College of Natural Sciences

Guidelines for Post-Tenure, Fourth- and Fifth-Year Reviews

College Chairs' Council, in consultation with their departments,
approved this policy for use by the college in Fall 2022.

Note About Impact of COVID-19:

The College of Natural Sciences recognizes the varying impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on our colleagues' teaching, scholarship, and service, beginning in the Spring of 2020. All colleagues were affected in March 2020 by the sudden shift to remote teaching as well as the implementation of online and blended modalities during the 2020-2021 academic year, requiring significantly more professional development and time for course preparation and implementation than during a more traditional academic year. Additionally, both the pandemic and the austerity measures of 2020-2021 eliminated the possibility of PLU-funded professional travel and other types of professional development that would otherwise result in data collection and/or the presentation of a faculty member's scholarship to one's peers. Additionally, the need for many colleagues to serve as caregivers during this time, in addition to carrying out their work, also has affected many colleagues. Moving forward, we want to remind our colleagues of the context of the pandemic as well as of the longstanding impacts that the pandemic may have had on a faculty member's progress in any or all of the three criteria.

Post-Tenure Reviews:

During the fourth year and the subsequent fourth year after achievement of tenure, the chair or dean[1] is required by the Faculty Handbook to complete a comprehensive review, focusing on the faculty member's performance in the years since the last such review and progress toward promotion. For those faculty members who have achieved the rank of professor, or have been tenured for eight years, the chair (or dean) is required by the Faculty Handbook to complete a comprehensive review each fifth year focusing on the years since the last review.

In Natural Sciences, previous policy has indicated that the faculty member under review should assemble a complete file of evidence, analogous to that provided for tenure and promotion purposes, and has also recommended the formation of review committees. In the Fall of 2020, the Natural Sciences Division Chairs' Council considered alternative approaches to respect our colleagues' limited time while recognizing the university's needs for documenting a

---

[1] If the department chair is being reviewed, the dean will be responsible for making sure that the review occurs as outlined in this document and will also complete the final review.

faculty member's efforts in teaching, scholarship, and service. As a result, the Natural Sciences Division Chairs' Council revised divisional guidelines for post-tenure reviews at that time. In Fall 2022, the new Natural Sciences College Chairs' Council agreed to adopt the division's policy for use by the college moving forward.

For the purposes of post-tenure reviews, the formation of a review committee is not necessary and the decision to do so may be determined departmentally. Departmental colleagues and any colleagues from outside of the department who can speak to the faculty member's work (for example, those with whom the review candidate has co-taught, worked with on scholarship, and/or in service capacities) may serve as the "review committee" in lieu of the appointment of a review committee.

All departmental colleagues, as well as colleagues from outside of the department (a list of colleagues invited to submit evaluations will be obtained from the faculty member by **September/February 20th[2]**), will be solicited by the department chair (or college dean) by **October/March 1st**. Because it is important to have letters from someone who can provide

input based on direct observation of teaching, the chair (or dean), in consultation with the faculty member, will also designate at least one departmental colleague to attend the faculty member's classes; all colleagues evaluating the faculty member may also attend classes. Colleagues will be invited to complete a [google form](#)[3] on which they will evaluate the faculty

member in each of the 3 rank and tenure criteria and be provided the opportunity to share no more than 600 characters of comments for each criterion and a 1200 character reflection at the end, due by **November/April 10th**.

By **October/March 15th**, the faculty member should assemble the following materials and share them with their departmental colleagues and other colleagues who have been solicited to submit an evaluation:
1. CV
2. Raw course evaluations and statistical summaries (most recent five years of data)
3. All eFARs and annual self-assessments from previous five years (or since last review)
4. <u>1 example</u> in each of the following criteria that documents excellence:
    a. **Teaching:** provide a meaningful piece of evidence of excellent teaching and concern for improving the quality of teaching that displays one or more of the following qualities of an excellent teacher: challenges students intellectually, communicates effectively, shows commitment to learning, remains current in

---

[2] All deadlines in this document that fall on a weekend should be moved to the business day preceding the deadline. The Fall dates are for reviews that are conducted during the Fall semester, while the Spring dates are for those conducted in the Spring. Fall reviews should only be performed if a department has to complete more than one review in an academic year.

[3] Department chairs will provide a google form for each candidate evaluated.

their disciplines, demonstrates personal and professional integrity. (Examples: a syllabus, a class assignment, a class activity, etc.)

    b. **Scholarship:** provide a meaningful piece of evidence of scholarly competence, continued growth in professional activity, and accomplishment involving interaction with peers

    c. **Service:** provide a meaningful piece of evidence of service to the university, profession, or community that demonstrates your distinct academic influence and leadership

5. Self-assessment that specifically and primarily uses each example provided as evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service

    a. For a fourth-year review, the self-assessment should not exceed **10 pages** (single-spaced).

    b. For a fifth-year review, the self-assessment should not exceed **5 pages** (single-spaced).

By November/April 10, faculty colleagues will complete the [google form evaluation](#) described above. These evaluations will <u>not</u> be shared with the faculty member, but will be used by faculty chairs when writing their reviews.

By November/April 21, the department chair (or dean) will complete a similar google form evaluation in which they will evaluate the faculty member in each category and provide an overall evaluation.

    a. For a fourth-year review, the chair (or dean) will either directly use the [google form](#) or use the layout of the google form as a template when writing their review and will work to limit their supporting comments to no more than 1500 characters per criterion/overall assessment. This chair (or dean) evaluation will synthesize information from the various materials (e.g., faculty members' shared materials, colleagues' evaluations, personal observations of teaching, etc.) and will provide feedback on their strengths and areas for improvement.

    b. For a fifth-year review, the chair (or dean) will either directly use the [google form](#) or use the layout of the google form as a template when writing their review and will work to limit their overall assessment to no more than 1500 characters. This chair (or dean) evaluation will synthesize information from the various materials (e.g., faculty members' shared materials, colleagues' evaluations, personal observations of teaching, etc.) and will provide feedback on their strengths and areas for improvement.

By November/April 30, after consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, the department chair (or dean) will submit the final review, signed by both the chair (or dean) and

the faculty member. The faculty member's signature will indicate receipt, but not necessarily agreement. Copies of the signed review will be sent to the provost and the dean. In addition to the final review, the department chair will also provide all other materials (i.e., committee report, individual letters and other supporting documents) relevant to the review to the dean to ensure that their review accurately reflects those materials. If in the event that the dean is writing a review for a department chair, they will forward the available materials to another academic dean to ensure that their review accurately reflects those materials.

If it is the opinion of the dean (or the other academic dean) that the final review does not accurately reflect the available materials, the dean (or other academic dean) may take one of two courses of action:

a. The dean (or other academic dean) may request that the chair (or dean) submit a new review that, in the opinion of the dean (or other academic dean), is more representative of the submitted materials; or

b. The dean (or other academic dean) may write a second review that is more representative of the submitted materials, and their review would be shared with the chair (or dean).

Regardless of the course of action, both the faculty member and those completing reviews (chair, dean, and/or other academic dean) will confer and sign the final review(s) as noted above. All documents written by the chair and dean (or other academic dean) (if any) shall become part of the final review.

The chair (or dean) should keep supporting documents related to the review for six months, after which the evaluations completed by colleagues should be deleted.

Note to the Department Chair or Dean

The following wording is suggested for the end of your report:

I have read the above and will submit a written reply to the provost with copies to the departmental chair and/or college dean if I am in disagreement.

_____

Signature of Faculty member   Date