

Information Packet for Promotion, Tenure, and Pre-Tenure Reviews

Submission of Materials and Deadlines (Appendix 1)	2
Standard Operating Procedure (Appendix 2)	4
Brief Field Guide to Classroom Observations (Appendix 3)	12
Procedure for External Evaluations (Appendix 4)	14
Summary of Courses Taught (Appendix 5)	16
FPC Course Evaluation Data Summary Form (Appendix 6)	17
Student Interview Process (Appendix 7)	18
Candidate Checklist – Tenure/Pre-Tenure (Appendix 8a)	21
Candidate Checklist – Promotion to Full Professor (Appendix 8b)	22

Compiled by

Faculty Personnel Committee

December 2014
Revised April 2021

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS AND DEADLINES

Tenure, pre-tenure, and promotion evaluations are scheduled reviews. Through the Provost's Office, candidates and chairs/directors are made aware of the year in which these reviews will take place far in advance. The deadlines for both the candidate's submission of materials to FPC and the department's submission of materials to FPC are made known well in advance of the deadline.

As per the Faculty Handbook (p. 19-20), there are two deadlines for the submission of materials. The first deadline is for the candidate's submission of materials to the department and the Provost's Office/FPC. The second deadline is for the department's submission of its evaluation materials to the Provost's Office and FPC.

Candidates may not make any changes to the statement and/or CV after the deadline for submission of materials to the department (i.e., the FIRST deadline). Therefore candidates should be sure to solicit feedback on the statement and C.V. from their mentor(s), chair/directors, and/or other colleagues well in advance of the first deadline. This practice ensures that the candidate has the strongest possible dossier before meeting with her/his (pre-)tenure/promotion committee.

NOTE: Both the candidate and the candidate's committee will have access to the candidate's Moodle site until 5:00pm on the deadline date for the candidate's submission to the department. This allows the candidate to share materials with her/his committee and receive feedback before his/her deadline to submit materials to the department. **Candidates should be pro-active in seeking advice and commentary from the different sources they value.**

The candidate MUST submit to the department all her/his materials by 5:00pm on the day of the candidate's deadline to submit materials to the department. The candidate will no longer have access to the Moodle site after 5:00pm on the day of the candidate's deadline. The candidate will no longer be able to submit materials to her/his dossier after the deadline.

As per the Faculty Handbook: "The departmental evaluation committee shall hold two meetings. The first meeting will take place once the candidate and the departmental evaluation committee have collected the materials that will be forwarded to the Faculty Personnel Committee" (19). Thus, all materials for evaluation at this meeting must be in order BEFORE this meeting; the meeting is not to mentor the candidate nor make suggestions for changes to the materials. As per the Faculty Handbook, members of the candidate's department or evaluation committee must write letters "based upon study of the materials which the candidate submits" (20) for this meeting. This is to ensure "fairness to the candidate and the College" (20).

All letters from members of the candidate's committee, along with the chair's summary letter, outside evaluations, and summary of student interviews, should be forwarded to Amy Smith before 5:00pm on the day of the department's deadline.

Committee members should copy their chairs/directors on the email submitting their letters to the Provost's Office. The deadline for the department's submission of materials is binding.

All letters of evaluation must be in pdf format.

Candidates should pattern their dossiers after the *SAMPLE - Template for Promotion, Tenure and Pre-Tenure*, which can be found on the FPC Moodle site (<https://www.gettysburg.edu/dotCMS/login?referrer=/faculty/fpc-login.dot>). The model template clarifies the order and structure of materials and exemplifies the number of representative assignments and exams appropriate for a complete course dossier. Candidates will upload their documents into their CANDIDATE FILE, which is specified by their name.

All of the candidate's written materials must be in pdf format. Non-written supporting materials are permissible in the appropriate formats (MP3, JPEG, etc.).

The review process allows for candidates to introduce new material after the candidate's deadline for submission of materials to the department if the FPC has questions on the candidate's materials. In such a case, FPC will invite the candidate to meet with its members. At this meeting, candidates will have an opportunity to clarify any questions as well as offer new material that may be beneficial to her/his case.

FPC strives to uphold fairness to the candidate, fairness to the process, and fairness to the institution. Adhering to the guidelines for submission of materials upholds the review process outlined in the Faculty Handbook and ensures that all candidates receive the same consideration and are subject to the same deadlines.

