

# GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS

2022-2023

Grinnell College is a highly selective liberal arts college whose faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers and scholars in their fields. Rigorous faculty reviews support a strong academic program. These reviews assess strengths and weaknesses in the teaching, scholarship, and service of faculty members to determine whether the faculty member meets the standards of excellence set out in the [Faculty Handbook](#). At the same time, the review process provides opportunities for experienced colleagues to mentor faculty members and foster professional development.

These guidelines interpret but do not supersede any regulations published in the [Grinnell College Faculty Handbook](#). Please also refer to special personnel considerations for early career faculty members impacted by the [COVID-19 pandemic here](#). The guidelines are divided into an overview of responsibilities, followed by sections that detail specific guidelines for each level of review. We have listed deadlines for submissions of dossiers for 2022-2023. We have also provided checklists for chairs to use to ensure compliance with the guidelines in assembling the dossier. All faculty members conducting reviews must undergo anti-bias training annually.

- I. [General Provisions](#)
  - A. [Deadlines for 2022-2023](#)
  - B. [Reviews of Faculty who teach in Interdisciplinary Concentrations](#)
  - C. [Reviews of Faculty Appointed to Two Departments](#)
  - D. [Special Process Review Committees](#)
  
- II. [Overview of Responsibilities](#)
  - A. [Planning in Advance of the Review](#)
  - B. [Beginning the Review](#)
  
- III. [Specific Instructions](#)
  - A. [The Interim Review](#)
  - B. [The Complete Review](#)
  - C. [The Tenure Review](#)
  - D. [The Promotion Review](#)
  - E. [Post-FMLA Interim Review](#)
  - F. [Dossier Contents](#)

## I. General Provisions

The [Faculty Handbook](#) provides that the chair of the department shall initiate action, collect materials, and present the department recommendation concerning a faculty member's promotion and tenure (Part One, III, B, 2). The College has interpreted this to mean that, with the approval of the Dean, the chair of the department may delegate these duties to another tenured member of the department. In such cases, the divisional personnel representative should also be informed. In these guidelines, "the chair" will refer to the person who is leading the review, unless otherwise noted. "The faculty member" will refer to the person undergoing

the review, unless otherwise noted. “The review committee” consists of all eligible tenured faculty members of the department unless specially constituted under certain circumstances.

#### **A. Deadlines for 2022-2023 [[Step-by-Step Calendar here](#)]**

Reviews cannot go forward until the dossiers have been checked by the Dean’s Office for compliance with the Guidelines, and the Dean’s Office has notified the chair that the dossier has been accepted. This year, the deadlines for submission of dossiers are as follows (If the deadline falls on a weekend, please upload documents on the next business day):

Interim Reviews (2 <sup>nd</sup> year) .....	October 1, 2022
Complete Reviews .....	November 1, 2022
Tenure Reviews .....	November 15, 2022
Promotion to Professor.....	January 15, 2023
Interim Reviews.....	February 1, 2023
(Library and PE Faculty with 6-year renewals)	
Complete Reviews.....	February 1, 2023
(Library and PE Faculty and all other faculty scheduled for Spring reviews)	

#### **B. Reviews of Faculty who teach in Interdisciplinary Concentrations**

In a case where a faculty member has a home department but teaches courses that are listed only under a concentration, at least three of the tenured faculty members on the concentration committee will visit these classes to evaluate the faculty member’s teaching. The chair of the concentration will then write a letter to the chair of the review addressing the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service in the area of the concentration. The concentration letter should be extensively cited in the review committee’s letter to the Dean concerning the recommendation. The chair of the concentration’s letter may be submitted with the dossier as supplemental material.

For faculty members teaching courses in another department or in an interdisciplinary program or concentration in addition to courses in their home departments, the review chair will request a written statement from the chair of that department, concentration, or program regarding the individuals’ effectiveness as a teacher in that area. This statement should be cited in the review committee’s letter to the Dean concerning the recommendation. It may also be submitted with the dossier as supplemental material.

