete either tenure review or their scheduled post-tenure review are eligible for, and will normally receive, a one semester sabbatical leave for the duty

year following review. Tenured faculty must complete their scheduled tenure or post-tenure review or they are not eligible for sabbatical leaves. Normally the leave is taken as 3/6 FTE in a single semester, where the faculty member is required to work the remaining 3/6 FTE in the semester in which they are not on leave.

Full year sabbaticals are possible, but must be negotiated on an individual basis. They are more likely to be granted when outside resources, such as grants or fellowships, are available. All benefits not covered by outside resources continue during a full year sabbatical.

If an eligible faculty member does not wish to use his or her sabbatical leave at the normal rotation times, they may delay using the leave, but must consult with the Department, and/or Program and the Dean about the intended schedule. While such a leave is pending, the faculty member may not apply for the other leaves outlined in Section 6.11.8. The faculty member must use his or her sabbatical leave before applying for a competitive leave. The seven-year rotation for his or her next leave does not begin until the previous leave has been taken.

6.11.3 Eligibility

Tenured faculty members may apply for a sabbatical leave in the normal rotation once every seventh year of service at 4/6 FTE or greater. The seventh year is counted by beginning with the year after the first leave, and does not count the year in which the leave was taken. Faculty members will normally receive a semester sabbatical leave (3/6 FTE)—and are required to work the remaining 3/6 FTE during the semester in which they are not on leave.

6.11.4 FTE Reallocation

Normally, departments and/or programs must plan what to do with the 3/6 FTE being used by the faculty member on sabbatical leave. Departments will not normally receive any additional FTE to cover courses for the member on sabbatical. Normally, departments must compensate for the faculty member on sabbatical by:

- a) offering courses or programs in different terms or years;
- b) combining under-enrolled course sections; and/or
- c) eliminating under-enrolled course sections.

In exceptional situations, the Department Chair and/or Program Director may negotiate with the Dean for an increase of up to 3/6 FTE for the express purpose of covering the FTE normally covered by the faculty member on sabbatical. In order to request additional FTE, the Department Chair should submit a letter to the Dean explaining: which faculty wish to take sabbaticals, what efforts have been made to fund those sabbaticals from within the department, and how many FTE cannot be funded from within the department.

On average, the Board of Regents has funded 15/6 to 18/6 FTE units each year for sabbaticals. The Dean's office expects to use that pool of FTE to supplement departments unable to fund their sabbaticals through budget neutral means. Such funding, of course, will depend upon the available financial resources of the College.

6.11.5 Compensation

If the leave of absence is taken for a full year, the recipient will receive 3/6 FTE of his or her salary and is not required to perform any other work during the leave. If the leave of absence is taken for one semester, the recipient will receive his or her full salary but will be required to work a normal load in the semester they are not on leave. The term "salary," as used above, refers to the assigned salary faculty members would have received if they have not been on leave for the year in which the leave of absence is taken. All relevant benefits continue during a sabbatical.

6.11.6 Application and Approval Process

Eligible faculty members must submit a brief letter to the Department Chair and/or Program Director and the Dean indicating their intention to take a sabbatical leave. This letter must be submitted by the date specified in Section 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews in the year prior to the anticipated leave. The letter should specify the dates of the leave; area(s) of research, study, or professional development; and expected benefits to the College and the individual faculty member. The letter does not need to include a detailed research proposal or bibliography.

The Department Chair or Program Director must approve a sabbatical application after consultation with all the tenure track and tenured members of the Department or Program, individually or as a group. Applications will be judged on the criteria listed in this section including: eligibility, purpose, and resources. The Department Chair and/or Program Director should discuss how the eligible faculty member's FTE will be covered during the leave. Departments and/or programs should make every effort to allow the eligible faculty member to take the leave, within the bounds of the College's financial and personnel resources.

By the Date Specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.2.3), the Dean notifies the candidate of his or her leave decision. All academic leaves are subject to the approval of the Dean and the Board of Regents (completed by the date specified in Section 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews) and depend upon the financial resources of the College.