FPC/November 2014

APPENDIX 2

Standard Operating Procedure **Faculty Personnel Committee**

Purpose: The Committee makes recommendations to the President concerning tenure, pre-tenure, promotion, and other personnel matters. The Committee also recommends to the President and the faculty policies concerning the faculty career process.

Membership: Six elected tenured faculty members, i.e., two from each of the three divisions of the faculty.
Provost of the College
President of the College (*ex officio*)

Voting: Only the elected members of the Committee can make motions and vote. The Provost is a non-voting member.

Committee Chair: Elected by the voting members of the FPC from the elected faculty members.

Committee Secretary: A secretary may be elected by the voting members of the FPC at its first meeting from the elected faculty members, or the Committee may choose to rotate the taking of minutes among its members. A full set of minutes is kept at each meeting except for portions of the meeting when personnel decisions are being made. During deliberations on tenure, pre-tenure, and promotion, only motions, preliminary votes, and final votes are recorded. When precedent-setting or policy-defining issues arise, the secretary will make note of this in the minutes for review by the Committee at the end of the year. This procedure will provide some guidance for the following year's Committee.

TENURE/PRE-TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

I. GENERAL

1. The letters sent to the department¹ chairs and candidates which are mentioned in this document under II and III will be forwarded after being approved by the FPC. These letters will emphasize the responsibilities of the candidate, department chair, and departmental colleagues as stipulated in the *Faculty Handbook*. Attached to each letter will be a copy of the *Standard Operating Procedures of the Faculty Personnel Committee, Guidelines for Outside Evaluation, and Guidelines for Classroom Evaluation*.

¹ In most instances, the pre-tenure, tenure, or promotion committee consists of the tenured members of the candidate's department. In some situations, however, the candidate's committee is differently constituted. For the sake of brevity, when the term "department" is used here, it will refer to either department or separate committee, e.g., department or committee members, department or committee chair, etc.

2. The dossier available to the FPC includes: those materials provided to the Committee (and to the candidate's department) by the candidate; the chairperson's letter and materials provided by the chairperson such as student interview data; letters from tenured members of the department; letters from outside evaluators; departmental discipline-specific guidelines on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service; adjudicated decisions regarding the finding of guilt in a breach of professional ethics; other materials from the candidate's personnel file excluding the following: information regarding salary, confidential reference letters, information of a personal nature. The Provost shall provide other appropriate materials from the candidate's personnel file upon request from the Committee; the Provost may decline to honor requests that he or she considers to be inappropriate in the evaluation of the candidate's professional performance. For tenure candidates the dossier also includes: the chairperson's pre-tenure summary letter and the Provost's letter to the candidate and the President at the time of the pre-tenure review.
3. During the spring semester, the FPC sets the schedule for the following academic year for the receipt of evidence from the candidate and materials from the chairperson and department members. Tenure decisions usually occur in the fall semester and pre-tenure and promotion recommendations in the spring semester. An exception is made for pre-tenure reviews for candidates who are granted the maximum of three years of service toward tenure; these pre-tenure reviews are conducted in the fall semester of the second year.

Deliberations begin when a candidate's file is complete. Under normal circumstances pre-tenure deliberations will begin when all tenure recommendations will have been made; promotion deliberations will begin when all pre-tenure recommendations will have been made.

4. By action of the faculty in spring 2010, external reviews of scholarship and creative work are required for candidates for tenure who began to work at the College in the 2010-2011 academic year or later. During the AY 2017-2018, the faculty acted to require candidates seeking promotion to full professor to have outside evaluation of their scholarship or creative activity beginning in AY 2018-2019 and thereafter. The procedures for external reviews are outlined in the separate document entitled *Procedure for External Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Work*, which is distributed to all candidates and their chairpersons.

External reviews are not required at present for candidates for pre-tenure, who should nevertheless consider the advisability of external evaluation of their scholarship and creative work. The FPC recommends external reviews under EACH of the following circumstances:

- If fewer than three members of the candidate's department/program evaluation committee are trained in the candidate's discipline.
- If fewer than three members of the candidate's department/program evaluation committee are sufficiently conversant with the candidate's specialty area to read and evaluate scholarship in this area.

- If members of the candidate's committee have substantial disagreements about the merit of the candidate's scholarship or creative work.
- If the candidate or the department/program committee prefer to have external evaluators. The candidate always has the right to receive external evaluation of his/her scholarship should he/she wish to.

Candidates for pre-tenure who choose to have external evaluation will follow the procedures outlined in the *Procedure for External Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Work*.