#### **C. Reviews of Faculty Appointed to Two Departments**

In a case where a faculty member is appointed to two departments, normally each department will undertake a review. The fully assembled dossier will contain department letters and recommendations from each department and SEPC reports from each department.

This dual review process will not be followed in a case where the Dean has constituted a Special Process Review Committee for a faculty member who has a joint appointment.

#### **D. Special Process Review Committees**

In a case where a faculty member teaches a substantial number of non-departmental courses, the Dean will appoint a review committee under the special process outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (Part Three, III, H, 1, b). The Dean will make every effort to ensure that the review committee is configured during the faculty member's first semester of appointment. The Dean will also make every effort to ensure that the membership of the review committee remains constant for the interim, complete, and tenure reviews.

#### **II. Overview of Responsibilities**

The chair of a department may assume direct responsibility for a review or may delegate this responsibility to another tenured member of the department, with approval of the Dean. In the case of a special process, the Dean appoints the chair of the review committee.

The chair is responsible for ensuring that the review is well planned and executed. The chair should ensure that the faculty member understands College standards for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. These standards are set out in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

The faculty member is responsible for learning and seeking clarification of the standards of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service that they are required to meet. The faculty member is responsible for inviting or accommodating observation of their teaching by colleagues, and providing materials relevant to teaching, scholarship, and service to the chair in a timely and professional manner. Except for a second-year interim review, the faculty member is responsible for writing a context statement in which they reflect on professional development and goals for teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty member is also responsible for providing annual faculty activity reports, course materials, and an up-to-date curriculum vitae to the chair. In the case of a tenure or promotion review, the chair, in consultation with the faculty member, develops an annotated list of potential external reviewers, which describes the faculty member's personal or professional proximity to any of the potential external reviewers.

Tenured members of departments, members of concentration committees, and members of review committees have responsibilities of judicious evaluation and timely cooperation in the review. The [Faculty Handbook](#) specifies voting eligibility and procedures for faculty reviews (Part One, III, C, 4 and D, 4). Tenured members of departments or review committees who plan to be on leave during the review semester must determine with the Dean the level of their participation in any prospective reviews. It should be noted that department members on Senior Faculty Status may assist with the review but, according to the [Faculty Handbook](#), are not eligible to vote on the recommendation. Untenured members of the department may be consulted but should not participate in the meeting where the vote is taken. (In the Physical Education department, special guidelines apply, which are set out in a separate document.)

Following our "Conflict of Interest" guidelines in the [Faculty Handbook](#) (Part Eight, I), if an individual has an especially close or intense relationship with the faculty member, they should discuss with the Dean whether to recuse themselves from the review.

The Dean's Office also has significant responsibilities in the review process. As early as the summer before a fall review, or in early January before a spring review, the Dean's Office will

initiate the collection of materials for the review. Materials may include course lists with enrollments from the Registrar, copies of the Dean's letters to the faculty member following previous reviews, numerical data from end-of-course evaluations, and tutorial evaluations if applicable. For complete, tenure, and promotion reviews, the Dean's Office will initiate surveys of students, advisees, and alumni. In tenure and promotion reviews, the Dean's Office will solicit from the chair a list of potential external reviewers of scholarship, contact certain of these individuals, and request peer evaluations of the faculty member's scholarship. The Dean's Office ensures that submitted dossiers are in compliance with the Guidelines and distributes dossiers to Personnel Committee members. At the end of a successful review, the Dean sends a letter to the faculty member reporting the outcome of the review, along with the letter submitted by the review committee.

For reviews that concern promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, the divisional personnel committee meets to discuss the evidence concerning the faculty member's performance. The divisional personnel committee then votes on a recommendation. This recommendation becomes part of the dossier.

For all reviews, the Personnel Committee meets and discusses the evidence concerning the faculty member's performance, and then votes on a recommendation to the President. When it makes a positive recommendation, the Personnel Committee will establish a merit score and submit it to the Dean and the Faculty Budget Committee for use in setting the faculty member's salary.

The President makes the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees concerning reappointments and promotions.

#### **A. Planning in Advance of the Review**

A successful review requires advance planning and communication among the chair, the faculty member, the department or review committee, and the Dean's Office.