6.11.7 Reporting and Return Requirements

When a faculty member returns from leave they must make a formal, public presentation of her or his work to the Department, Program and/or other appropriate College gatherings by the date specified in Section 6.2.3 Timelines for Reviews. A copy of this presentation, called a Sabbatical

Report, is given to the Department Chair and/or Program Director and the Dean by that same date. A faculty member must continue working at the College at least one full semester after the sabbatical. If a faculty member fails to return, she or he must reimburse the College for all salary and benefits received during the sabbatical.

6.11.8 Other Academic Leaves

Sabbatical leaves are normally granted to individual faculty no more than once every seven years of service. However, occasionally a faculty member may apply for a leave of absence between the standard seventh-year sabbatical.

Such leaves are only occasionally available and depend upon the financial resources of the College. Amounts will vary according to the number of applications and the funds available for this purpose. The form, duration and procedure for such occasional leaves must be determined on an individual basis in negotiations with the Dean, and the relevant department and/or program. Such leaves are more likely when outside funding is available (grants, fellowships, etc.).

6.12 Reviews of Non-tenure Track Faculty Members (NTTF)

6.12.1 General Statement on Review of NTTF

Faculty members are expected to regularly reflect on their performance, set goals for their work, and undergo evaluation by students, peers, and College leadership. These reviews include Student Evaluation and Peer Review of teaching and Annual Reviews required of all faculty members.

Faculty members in Special Appointments also participate in formal reviews of their performance every third year of their appointment. The first of these reviews is the Third Year Review; the second is the Sixth Year Review; and thereafter are the Renewal Reviews.

Non-tenure Track positions are contingent on the needs of the Department and the College. To encourage departments to be thoughtful and deliberate in the continuing employment of faculty members in Non-tenure Track Appointments, the first stage of the Third Year, Sixth Year, and Renewal Reviews is to assess the needs of the Department in order to decide whether to continue the position. The timing of these position reviews deliberately coincides with the timing for Tenure Track position requests so that the Department may review each position within the broader context of strategic planning for Department staffing.

The position review is conducted by the Tenure Track faculty members in the Department and is outlined in Section 6.12.4. In reviewing the position, the Department may request continuation,

request a different type of Non-tenure Track appointment, request a Tenure Track appointment, or may recommend terminating the position. If the Department identifies a need for a permanent full-time position, the Department is normally expected to request a Tenure Track position. Requests for continuation of the existing position, a new position, or termination of the existing position are subject to approval by the Dean.

If continuing the position is approved, the second stage of the Third Year, Sixth Year, and Renewal Review is to evaluate the performance and promise of future performance of the faculty member in a Special Appointment, in order to decide whether to continue that faculty member's appointment to the position. This part of the review is conducted by the appropriate Review Committee described in Section 6.12.1B and follows the process outlined in Sections 6.12.5.

The Timeline for Reviews is listed in Section 6.12.1C. It is designed so that the decision on the position occurs sufficiently ahead of the deadline for notification for non re-appointment – before the third, sixth, or renewal year begins. If a position is continued, the review of the faculty member occurs after the deadline for notification for non re-appointment. This timing means that a faculty member whose position is continued but who receives a negative review of their performance at the Third Year, Sixth Year, or Renewal Review retains the right to a non-renewable (terminal) one-year appointment for the next academic year.

The remainder of this section outlines the criteria for evaluation, expectations for performance at each level of review, and the procedures for reviews, including timelines and necessary documentation.

6.12.1 A Timing and Nature of Reviews for NTTF

All faculty members participate in the Annual Review, as described in Section 6.5. The Annual Report may be modified as appropriate to the position, but faculty members are encouraged to list all activities and accomplishments relevant to their work at the College. Annual Reviews are intended to be primarily formative (as defined in Section 6.2.1).

Faculty members in **Adjunct** Appointments participate in Annual Reviews on a regular basis, at least once every three years.