5. Once membership of the departmental evaluation committee in pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion cases has been determined, the Provost will contact each candidate informing them of the membership of the departmental evaluation committee. The candidate will be reminded that the Faculty Handbook provides guidance on the formation of the departmental evaluation committee when there are fewer than three tenured department members or when there are unusual circumstances that may interfere with an accurate departmental assessment.

It should be noted that, if a candidate's committee makes a negative recommendation on the basis of scholarship, and if the candidate has a body of work published or in progress, and if external reviews have not been carried out, the FPC may request such reviews.

6. If, in the judgment of the Committee, a member of FPC is involved in a conflict of interest concerning any candidate before the Committee, that member will be excused from both the deliberations and the voting on that candidate. Such exclusion will always apply to members who are departmental colleagues or are related to a candidate through marriage, partnership, or kinship.
7. Any faculty member who serves as the coordinator of a special program (e.g., Africana Studies or Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies) will be evaluated not only by his/her academic department but also by the advisory committee of the special program. In evaluating the candidate as coordinator of the program, the advisory committee will assume the "Task of Departmental Colleagues" and one (or more) members of the advisory committee will be appointed to assume the "Task of the Chairperson." The advisory committee will be expected, insofar as possible, to provide the FPC with assessments of the candidate's performance in the special program in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and governance.
8. The FPC will consider the cases of part-time faculty members, i.e., adjuncts, who have fulfilled the qualifications for promotion and whose cases are brought to the FPC by the Provost. The FPC will assess the candidate's performance in teaching and, as appropriate, in scholarship. Part-time faculty members will be held to the

same standards of teaching as applied to full-time faculty members. See the *Faculty Handbook*.

9. For part-time faculty members, i.e., adjuncts, who are assigned to instructional committees that are not departments (e.g., the Interdepartmental Studies Committee), the chair of the instructional committee will assume the "Task of the Chairperson" in the promotion review process. Current and former members of that committee will be expected, insofar as possible, to provide the FPC with evaluations of the candidate's performance and to make recommendations.
10. None of the operating procedures stated in this document is to supersede the policy and procedures adopted by the Faculty.

II. **DETERMINATION OF CANDIDATES**

1. **Tenure and Pre-Tenure:**

At the beginning of the fall semester, the Provost, on behalf of the President, provides the FPC with a final list of those faculty members who are eligible for tenure or pre-tenure review during the current academic year.

2. **Promotion**

At the beginning of the fall semester, the Provost will identify those members of the faculty who have completed six years in the rank of associate professor and inform those associate professors of their eligibility for a promotion review. The Provost will also communicate both to those candidates and to the faculty as a whole the deadlines by which the intention to stand for a review must be communicated to the Provost and materials must be submitted to the department/program and the FPC. As stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, the faculty member who is considering the possibility of standing for promotion should consult the department chairperson and the Provost about the likelihood of a successful promotion review.

Usually a faculty member nominates himself/herself for a promotion review. The Provost, the FPC, or a department, through its chairperson, may also nominate a faculty member; in that case, the FPC or the Provost will ask the candidate if she/he wishes to be considered and will abide by her/his decision.

III. ALL CANDIDATES FOR TENURE, PRE-TENURE, AND PROMOTION

1. The chair of the FPC prepares and sends a letter to the candidate requesting that the candidate prepare and submit her/his materials (as noted in “The Candidate’s Task” in the *Faculty Handbook*) to the department, which forwards the materials to the FPC.
2. The chair of the FPC prepares and sends a letter to the appropriate department chairperson requesting that the department review the candidate’s materials. This letter is to be shared with the other members of the department. After the department has reviewed the candidate’s materials, it will first meet with the candidate to discuss his/her qualifications. A second meeting of the tenured members of the department will then take place. After the deliberations of the members of the department and their vote, each tenured member of the department must submit to the FPC a written evaluation of the candidate. A copy of that letter will go to the chairperson. The chairperson’s letter will briefly summarize and, as appropriate, contextualize the views expressed in the departmental meeting as well as in the faculty members’ letters and will report the results of the vote. (Please review “The Task of Departmental Colleagues” in the *Faculty Handbook*.)
3. Deliberations on individual candidates begin when the dossier is complete. The FPC will establish a deadline for submission of information. After that date, additional information supplied by the candidate or the chairperson will be considered at the Committee’s discretion.
4. Deliberations on a candidate begin with one of the following motions:

For tenure: I move that (name) be granted tenure beginning with the (date) academic year.