Planning for a review should ideally take place in the academic year before the review. When possible, upcoming course schedules should be planned so that the faculty member will offer an appropriate range of courses for colleagues to visit during the review semester. Alternatively, class visits associated with the review should be planned in the semester prior to the review as well as the semester of the review. If the faculty member under review will be on leave during the semester of the review, tenured colleagues should visit classes during the semester or year prior to the review.

The chair should foster continuity between levels of review so that the recommendations made pursuant to one review set the stage for the next. For example, tenured colleagues may plan to visit the same course over two consecutive semesters, especially if problems were noted in an earlier review. The chair should discuss with the faculty member their research progress and plan of publication in advance of the review.

#### **B. Beginning the Review**

In the semester preceding the review, the Dean will send the faculty member under review a letter announcing the review and the dossier deadline. Materials accompanying this letter will include information sent to the chair describing the review process, such as this document and

the relevant sections of the [Faculty Handbook](#). Chairs will receive a copy of the Dean's letter to the faculty member as well as these documents.

In all reviews, the chair should meet with the faculty member to outline the specific schedule for the review, request relevant materials, set appropriate deadlines, and discuss any questions or concerns. The chair will explain the role of class visits and evaluations of teaching materials.

The Associate Dean for Faculty Development or the Dean meets with the chair and the faculty member undergoing an interim, a complete, tenure, or promotion review to outline the process and to answer any questions or concerns.

The faculty member will supply course materials such as syllabi, assignments, exam questions, electronic links to websites, or copies of graded student work to the chair. Such materials demonstrate important aspects of teaching, such as course design and clarity of objectives.

In addition, the faculty member will provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae and recent faculty activity reports. The CV should indicate scholarly works that have been published pursuant to professional review or another competitive selection process. Faculty should include the month and year of the publication in the CV for any publications *after the most recent salary review*. Only scholarly work that has been accepted and scheduled for publication should be listed as "forthcoming." Scholarly work that has been submitted for professional review should be listed as "under review" with the venue noted. Scholarly projects not yet under submission are listed as "work in progress." The chair should encourage a faculty member who lists foreign language publications on the CV to provide translations as well as the original titles.

Except in the case of a second-year interim review, the chair will invite the faculty member to prepare a [context statement](#), in which the faculty member reflects on accomplishments and goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Context statements should consist of *no more than six pages*: usually up to three commenting on teaching, two on scholarship, and one on service.

For complete, tenure, and promotion reviews, the Dean's Office will request that the Office of Analytics and Institutional Research survey a sample of students and alumni who have completed at least one course from the faculty member. The survey questions are set out in Appendix III. The Dean will also request a survey of the faculty member's current and former advisees. The survey questions are set out in Appendix IV. While the review is in progress, the chair will make the survey responses available to the review committee (though not to the SRC) and make reference to them in the review committee's letter of recommendation.

The Dean's Office will request from the Office of Analytics and Institutional Research a summary of numerical data from end-of-course ratings for the courses taught by the faculty member during the period covered by the review: usually including summary of EOCEs for one year for interim reviews, two years for complete reviews, five years for tenure reviews, and five years for promotion reviews. The summary will become part of the review dossier. The chair may refer to the numerical data to contextualize other evidence concerning the effectiveness of the faculty member's teaching. Once the review process has begun, the chair is responsible for gathering required materials for the dossier, leading discussion among colleagues, and writing the letter of recommendation from the review committee. The chair will submit the dossier to the Dean's Office by the appropriate deadline (see I, A above).

Below are further guidelines that pertain to each level of review.

### III. Specific Instructions

#### A. The Interim Review

Interim reviews fall into three categories: the second-year interim review, which pertains to all Regular faculty members who are on tenure-track or renewable contracts; and the sixth-year interim review, which pertains to Regular faculty members in the Library and the Department of Physical Education on renewable contracts; and post FMLA Interim Reviews (prior to tenure, discussed under III.E).