Faculty members in **Fixed-term Appointments** participate in Annual Reviews each year. In the unusual circumstance when a Department wishes to appoint a faculty member past a third year of a Fixed-term Appointment, the faculty member must first undergo a Third Year Review before the appointment to the fourth year can be finalized. The steps of the process are the same as for the Third Year Review of faculty members in a Special Appointment, including first reviewing the position. While the precise timing for this review is not preset, it should occur as soon as possible after the need for a fourth year is determined. It must allow the faculty member a reasonable amount of time to prepare the necessary materials.

Faculty members in **Special Appointments** participate in Annual Reviews each year. The Third Year Review and Sixth Year Review typically occur in years three and six, respectively, beginning each time with a review of the position in the spring of the prior year. Faculty members with significant experience relevant to the position may be hired into Special Appointments with an accelerated review schedule, but a minimum of three years in a full-time or part-time paid “on scale” faculty appointment at Augsburg is expected prior to the Sixth Year Review. The Renewal Review occurs every three years thereafter, beginning each time with a review of the position in the spring of the prior year. The Third Year, Sixth Year, and Renewal Reviews are primarily summative (as defined in Section 6.2.1).

A faculty member originally holding a Fixed-term Appointment may subsequently be hired into a Special Appointment. The timing of the Third Year and Sixth Year Reviews are set at the time of appointment to the new position. If the timing of those reviews would result in the faculty member being in full-time or part-time paid “on scale” appointments for more than three years (Fixed-term and Special Appointments combined) without a formal departmental review, then the Department conducts a review of the faculty member no later than during the third year of appointment. This review follows the same expectations and timing as for any faculty member in a Fixed-term Appointment continuing past three years.

6.12.1 B The Review Committees for NTTF

All Tenure Track members of a Department are involved in the review of a Non-tenure Track position, as described in Section 6.12.4. Pending recommendation and approval to continue the position, a Review Committee reviews the performance of the faculty member. This section describes the composition of the Review Committee.

The Review Committee for the Third Year Review and Sixth Year Review includes all Tenure Track faculty members in the faculty member’s Department as well as the Division Chair as a non-voting member. For the Sixth Year Review, a tenured faculty member from an outside department is added to the Review Committee as a voting member. This additional faculty member is often a current or former Department Chair from a department employing similar Special Appointments and is selected by the Department Chair and the Division Chair, subject to approval by the Dean.

The Review Committee for the Renewal Review consists of the Department Chair, a tenured member of the Department selected by the faculty member, and a tenured member of the Department selected by the Department Chair and Division Chair. The Division Chair also serves, as a non-voting member.

In qualified circumstances, substitutions for the Department or Division Chair or other members of the faculty member’s Department are necessary in the review process, including when there is

not a sufficient number of department members eligible to participate in that role for a review. Any reference to the Department or Division Chair and members of the Department is intended to apply to their substitutes, if appointed. Section 6.2.2 outlines the circumstances requiring substitution and the process for appointing substitutes.

6.12.1 C Timelines for Review of NTTF

In most cases, the following timelines will be used. The process, including required materials, is described in detail in Sections 6.12.3-6.12.5.

Third Year Review of NTTF

Unless indicated otherwise, dates refer to the third year of full-time faculty appointment.

Step 1: Review of position

Department meets to decide whether to recommend continuation of the position, request a new position (e.g. Tenure Track or different Non-tenure Track position), or recommend termination of the position: By May 15 *of second year*

Department Chair submits recommendation/request to the Dean: June 1 *of second year*

Dean informs Department Chair of decision: August 15 *of second year*

If position as Non-tenure track of same appointment type is not recommended and approved, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming (third) year is final year of appointment: September 1

Step 2: Review of faculty member (if position as Non-tenure Track of same appointment type is recommended and approved)

Dean notifies faculty member that appointment is continuing and Third Year Review will commence: September 1

Department Chair notifies Dean of the members of the Review Committee: September 15

Materials to Review Committee (by faculty member): March 1

Review Committee Meeting: by March 15

Department Chair provides draft of Department Report to the Review Committee: April 1

Department Report to the Dean: April 8

Materials to Dean (by faculty member): April 8

Dean decides and notifies Department Chair and faculty member: May 1

If negative decision, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming (fourth) year is the final year of appointment: September 1 *of fourth year*

Sixth Year Review of Special Appointments

Unless indicated otherwise, dates refer to the sixth year of full-time faculty appointment, or its equivalent for advanced hires.