For pre-tenure: I move that (name) be continued in the tenure probation process.

For promotion: I move that (name) be promoted to (rank) beginning with the (date) academic year.
5. The FPC review begins after the motion has been made and seconded. The process for review is as follows:
 - a) The chairperson of the FPC directs the Committee’s attention to the body of evidence on which the judgment is to be made.
 - b) The FPC discusses this evidence and may take a preliminary vote.

c) If the members of the FPC reach consensus that additional information is needed, or if the preliminary vote of the Committee is negative or split, the FPC may request that its chair seek further information or an interview from the candidate, the chair or designated senior member of the department, the members of the department, the Provost, and/or other individuals who can provide information relevant to the Committee's deliberations. The FPC will also honor a request from the Chair or senior member of the department for an interview.

d) The FPC may, after informing the chairperson and the candidate, seek additional information from other sources, either within or outside the College. The FPC shall make this information available to the department and the candidate at the time it is considering the candidate. Should this information be confidential insofar as the candidate is concerned, it shall be made available to the department chairperson and to the tenured members of the department who submitted evaluations to the committee.

e) The FPC invites the candidate for an interview; if the FPC has no issues or questions to rise with the candidate, s/he may decline without prejudice. If the FPC has any concerns or questions about the candidate's file, the candidate must accept the invitation.

f) Should the FPC disagree with the majority recommendation of the department, the FPC shall meet with the tenured members of the candidate's department before the final vote on the candidate. It shall identify its position on the candidate's qualifications, and provide and request clarification on those points over which the two disagree. The department shall be given the opportunity to reiterate its position on the candidate. The FPC may request additional information and the department may provide additional information prior to this meeting.

g) After discussion has been completed, if no preliminary vote had been taken, it will be taken at this time and recorded in the minutes. If a first preliminary vote had been taken before additional information and/or interviews were sought, a second preliminary vote may be taken after those actions have been completed.

- No formal record is kept of the discussions.
- The chair of the FPC will remind each interviewed person that the interview is part of FPC deliberations and, therefore, is to be kept confidential.

6. If a FPC member is also a member of a candidate's department/program evaluation committee, that member will not participate in any FPC discussion about that candidate, except as provided in 5c, 5d and 5f. That member will participate in no FPC vote about that candidate.
7. If a member of the FPC stands for promotion, that person shall be excused from all discussion and deliberation leading to promotion recommendations. The excused

member will be replaced by a standby faculty member until all such discussions and deliberations will have been completed and final votes will have been taken. The Faculty Governance Committee will select the standby faculty member of the FPC.

8. The FPC may request that the President be present during its discussions about a candidate and/or at the interview of a candidate's chair or department members.
9. After all eligible candidates have been discussed and preliminary votes have been taken, each case is considered and a final vote is taken. Except by unanimous consent, this final vote occurs no earlier than one week after the preliminary vote is recorded in the minutes.
10. On occasion, the FPC may choose to recommend that promotion to professor be deferred. This option may be exercised when a) the Committee evaluates the candidate's credentials as strong in two of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, governance, and b) the Committee believes that the deficiencies in the third area of evaluation could be remedied within a relatively short period of time by an accomplishment that is clearly defined. When promotion has been deferred, the candidate provides the specified evidence of accomplishment to the FPC, and the FPC then reconsiders the case. The Committee need not require a full review of the candidate's materials at this time, but it may elect to do so.

In such cases, the motion would read:

I move that the promotion of **(name)** to the rank of Professor be deferred until s/he presents to the FPC for review evidence of (specified accomplishment).

11. The FPC may request a meeting with the President to discuss some or all of its recommendations.
12. When the Provost disagrees with the recommendation of the FPC, the Provost will provide a written rationale to the Committee.
13. The FPC reports its final votes of recommendation, by letter, to the President. In any case in which its recommendation is negative, the FPC will also forward to the President a written rationale for that recommendation.
14. The President may request a meeting with the FPC to discuss individual cases.
15. Before making a final decision, the President will consult with the FPC on any case in which the President disagrees with the recommendation of the Committee.
16. The President makes a final decision after consultation with the Provost. This consultation occurs at the initiation of the President.

