April 13, 2016

To: Todd McNerney, 2015-16 Speaker of the Faculty

From: Julie Swanson, Chair, 2015-16 Post-Tenure Review Committee


The Post-Tenure Review Committee met during January and February 2016 to review eight candidates requesting a Superior review. All cases were deemed to be Superior by the Committee. These recommendations were sent to the Provost in the form of letters on each of the candidates reviewed.

After the deliberations were completed, the committee identified specific issues that became evident during our work. The following summarizes the issues in a way that should be helpful to faculty preparing packets for Post-Tenure Review and to future Post-Tenure Review Committees.

Issue 1: **Teaching evidence:** Because the *Faculty Administration Manual (FAM)* standards for promotion to Professor are the yardstick, it is incumbent on the PTR candidate seeking a Superior rating to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness. The most persuasive packets included multiple sources of evidence, from teaching materials, syllabi, and graded work, to student course evaluation, to peer observations and colleague letters, to annual reviews of teaching by the chair. It was noted that low return rates of course evaluations limits an important evidence source in some of the cases reviewed. We suggest that candidates be reminded that they must make the case through the evidence provided.

Issue 2: **Chair’s annual evaluations:** Thoroughness of the chair’s annual evaluations was widely variant in packets reviewed. Some were specific, with details and elaboration of what had been accomplished relative to each area of teaching, scholarship, and service, and including areas for improvement. Others were vague and general, with little precision about what the candidate had accomplished relative to the standards in the *FAM*.

Issue 3: **Precision and accuracy:** The PTR Committee suggests that candidates, in their cover letter, highlight the dates under review. On the CV, it would be helpful if the candidate clearly highlights the accomplishments during the period under review so that the Committee can clearly make distinctions between what came before and what came during the review period.