Step 1: Review of position

Department meets to decide whether to recommend continuation of the position, request a new position (e.g. Tenure Track or different Non-tenure Track), or recommend termination of the position: By May 15 *of fifth year*

Department Chair submits recommendation/request to the Dean: June 1 *of fifth year*

Dean informs Department Chair of decision: August 15 *of fifth year*

If position as Non-tenure Track of same appointment type is not recommended and approved, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming (sixth) year is final year of appointment: September 1

Step 2: Review of faculty member (if position as Non-tenure Track of same appointment type is recommended and approved)

Dean notifies faculty member that appointment is continuing and Sixth Year Review will commence: September 1

Department Chair notifies the Dean of members of the Review Committee: September 15

Materials to Review Committee (by faculty member): November 1

Review Committee Meeting: by November 15

Department Chair provides draft of Department Report to the Review Committee: December 1

Department Report to the Dean: December 8

Materials to Dean (by faculty member): December 8

Dean decides and notifies Department Chair and faculty member: January 15

If negative decision, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming (seventh) year is the final year of appointment: September 1 *of seventh year*

Renewal Review of Special Appointments

Unless indicated otherwise, dates refer to the third year of the cycle, a.k.a. the "renewal year."

Step 1: Review of position

Department meets to decide whether to recommend continuation of the position, request a new position (e.g. Tenure Track or different Non-tenure Track), or recommend termination of the position: By May 15 *of second year of cycle*

Department Chair submits recommendation/request to the Dean: June 1 *of second year of cycle*

Dean informs Department Chair of decision: August 15 *of second year of cycle*

If position as Non-tenure Track of same appointment type is not recommended and approved, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming year (third year of cycle) is final year of appointment: September 1

Step 2: Review of faculty member (if position as Non-tenure Track of same appointment type is recommended and approved)

Dean notifies faculty member that appointment is continuing and Renewal Review will commence: September 1

Department Chair notifies Dean of the members of the Review Committee: September 15

Materials to Review Committee (by faculty member): April 8

Review Committee Meeting: by April 22

Department Chair submits Review Committee recommendation to the Dean: April 30

Materials to Dean (by faculty member): April 30

Dean decides and notifies Department Chair and faculty member: May 15

If negative decision, Dean notifies faculty member that upcoming year (fourth year of cycle) is the final year of appointment: September 1 *of fourth year*

6.12.1 D Criteria for Defining and Evaluating Teaching, Scholarship, and Service of NTTF

Section 6.3.2 provides criteria that both define what the College considers “Teaching,” “Scholarship,” and “Service,” and how the College evaluates the quality of those activities in the review of Tenure Track faculty members. While the expectations for Non-tenure Track faculty members are different from those of Tenure-track Faculty members, and vary by type of Non-tenure Track Appointment, the criteria that define “Teaching,” “Scholarship,” and “Service” and how the College evaluates the quality of those activities outlined in Section 6.3.2 also apply in the review of Non-tenure Track faculty members. Expectations for Non-tenure Track faculty members by type of appointment and level of review are outlined in Sections 6.12.2 (Adjunct Appointments), 6.12.3 (Fixed-term Appointments), and 6.12.5 (Special Appointments).

6.12.2 Review of Faculty Members in Adjunct Appointments

Faculty members in Adjunct Appointments participate in Annual Reviews on a regular basis, at least once every three years. Information about the Annual Review process appears in Section 6.5.