17. The President informs the FPC of the final decisions.
18. The President's decision is reported to the candidate and to the department chair by the Provost.
19. While conducting pre-tenure reviews, the FPC may wish to inform a candidate who is continued in a tenure track position about certain reservations it had regarding the candidate's current performance in order that s/he may be better able to meet the expectations for tenure. If so, the Committee will ask the Provost to include these reservations in a letter sent to the President as well as the candidate, out of fairness to the candidate. The letter and the expectations stated in it will form part of the candidate's dossier at tenure review. Should the candidate seek further clarification of the reservations and expectations expressed, s/he may meet with the Provost to discuss them. The chair of the candidate's department may be included in this meeting, at the candidate's discretion. The Provost shall keep a record of this discussion and make it available to the Committee.
20. Original letters written on behalf of the candidate are kept in the Provost's office. All copies of these letters are destroyed after the completion of the review process. In cases where external reviews were obtained, the candidate will receive copies of these letters with all identifying information about the reviewers removed.

Revised 3/24/20
Revised 12/4/19
Revised 9/25/18
Revised 2/13/17
Revised 12/8/14
Revised 01/2013

APPENDIX 3

A Brief Field Guide to Classroom Observations

Classroom observations of tenure-track faculty are an important part of evaluating teaching effectiveness at the pre-tenure and tenure reviews (and for tenured faculty applying for promotion as well). Therefore, the FPC expects each candidate's file to contain letters from their tenured peers commenting on what they have observed in the candidate's classroom.

The faculty has agreed upon the importance of classroom observations in the evaluation of teaching for the pre-tenure and tenure reviews and promotion. The Faculty Handbook states:

THE TASK OF DEPARTMENTAL COLLEAGUES: In fairness to the candidate and the College, the letter should cite the best available evidence to substantiate the evaluations made. Accordingly, it should be based upon study of the materials which the candidate submits, observations over a period of time of the candidate's teaching of course work in the classroom... (pp. 19-20).

To bring some standardization to classroom observation and to ensure that it is accurate, reliable, effective, and useful, the Faculty Personnel Committee recommends these guidelines:

The Colleague's Responsibilities:

Ideally, a tenured member of a department will observe a candidate's teaching several times during that person's progress along the tenure track and at intervals appropriately spaced so that the observer may speak to how the candidate's teaching has changed over time. A tenured colleague should observe a candidate's classes several times before a pre-tenure or tenure review, with the observations spaced over at least two semesters. The committee believes it is best practice for a colleague to visit courses at different levels (where appropriate) and to visit any given course for multiple class sessions, in order to observe the full range of the candidate's teaching modalities.

The faculty member conducting the observation should confer with the candidate ahead of time about which class to attend (i.e. do not show up unexpectedly), and should arrive on time and stay for the duration of the class unless having made a previous arrangement with the candidate to do otherwise. After conducting the observation, the faculty member should share feedback with the candidate either in written or oral form, making clear especially any issues in need of improvement.

The Candidate's Responsibilities:

The candidate should provide the visiting faculty member with a copy of the course syllabus and readings/assignments for the class to be observed. The candidate should be willing to have a colleague observe the class unless something exceptional on the syllabus (e.g. an exam, review session, field trip) would make the observation unproductive. The candidate should not attempt to convince the observer to attend a particular class on the

schedule, but may ask a colleague to defer to another date if someone else is already observing the class in question.

The candidate may wish to introduce the observer at the start of class, but under no circumstances should the candidate attempt to prime the class for the observation by telling students that an important visitor is coming to class or that the observation is for an important professional review.

A final note: the FPC realizes that some faculty consider classroom observation a faulty means of assessing teaching. We are willing to stipulate that all measures we employ to assess our candidates are to some degree imperfect. That is why we use a variety of measures to assess teaching performance in addition to classroom observations, such as course evaluations and student interviews. Personal objections to conducting classroom observations do not absolve a tenured colleague from the responsibility to participate in this process.

APPENDIX 4

Procedure for External Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Work November 2020

Each candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for promotion to full professor will consult with his/her department to create a list of at least ten potential external evaluators and will submit the list of potential external evaluators acceptable to both the candidate and the department to the Provost for approval. For each name on the list, the candidate should provide sufficient information to demonstrate the appropriateness of the person as an evaluator that includes (1) basic information about the person (name, title, institution, contact information, and either a *c.v.* or a list of at least five recent publications and grants, a website URL if available), (2) a brief statement of the potential reviewer's scholarly background, and (3) an explicit statement describing any relationship between the candidate and the potential evaluator. Evaluators who have a relationship with the candidate (e.g., graduate school faculty, friends, mentors, co-authors or other collaborators) should be avoided. It is understood that academic communities within specialized subfields are often small enough that there may have been personal interaction between the candidate and the potential reviewer. This, by itself, is not disqualifying as long as there is sufficient reason to consider the interactions to be superficial enough that it will not challenge the objectivity of the reviewer.

The candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor will submit the list to the Provost by 1 March of the academic year prior to the tenure review in the fall. A pre-tenure candidate who chooses to use outside evaluators will follow the same procedure and will submit a list to the Provost by 1 May of the spring semester of the academic year before the submission of pre-tenure materials in fall. A candidate for promotion to full professor will follow the same procedure and will submit a list by 1 November before promotion review in the spring.

The Provost may veto any name or names on the list and request that the candidate and department propose additional ones acceptable to both and approved by the Provost. In the meantime, however, as soon as the Provost has approved some of the names on the list, the department chairperson will begin to solicit external evaluations from the approved persons, contacting them by email or letter and requesting that they perform the evaluation, in order to find four external evaluators. The chairperson will have the responsibility for sending the materials to the external evaluators and managing the correspondence with them; their letters of evaluation will be shared with the tenured members of the department (or of the candidate's committee) as well as with the Faculty Personnel Committee. In the event that an evaluator fails to provide a letter, the case may proceed with a minimum of three evaluations.

The candidate will assemble a packet of representative scholarship or creative work (published or unpublished) to be sent to the evaluators. The packet should include at most five examples of scholarly or creative work. For candidates undergoing a tenure review, these should be works the candidate lists on the *cv* as having been completed since the pre-tenure review. If the number of such works is less than five, the candidate may include work from the period before the pre-tenure review.

Additionally, the candidate should also include a statement, approximately two pages in length, that summarizes how his/her/their scholarship/creative work has progressed at Gettysburg, placing the publications or scholarly/creative work included in the packet within a context in

APPENDIX 4

which the evaluator can assess this work's growth and its trajectory. If the candidate's scholarly/creative work is collaborative, this document should also discuss the specific role that the candidate played in the production of that work. The chairperson will send the candidate's packet to the evaluator along with the candidate's c.v. and website URL (if available).

The candidate should include this professional research statement, along with the list of works sent to the evaluators in the materials uploaded to the Moodle site.

The chairperson will include a cover letter describing the position held by the candidate in the context of the College's mission and expectations for scholarship and creative work. It will ask the evaluator for a confidential assessment only of the candidate's scholarly or creative work, not of teaching and service, and not for a positive or negative recommendation about tenure or promotion. A clear deadline for receipt of the evaluation should be stated. (Examples of letters may be sought from the Provost's office.)

Specific questions of the evaluators must include but are not limited to the following: *Are you acquainted with the candidate and, if so, for how long and under what circumstances? What is the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the field, with comments, for example, on the quality of the journals in which it is published or the venues in which it is displayed or performed?*

Sample letter:

Dear Dr. XXXXX,

I am contacting you in my role as chair of the XXXXXXX department at Gettysburg College. Our colleague, Assistant/Associate Professor XXXXXX XXXXXXX, is standing for tenure/promotion to full professor this year and as part of the review process, we are seeking external evaluations of the candidate's scholarship/creative work. Dr. XXXXX has identified you as someone who is in a good position to comment on their work and its impact on the field.

For context, you should know that Gettysburg College is a national, highly selective, liberal arts college enrolling approximately 2600 undergraduates. In addition to teaching five courses each year, faculty members are expected to put significant effort into student advising and governance and to pursue an active research program of high quality.

If you are able to help us with your comments, I will send you an electronic packet including the candidate's c.v., recent publications, and a short statement on their research trajectory. We then request a letter addressing the following questions:

Are you acquainted with the candidate and, if so, for how long and under what circumstances?

What is the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the field, with comments, for example, on the quality of the journals in which it is published or the venues in which it is displayed or performed?

Please note that we are asking solely for your evaluation of Dr. XXXXXXX's scholarship, not for comments on the candidate's suitability for promotion.

I would greatly appreciate you letting me know by e-mail at your earliest convenience if you are able to perform this review. If you are able to do so, then I will send you the electronic materials via email, and we will need your review to be completed by August XX, 20XX. You may send your review letter via email to me.