Typically, the second-year interim review is conducted in the third semester of a faculty member's appointment. The department or review committee's recommendation must be either to renew the faculty member's appointment or to proceed with a complete review. The interim review thus provides an opportunity for the department or committee to assess early problems and to help the faculty member plan appropriate professional development and improvements. Where a department or review committee considers that the faculty member may face substantial professional difficulties in meeting college standards of excellence, the interim review may be, with the Dean's permission, converted to a complete review in the same semester.

In consultation with the faculty member, the chair shall develop a class visitation schedule for members of the review committee to observe the faculty member's teaching. The schedule must include visits by at least two tenured faculty members. It is preferred that at least one visitor observes a minimum of three class hours over at least two consecutive class days, and the other may visit one hour during the semester of the review. If possible, visitors should observe courses at different levels and courses with different formats.

The chair should meet with members of the student review committee (SRC, usually overlapping with the department Student Educational Policy Committee, SEPC) early in the semester of review to discuss the SRC guidelines in the [Faculty Handbook](#). For faculty members doing the majority of their teaching in a concentration, there should be consistency in SRC configuration across reviews. For example, if the SRC members for the review are drawn from only the concentration SEPC, then this practice should be followed for each review of the same faculty member. For an interim review, the SRC Report may be either an oral or written report to the chair. Some departments ask the SRC to follow a formal interview process; others ask the SRC to talk informally with the majors. *The chair should discourage the SRC from conducting an on-line survey of students*; face-to-face conversations are preferred. The chair should provide the SRC with the list of all department majors; in the case of a department that doesn't offer a major or has a small number of them, class lists of students currently taking classes with the faculty member may be provided. The chair should explain that the SRC's report is confidential and should not be shared with anyone beyond members of the SRC and the chair.

If the faculty member under review has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree, the chair should reference (and document) any conversations or correspondence with the faculty member's adviser as to the expected date all degree requirements will be met. The chair should also request an up-to-date draft of the dissertation or equivalent project, which must be submitted along with the dossier as supplemental material. **A Regular faculty member**

**who has not completed all requirements for completion of the terminal degree by November 1 of the third year of appointment will be denied reappointment.**

A context statement is **not** required of faculty members for a second-year interim review and will not be included in the dossier.

Once the material for the dossier has been assembled, shared with tenured colleagues, and considered, the chair should meet with all eligible tenured members of the department or review committee to vote on a recommendation. (In [Library](#) and the [Physical Education](#) department, special guidelines apply, each of which are set out in a separate document.) It should be noted that department members on Senior Faculty Status may assist with the review but, according to the [Faculty Handbook](#), are not eligible to vote on the recommendation. In a case where the department or review committee recommends that a complete review of the faculty member is required, the Dean should be notified as soon as possible. To allow compliance with notification deadlines, the Dean may authorize the interim review in progress to be immediately converted to a complete review.

In a case where the department or review committee recommends reappointment, the chair then writes a letter to the Dean. Normally, the interim review letter is *no more than three pages*. With respect to teaching, the letter should summarize (with brief quotations if helpful) what the colleagues observed in their visits to the faculty member's classes as well as colleagues' evaluation of course materials. The letter should specify which classes were visited, by whom, and on what dates. The letter should also discuss the SRC Report, which the chair may contextualize with reference to end-of-course evaluations.

If there are divergent opinions about the recommendation that cannot be resolved through discussion, the letter should represent the divergent arguments and indicate the levels of support among colleagues. All members of the review committee who voted on the recommendation should, if possible, sign the review committee's letter.

The chair may submit the letter (along with scanned signature page) and dossier via the Interfolio site or by bringing a hard copy to the Dean's Office, by the stated deadline (see I, A above). The letter should not be shared with the candidate at this time. However, once the Dean's Office accepts the dossier, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development will inform the faculty member of the review committee's recommendation.

The Personnel Committee reviews the dossier, discusses the case, and makes the recommendation to the President. The Dean will convey the Personnel Committee's recommendation to the President along with the dossier and any requested supplemental materials.