6.12.2 A Areas for Evaluating Faculty Members in Adjunct Appointments

Faculty members in Adjunct Appointments are evaluated based on Expertise, Teaching, Commitment to the Mission of the College, and Professional Qualities. Expertise may be a combination of educational preparation and professional experience appropriate to the position; often a Master’s degree or some form of professional recognition within the discipline is expected. The level of expertise would be stated at the time of appointment, or the Department may propose a standard level of expertise for all Adjunct Appointments.

6.12.2 B Expectation of Faculty Members in Adjunct Appointments

Faculty members in an Adjunct Appointment, at the point of each Annual Review are expected to

Teaching

- a. Demonstrate a pattern of quality teaching practice.
- b. Follow Department or College expectations for course content, learning objectives, and other standards.
- c. Demonstrate a high level of student learning by students in their courses.
- d. Be consistently available to students, possibly primarily through electronic communication.
- e. Engage in reflection on teaching, student evaluation of teaching, peer review of teaching, and professional development in teaching.
- f. Show promise and continued interest in development within the area of teaching.

Other expectations

- a. Demonstrate current expertise in subject matter appropriate to course(s) taught.
- b. Maintain regular communication with Department Chair and provide student information as needed by the College, such as grades and student progress reports.
- c. Support the Mission of the College.
- d. Demonstrate professional qualities.

6.12.3 Review of Faculty Members in Fixed-term Appointments

Faculty members in Fixed-term Appointments participate in Annual Reviews each year. Information about the Annual Review process appears in Section 6.5.

In the unusual circumstance when a Department wishes to appoint a faculty member to a fourth year of a Fixed-term Appointment, the faculty member must first undergo the Third Year Review which follows the same process as the Third Year Review of faculty members in Special Appointments in Section 6.12.4-6.12.5, but carries only the expectations outlined in Section 6.12.3A- B.

6.12.3 A Areas for Evaluating of Faculty Members in Fixed-term Appointments

Faculty members in Fixed-term Appointments are evaluated based on Expertise, Teaching, Service, Commitment to the Mission of the College, and Professional Qualities. Expertise may be a combination of educational preparation and professional experience appropriate to the position; usually a Master's degree or some form of professional recognition within the discipline is expected. For the rank of Visiting Assistant Professor and above, the terminal

degree and engagement in scholarship is expected. In either case, the level of expertise would be stated in the position request for the position.

6.12.3 B Expectation of Faculty Members in Fixed-term Appointments by level of Review

Faculty members in a Fixed-term Appointment, at the point of each Annual Review and at the time of a Third Year Review (if appointed past three years) are expected to

Teaching

- a. Demonstrate a pattern of quality teaching practice.
- b. Follow Department or College expectations for course content, learning objectives, and other standards.
- c. Demonstrate a high level of student learning by students in their courses.
- d. Be consistently available to students, including regularly scheduled in-person office hours.
- e. Engage in reflection on teaching, student evaluation of teaching, peer review of teaching, and professional development in teaching.
- f. Show promise and continued interest in development within the area of teaching.
- g. When asked, provide feedback to other members of the Department engaged in course design or assist with on-going course development.
- h. Engage in advising and/or mentoring activities (starting in the second year).

Scholarship (if/as applicable)*

*Only for faculty members holding the terminal degree and appointed to the rank of Visiting Assistant Professor or above.

- a. Work on one or more scholarly projects that have the potential to demonstrate excellence in scholarship based on all four of the following: (1) presentation to an audience, (2) external review, (3) creativity/originality, and (4) expertise within the discipline.
- b. Engage in presenting scholarship to an audience, providing scholarship for external review, and/or being involved in the life of the discipline (starting in the second year).

Service

- a. Participate in New Faculty Orientation to the College.
- b. Participate in the life of the Department and the College.

Other expectations

- a. Demonstrate current expertise in subject matter appropriate to course(s) taught.
- b. Maintain regular communication with Department Chair and provide student information as needed by the College, such as grades and student progress reports.
- c. Support the Mission of the College.
- d. Demonstrate professional qualities.