Thank you for considering this request to help us ensure a thorough evaluation of Dr. XXXXX's scholarly work/creative activity. Your collegial efforts would be a valued contribution to this important evaluation. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dr. XXXX XXXXXX
XXXXXX Department Chair

APPENDIX 5

SAMPLE

SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT Jean L. Potuchek

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Fall 2003</u></p> <p>FYS 170-2 (15 enrolled; 15 completed evaluations) SOC 206 (22 enrolled; 22 completed evaluations) WS 320 (8 enrolled; 8 completed evaluation)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Spring, 2004</u></p> <p>SOC (239 (7 enrolled; 6 completed evaluations) SOC 302 (9 enrolled; 8 completed evaluations) WS120 (32 enrolled; 31 completed evaluations)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Fall, 2004</u></p> <p>SOC 302 (13 enrolled; 13 completed evaluations) WS 120 (31 enrolled; 30 completed evaluations) WS 222 (12 enrolled; 12 completed evaluations) SOC 450 (Individualized Study – 1 enrolled)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Spring, 2005</u></p> <p>SOC 101 (27 enrolled; 23 completed evaluations) SOC 206 (16 enrolled; 16 completed evaluations) SOC 460 (Senior Honors Research -1 enrolled) *Course release for serving as acting department chair</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Fall, 2005</u></p> <p>FYS 170-2 (16 enrolled; 16 completed evaluations) SOC 239 (9 enrolled; 9 completed evaluations) WS 222 (13 enrolled; 13 completed evaluations)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Spring, 2006</u></p> <p>SOC 302 (15 enrolled) SOC 310 (6 enrolled) WS 320 (6 enrolled)</p>

APPENDIX 6

This sample can also be found on the Provost webpage under "Forms."

FPC COURSE EVALUATION DATA SUMMARY FORM

COURSE:

1. REASON FOR TAKING COURSE	MAJOR/MINOR	CORE REQUIREMENT	OTHER

SEMESTER:

ENROLLMENT:

2. HOURS/WEEK DEVOTED TO CLASS	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10+

COMPLETED EVALUATIONS:

3. COMMITMENT	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT

STUDENT INFORMATION:

1. HOW MUCH HAVE YOU LEARNED FROM THIS COURSE?	VERY LITTLE	A LITTLE	A FAIR AMOUNT	A LOT	A GREAT DEAL
COURSE/INSTRUCTOR RANKING:	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
2. COURSE MATERIALS					
3. CONDUCT OF CLASS					
4. EXAMS					
5. FEEDBACK					
6. OVERALL INSTRUCTOR					
7. OVERALL COURSE					

COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION:

NOTE: With **electronic evaluations**, this summary page can be generated automatically along with the evaluation data organized by question as well as by student. After navigating to a particular set of course evaluations via the Faculty Center, simply export a PDF document using the Export drop down menu (floppy disk image).

/bb

12/5/14

03/24/20

APPENDIX 7

Procedure for Student Interviews November 2020

One of the obligations of the chair of an evaluation committee in all pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion cases is to conduct a series of student interviews. These provide additional information concerning the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching and advising.

As part of the student interview process, chairs should keep several things in mind:

The Sample: Chairs should aim to interview between twelve and fifteen students. This sample should reflect, as far as possible, the vectors of diversity represented among the students taught. It is expected that the interview pool will include majors and non-majors, advisees and non-advisees, members of different courses, and students with a range of final grades. It is desirable that different class years are represented. To secure a sample of this breadth, it will be necessary for the chair to contact a significant number of potential interviewees as some will decline the offer and others will fail to respond to the chair's invitation to be part of the process.

The Interviews: While it is ideal to perform these interviews in person, if contextual factors make this difficult, they may be conducted by phone or by video (Skype or Zoom). Interviews are preferred over questionnaires as the former convey the ability to ask for clarification or disambiguation.

Interview questions concerning the candidate's teaching should include:

- Describe a typical class period in this professor's class.
- What are this professor's strengths as a teacher?
- What, if anything, could this professor do differently to improve as a teacher?
- Would you recommend that other students take this professor's courses? Why or why not?
- Do you have any additional comments or important issues that you would like to discuss?

If the candidate's departmental committee deems other questions important or relevant, they may also be included.

When interviewing a candidate's advisees, please address the following issues:

- How accessible was your adviser? Was it easy or difficult to schedule meetings?
- Was your adviser knowledgeable about the Gettysburg Curriculum?
- Was your adviser knowledgeable about the requirements for your major? If applicable, was your advisor able to help you understand minor requirements?
- Was your adviser able and willing to address your academic plans beyond the classroom, for example, with respect to study abroad, transfer credit, applications for post-graduate study, etc.

