

AUGSBURG COLLEGE

FACULTY HANDBOOK

Revised May 2015

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

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

Formatted: Highlight

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. 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

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.

Deleted:

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

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~~ 25
 Dean Notifies Candidate (Section 6.7.5).....~~May 1~~ April 30

- 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.....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 24
 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 24
 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
 Formatted: Strikethrough

Appeal of Negative Decision (Section 6.2.4)

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Notification of Terminal Contract (if necessary; rescinded if appeal prevails) May 15	

Review for Promotion to Professor (Section 6.10)

Nominating letter to the Dean, Chair, and/or Candidate February 1 (the spring <i>prior</i> (see Section 6.10.1) promotion review)	
Candidate provides the Dean with a list of disciplinary May 1 (the spring <i>prior</i> 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 <i>prior</i> to promotion review)	
Dept. Chair Notifies Dean & Candidate of the members of the May 1 (the spring <i>prior</i> to Promotion Departmental Review Committee (Section 6.10.4) promotion review)	
Reference Letter on Scholarship to the Dean’s Office September 1 14	Formatted: Strikethrough
Dean’s Office Forwards Reference Letter on Scholarship September 5 21	Formatted: Strikethrough
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	Formatted: Strikethrough
Departmental Review Committee Meeting (Section 6.10.4)..... Completed by September 25 September 25	Formatted: Strikethrough
October 8	Formatted: Strikethrough
Dept. Chair Provides Draft of Departmental Report to the Completed by October 5 15	Formatted: Strikethrough
Review Committee Members (Section 6.10.4)	
Departmental Report to CTP (Section 6.10.4)..... October 15 22	Formatted: Strikethrough
Materials to CTP (by candidate) (Section 6.10.3)..... October 15 22	Formatted: Strikethrough
Reference Letters to CTP (Section 6.10.3)..... October 15 22	Formatted: Strikethrough
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	Formatted: Strikethrough
20 February 1	Formatted: Strikethrough
Board of Regents Approves or Disapproves (Section 6.10.5)..... Completed by May 30	

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.

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, [a Dean's Report](#), 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 – [Section 6.4.3](#)
Candidate's Written Personal Statement – [Section 6.4.4](#)
Cumulative Report for Post-tenure Review – [Section 6.9.3](#)
Peer Review Reports
Required Reference Letters – [Section 6.4.6](#)
[Dean's Report – Section 6.4.7](#)
Sabbatical Reports – [Section 6.11.7](#)
Student Course Evaluations – [Section 3.2.8](#)

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 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).

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

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.

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 Dean's Report

The Academic Dean from the candidate's division will report in writing to the Committee on Tenure and Promotion any information concerning the candidate that may not be available to the candidate's Department. The report may include information in the candidate's file, maintained by the Dean's Office, that may be relevant to the Committee's decision.

6.4.8 Confidentiality of Report and Letters

Formatted: Strikethrough

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

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

- 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.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

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).

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.

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

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

- 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:

- l. 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