6.12.4 Review of Special Appointment Positions

The first stage of the Third Year, Sixth Year, and Renewal Reviews of Special Appointments is to decide whether to continue the position. This section describes the process for the review of the position.

By the dates specified in the Timeline for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C), the faculty member's Department Chair convenes a meeting of the Tenure Track members of the Department to determine whether to request continuation of the Non-tenure Track appointment; to request a different type of Non-tenure Track appointment in place of the current position; to request a Tenure Track appointment; or to recommend terminating the position. If a need for a permanent full-time position is identified, the Department is normally expected to request a Tenure Track position. If the Department Chair is Non-tenure Track or if there are not a sufficient number of Tenure Track members of the Department, substitutes are appointed following the guidelines in Section 6.2.2.

In advance of this meeting, the Tenure Track members of the Department should identify relevant data and other information about the position (e.g. program status, enrollment data, percentage of courses taught by TT-NTT faculty, etc.). The Department Chair, working with the Dean's Office and the Office of Planning and Effectiveness, will provide data and information as requested.

After the Department makes its recommendation about the position, the Department Chair communicates that decision to the Dean, and the Dean makes the final decision – each step by the dates specified in the Timeline for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). If the decision is made to discontinue the position, the faculty member is notified by the dates listed in Section 6.12.1C that the upcoming academic year is the last year of their appointment.

The Department also recommends whether the appointment should be a renewable three-year appointment or renewable annual appointment. For the sake of continuity in staffing for the Department and job security for the faculty member, three-year appointments should be offered whenever reasonably supported by the needs of the Department and the College. In either case, the continuing need for these positions is re-evaluated every third year as described above.

6.12.5 Review of Faculty Members in Special Appointments

Faculty members in Special Appointments participate in Annual Reviews each year. Every third year and contingent on approval to continue the position as outlined in Section 6.12.4, faculty members in Special Appointments also undergo Third Year Review, Sixth Year Review, and Renewal Reviews as described in the remainder of this section.

6.12.5 A Areas for Evaluating Faculty Members in Special Appointments

Faculty members in Special Appointments are evaluated based on Expertise, Commitment to the

Mission of the College, Professional Qualities and elements of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service as appropriate to the specific position. Expertise may be a combination of educational preparation and professional experience, as described in the request for the position.

6.12.5 B Expectations for Faculty Members in Special Appointments

Expectations for faculty members in Special Appointments reflect the rationale for the position and the duties specific to the position. These expectations are articulated by the Department, subject to the approval of the Dean at the point of hire, and may be adjusted by the Department, subject to the approval of the Dean, following each position review. The Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service should be selected from the lists for Tenure Track faculty members – using the Expectations for Third Year Review from Section 6.7.2A-C for the Third Year Review and the Expectations for Tenure Review or Post-tenure Review from Section 6.8.2.A-C or 6.9.2.A-C for the Sixth Year and Renewal Reviews. A limited number of additional expectations specific to the position may be added, if appropriate.

A significant portion of the faculty member's workload might involve collaborating with students or faculty in research or creative projects; or establishing, coordinating, supervising, or mentoring student experiences such as internships, practica, preceptorships, student teaching, service-learning, work study, or study abroad. In such cases, often the teaching load is significantly fewer than the standard six courses or focuses on teaching experiential courses such as science laboratories or studio courses in the fine arts, and so the expectations chosen for Teaching should be consistent with that role.

For faculty members in Special Appointments with a six course per year teaching load, the expectations chosen normally should include all expectations for Teaching and Service from those lists, with the understand that the opportunities for service on a Standing Committee of the Faculty might be limited.

In either case, these expectations normally would include Advising and Mentoring (under Teaching), Departmental Service (under Service), as well as the following:

- a. Demonstrate current expertise in subject matter appropriate to the position description.
- b. Maintain regular communication with Department Chair and provide student information as needed by the College, such as grades and student progress reports.
- c. Support the Mission of the College.
- d. Demonstrate professional qualities.