APPENDIX 7

The chair should take notes during all interviews that can be submitted as raw data in addition to the summary report. A form for taking these notes is included as an addendum to this letter.

The Report: The chair is responsible for submitting a report of the interviews to the FPC. This report should include (1) a brief description of the selection and interview processes including a sketch of the demographic elements of the sample, (2) a summary of the results with analysis, and (3) notes taken during the interviews. The summary must offer an analysis of the student responses rather than a restatement of them, e.g., make note of recurring observations, determine whether student comments are generally favorable or where they indicate areas for improvement, etc. When preparing the interview notes (which will be viewed by the departmental committee and FPC), the chair should be careful to remove any demographic information associated with the notes of each interview to maximize the likelihood of interviewees remaining anonymous. It is imperative that the identity of students involved in the interviews should be kept in strict confidence at all times.

APPENDIX 7

PRE-TENURE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION EVALUATION STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA

CLASSES STUDENT TOOK WITH CANDIDATE	LEVEL OF STUDENT	GRADE RANGE OF STUDENT
	First-year student Upper-class student	
DEPARTMENTAL STATUS	ADVISEE?	INTERVIEW CONDUCTED ...
Major	Yes	
Minor	No	In person
Neither major nor minor		Over email Via Zoom

STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Describe a typical class period in this professor's class.
What are this professor's strengths as a teacher?
What, if anything, could this professor do differently to improve as a teacher?
Would you recommend that other students take this professor's courses? Why or why not?
Do you have any additional comments or important issues that you would like to discuss?

ADVISEE INTERVIEW

How accessible was your adviser? Was it easy or difficult to schedule meetings?
Was your adviser knowledgeable about the Gettysburg Curriculum?
Was your adviser knowledgeable about the requirements for your major? If applicable, was your adviser able to help you understand minor requirements?
Was your adviser able and willing to address your academic plans beyond the classroom, for example, with respect to study abroad, transfer credit, applications for post-graduate study, etc.?

APPENDIX 8a

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

CHECKLIST FOR CANDIDATE FILES FOR TENURE AND PRE-TENURE

Candidate's Name _____

- _____ Current complete *curriculum vitae*
- _____ Statement of teaching and research goals, current efforts to achieve them, and contributions to governance (maximum of 15 pages double spaced)

Evidence of Effective Teaching

- _____ List of courses taught including independent studies, etc.
- _____ Course syllabus for each course listed (not every time a course was taught!)
- _____ Examinations and up to three examples of representative assignments for each course
- _____ Student Evaluations
- _____ FPC Course Evaluation Data Summary Form
- _____ Narrative Summary of Student Evaluations

Evidence of Scholarship or Creative Work

- _____ Publications, papers, reports
- _____ Performances, compositions, exhibits with critical reviews
- _____ Outside evaluation of scholarship, if requested (and necessary for tenure)
- _____ Acceptance letters, if work accepted but not published

Checklist For Department

- _____ Letter from each tenured faculty member including chairperson
- _____ Department recommendation letter from chairperson
- _____ Student interview data

Miscellaneous Materials (provided by Provost)

- _____ Contractual information from Provost, if not standard hire
- _____ Policy Information: Policy On Shared Faculty Appointments
- _____ Pre-Tenure Letter (Provost to Candidate/President)
- _____ Chair's pre-tenure summary letter for tenure review

APPENDIX 8b

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

CHECKLIST FOR CANDIDATE FILES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Candidate's Name _____

- _____ Current complete *curriculum vitae*
- _____ Written statement of teaching and research goals, current efforts to achieve them, and contributions to governance (maximum of 15 pages double spaced)

Evidence of Effective Teaching

- _____ List of courses taught including independent studies, etc., in each of the eight semesters prior to the review.
- _____ Course syllabus for each course listed (not every time a course was taught!)
- _____ Examinations and up to three examples of representative assignments for each course
- _____ Student Evaluations
- _____ FPC Course Evaluation Data Summary Form
- _____ Narrative Summary of Student Evaluations

Evidence of Scholarship:

- _____ Publications, papers, reports
- _____ Performances, compositions, exhibits with critical reviews
- _____ Outside evaluation of scholarship
- _____ Acceptance letters, if work accepted but not published

Checklist for Department

- _____ Letter from each tenured faculty member including chairperson
- _____ Department recommendation letter from chairperson
- _____ Student interview data

Miscellaneous Materials

- _____ Contractual information from Provost, if not standard hire
- _____ Policy Information: Policy on Shared Faculty Appointments