After completion of a review that results in contract renewal, the Dean sends a letter to the faculty member summarizing the Personnel Committee's assessment of their professional strengths and weaknesses. The Dean's Office also sends the review committee's letter to the faculty member. The chair of the review (and the chair of the department, if different) will be sent a copy of the Dean's letter.

The chair should schedule a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the Dean's letter and the outcome of the review. It is important to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses of the review with the colleague and to begin preparing for the next review.

### **B. The Complete Review**

The complete review typically comes in the third year of the faculty member's appointment. This process parallels a tenure review except that external peer evaluation of the faculty member's scholarship is not solicited. The information gained from a successful complete review should guide planning for the tenure review. The College normally does not make reappointments unless the complete review demonstrates that the faculty member is making appropriate progress toward the standards of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service that the College expects of tenured faculty members.

Early in the academic year of the review, the chair should meet with the faculty member to outline the process and request appropriate materials for the dossier. These may include an updated curriculum vitae, samples of scholarly work, faculty activity reports from recent years, and a context statement commenting on accomplishments and goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service (see II, B above). The chair should request samples of course materials such as syllabi, assignments, exam questions, web links, or copies of graded student work. In consultation with the faculty member, the chair shall develop a class visitation schedule for members of the review committee to observe the faculty member's teaching. The schedule must include visits by at least three tenured faculty members. It is preferred that visitors each observe a minimum of three class hours over at least two consecutive class days during the semester of the review. If possible, visitors should observe courses at different levels and courses with different formats.

The chair should meet with members of the SRC early in the semester to request a written report concerning the faculty member's teaching; provide them with the list of department majors and concentrators, if applicable; and review and discuss the SRC guidelines from the [Faculty Handbook](#). For faculty members doing the majority of their teaching in a concentration, there should be consistency in SRC configuration across reviews. For example, if the SRC members for the review are drawn from only the concentration SEPC, then this practice should be followed for each review. The SRC Report must include a description of its methodology, including sampling (number of students interviewed and selection criteria), the interview questions, and an analysis of the responses. The report should describe the criteria used to evaluate a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher, adviser, and member of the department. Then, measured by these criteria, the group should discuss the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. The chair should tell the SRC that its report is confidential and not to be shared with students beyond the SRC membership. The evaluation should be primarily based on conversations and interviews with majors. In some cases, interviews with non-majors may provide a fuller picture of the faculty member's contributions to students' learning. The chair should explain to the SRC the expected range and number of interviews and provide the members with a way to identify appropriate interview subjects. Please discourage the SRC from conducting an on-line survey of students; face-to-face interviews are preferred. All members of the SRC who contribute to the review should sign the report.



If the faculty member under review has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree, the chair should reference (and document with dates) any conversations or correspondence with the faculty member's adviser as to the expected date all degree requirements will be met. The chair should also request an up-to-date draft of the dissertation or equivalent project, which must be submitted along with the dossier as supplemental material. **Any Regular faculty member who has not completed all requirements for completion of the terminal degree by November 1 of the third year of appointment will be denied reappointment.**

Colleagues may review examples of the faculty member's publications or work in progress, and, if colleagues have relevant expertise, assess their significance for the discipline. The [Faculty Handbook](#) permits "letters from other persons who have some knowledge about the professional performance of the faculty member being evaluated." Normally, the chair will invite such letters when they might convey insights not documented otherwise in the dossier. For instance, if someone engages in a great deal of collaborative scholarship, it might be useful to obtain a letter from the collaborator that helps contextualize the faculty member's role. Such letters may be submitted with the dossier as supplemental material.

Once the material for the dossier has been assembled, shared with tenured colleagues, and considered, the chair should meet with all eligible, tenured members of the department or review committee to vote on the recommendation. (In [Library](#) and the [Physical Education](#) department, special guidelines apply, each of which are set out in a separate document.) It should be noted that department members on Senior Faculty Status may assist with the review but, according to the [Faculty Handbook](#), are not eligible to vote on the recommendation.