6.12.5 C Department Review Process for Faculty Members in Special Appointments

The first stage of the review process for faculty members in Special Appointments is a review of the position, as described in Section 6.12.4. If the Department proposes to continue the position

and the Dean approves continuation, then the process of reviewing the faculty member begins, as outlined in this section.

The Department Chair convenes a Review Committee as outlined in Section 6.12.1B, by the dates specified in the Timeline for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C).

The faculty member provides the following written materials to the Review Committee members by the date specified in the Timeline for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C).

- a. A current Curriculum Vitae, where reasonable following the outline in Section 6.4.3.
- b. A brief Written Personal Statement addressing Commitment to the Mission of the College. Departments may establish additional expectations for the Written Personal statement selected from the list in Section 6.4.4. Any additional expectations should be communicated to the candidate in writing at least one month before the statement is due. The Written Personal Statement is not required for Renewal Reviews.
- c. Annual Reports to the Dean, as described in Section 6.5.4 for all years of employment at Augsburg College. For Renewal Review, only reports from the prior three years are required.
- d. Student Course Evaluations, as described in Section 3.2.8, if any. For Renewal Review, only evaluations from the prior three years are required. In the case where no (or very few) courses are taught, the faculty member will confer with the Department Chair and determine what external evaluation of work should be provided, if any. For example, the faculty member might be asked to provide an evaluation of grant-funded work or a reference letter from an individual with whom the faculty member maintains relationships for supervising students at experiential education sites or from a professional colleague outside the College who can speak to the candidate's professional standing, etc. The list of required materials should be kept minimal and should be communicated to the candidate in writing at the time the review begins (i.e. immediately after the continuation of the position is approved).

Next, the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the faculty member and the Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). The faculty member is present at the start of the Review Committee meeting to answer questions and address concerns. Then the faculty member is excused and the Review Committee discusses the faculty member's qualifications relative to the Areas for Evaluating Faculty Members in Special Appointments in Section 6.12.5A, for the appropriate level of review. Next, the members of the Review Committee, excluding the Division Chair, vote on whether to recommend the faculty member for positive review. (Note: The Division Chair's role is to represent the Faculty outside the faculty member's Department and to offer guidance as needed. As such, the Division Chair attends the meeting, but does not chair it, and counts votes.)

For Third Year and Sixth Year Review, the next step is the Department Chair writes the

Department Report as described in Section 6.4.5, but addressing the Areas and Expectations from 6.12.5.A-B. The Department Chair distributes a draft of the Department Report to the members of the Review Committee by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (see Section 6.12.1C) to allow feedback from the Review Committee members and time for the preparation of a Department Minority Report as described in Section 6.4.5 if appropriate. Once the Department Report is signed by the members of the Review Committee, the Department Chair submits this report to Dean by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). If there is a Minority Report, it is sent by the signatories directly to the Dean by the same date.

For Third Year and Sixth Year Review, the faculty member forwards their Curriculum Vitae and Written Personal Statement to the Dean by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). The faculty member may make minor revisions to these materials after their review by the Department, for example, to incorporate feedback from the Review Committee. In addition to these materials, the Dean has access to the faculty member's Annual Reports to the Dean and Student Course Evaluations (or other external reviews as listed above) and will have the Department Report. The Dean makes the final decision by the date specified in the Timelines for Review (Section 6.12.1C).

For Renewal Review, no Department Report is written. Instead, the Department Chair forwards the recommendation of the Department to the Dean by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). The faculty member forwards their Curriculum Vitae to the Dean by the date specified in the Timelines for Reviews (Section 6.12.1C). The faculty member may make minor revisions to these materials after their review by the Department, for example, to incorporate feedback from the Review Committee. No Written Personal Statement is required. In addition to these materials, the Dean has access to the faculty member's Annual Reports to the Dean and the faculty member's Student Course Evaluations (or other external reviews as listed above). The Dean makes the final decision by the date specified in the Timelines for Review (Section 6.12.1C).

Section 6 approved Spring 2010.

Sections 6.1 and 6.12 revised May 2015.