The chair then writes the letter of recommendation to the Dean, *normally no more than six pages*, setting out the arguments and evidence that support the recommendation. For tenure-track faculty, the recommendation should be followed by information that indicates an awareness of when the faculty member under review will come up for tenure. The letter should offer a description of the faculty member's professional development as well as specific areas of concern. If areas of concern or difficulty were identified in earlier reviews, the letter should address whether there has been adequate progress to meet College standards of excellence. The letter should summarize (with brief quotations if helpful) what the colleagues observed in visits to the faculty member's classes, and the colleagues' evaluation of course materials. The letter should specify which classes were visited, by whom, and on what dates. The letter should refer to the Dean's surveys of students and advisees, and end-of-course summaries. The letter should assess the faculty member's research program, and explain the significance of scholarly publications, noting the relative professional importance of venues of publication or performance. Finally, the letter should address the faculty member's professional service to the College and to professional associations. The Personnel Committee is particularly interested in service that has college-wide impact, supports and contributes to campus diversity and inclusion, or otherwise requires significant contributions of the faculty member.

If there are divergent opinions about the recommendation that cannot be resolved through discussion, the letter should represent the divergent arguments and indicate the levels of support among colleagues. All members of the review committee who voted on the recommendation should, if possible, sign the letter.

The chair may submit an electronic copy of the review committee letter (along with scanned signature page) and dossier via the Interfolio site or by bringing a hard copy and any supplemental materials to the Dean's Office by the appropriate deadline (see I, A above). The chair should not share the letter with the faculty member at this time. The Dean's Office will review the dossier to ensure it is in compliance with the Guidelines and notify the chair that the dossier has been accepted for consideration. After the Dean's Office accepts the dossier, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development will inform the faculty member of the review committee's recommendation.

The Personnel Committee will review the dossier, discuss the case, and vote on a recommendation to the President. The Dean will convey the dossier, along with any requested supplemental materials, and the Personnel Committee's recommendation to the President.

After completion of a review that results in contract renewal, the Dean sends a letter to the faculty member summarizing the Personnel Committee's assessment of their professional strengths and weaknesses. The Dean's Office also sends the review committee's letter to the faculty member. The chair of the review (and the chair of the department, if different) will be sent a copy of the Dean's letter.

The chair should schedule a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the Dean's letter and the outcome of the review. It is important to discuss both the strengths and weaknesses of the review with the colleague and to begin preparing for the tenure review.

### **C. Review for Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor and/or to Grant Indefinite Tenure**

A faculty member is typically reviewed for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with indefinite tenure in the sixth year of appointment. The tenure review includes an intensive evaluation of teaching and an expert evaluation of the faculty member's scholarship by external reviewers. The faculty member must positively demonstrate that they have met or exceeded the standards of excellence set out in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

Early in the academic year of the review, the chair will meet with the faculty member to outline the process and request appropriate materials for the dossier. These include an updated curriculum vitae, faculty activity reports from the past three years, and a context statement commenting on accomplishments and goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service (see II, B above). The faculty member should submit material demonstrating effectiveness in teaching such as syllabi, assignments, exam questions, web links, or copies of graded student work. If the review committee wishes to see additional course materials, these will be requested. Colleagues will review these materials to evaluate the faculty member's pedagogical sophistication and effectiveness.

The chair will ask the faculty member under review to compile a complete file of scholarly publications and scholarship. In some cases, scholarly work in progress may also be included in this file. Colleagues may review examples of the faculty member's publications or work in progress, and, if colleagues have relevant expertise, assess its significance for the discipline.

In consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, the chair will submit a list of eight to ten external reviewers, with addresses, telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, and rank (only reviewers at senior ranks should be included). The list should be submitted to the Dean's Office

by May 15 and should ideally include potential evaluators at both research universities and superior liberal arts colleges. The faculty member should annotate the list to explain the context in which they know any potential reviewer, describe any issues of personal or professional proximity that might bias the evaluation, and report whether the potential reviewer has already placed a professional judgment on record of the faculty member's work.

Faculty may submit books, book-length manuscripts, or page proofs for external review in addition to article-length work by July 1. If faculty have questions regarding the materials they wish to submit, the Dean will be glad to talk with them. Different disciplines have different scholarly conventions and practices, and we encourage candidates to provide the best representation of their work.

The College assures external reviewers that their evaluations will be anonymous to the faculty member. Therefore, the names and affiliations of external reviewers should not be discussed beyond the tenured colleagues or the review committee. The review committee's letter should refer to the reviewers as Reviewer 1, 2, or 3, taking care not to include information that might identify an external reviewer to the faculty member.

In consultation with the faculty member, the chair shall develop a class visitation schedule for members of the review committee to observe the faculty member's teaching. The schedule must include visits by at least three tenured faculty members. It is preferred that visitors each observe a minimum of three class hours over at least two consecutive class days during the semester of the review. If possible, visitors should observe courses at different levels and courses with different formats.

The chair should meet with members of the SRC early in the semester to request a written report concerning the faculty member's teaching, provide them with the list of department majors and concentrators, if applicable, and review and discuss the SRC guidelines in the [Faculty Handbook](#). For faculty members doing the majority of their teaching in a concentration, there should be consistency in SRC configuration across reviews. For example, if the SRC members for the review are drawn from only the concentration SEPC, then this practice should be followed for each review. The SRC Report must include a description of its methodology including sampling (number of students interviewed and selection criteria), the interview questions, and an analysis of the responses. The report should describe the criteria used to evaluate a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher, adviser, and member of the department. Then, measured by these criteria, the group should discuss the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. The chair should tell the SRC that its report is confidential and not to be shared with students beyond the SRC membership. The evaluation should be primarily based on conversations and interviews with majors. In some cases, interviews with non-majors may provide a fuller picture of the faculty member's contributions to students' learning. The chair should explain to the SRC the expected range and number of these interviews and provide the members with a way to identify appropriate interview subjects. Please discourage the SRC from conducting an on-line survey of students; face-to-face interviews are preferred. All members of the SRC who contribute to the review should sign the report.

The [Faculty Handbook](#) permits "letters from other persons who have some knowledge about the professional performance of the faculty member being evaluated." Normally, the chair will invite such letters when they might convey insights not documented otherwise in the dossier.

For instance, if someone engages in a great deal of collaborative scholarship, it might be useful to obtain a letter from the collaborator that helps contextualize the faculty member's role in the collaboration. Such letters may be submitted with the dossier as supplemental material.

Once the material for the dossier has been assembled, shared with tenured colleagues, and considered, the chair should meet with all eligible tenured members of the department or review committee to vote on the recommendation. (In [Library](#) and the [Physical Education](#) department, special guidelines apply, each of which are set out in a separate document.) It should be noted that department members on Senior Faculty Status may assist with the review but, according to the [Faculty Handbook](#), are not eligible to vote on the recommendation.

The chair then writes the letter of recommendation to the Dean, *normally no more than six pages*, setting out the arguments and evidence that support the recommendation. The letter should offer a description of the faculty member's professional development as well as specific areas of concern. If areas of concern or difficulty were identified in earlier reviews, the letter should address whether there has been adequate improvement to meet College standards of excellence. The letter should summarize (with brief quotations if helpful) what the colleagues observed in visits to the faculty member's classes, and the colleagues' evaluation of course materials. The letter should specify which classes were visited, by whom, and on what dates. The letter should refer to the Dean's surveys of students and advisees, as well as the summary end-of-course evaluation data. The letter should assess the faculty member's research program, and explain the significance of scholarly publications, noting the relative professional importance of venues of publication or performance. The letter should address the evaluations of external reviewers, addressing any contradictions or challenges. Finally, the letter should address the faculty member's professional service to the College and to professional associations. The Personnel Committee is particularly interested in service that has college-wide impact, supports or contributes to campus diversity and inclusion, or otherwise requires significant contributions of the faculty member.

If there are divergent opinions among colleagues or among the external reviewers, the review committee's letter should represent the divergent arguments and indicate the levels of support for them. All members of the review committee who voted on the recommendation should, if possible, sign the letter.

The chair may submit an electronic copy of the review committee letter (along with scanned signature page) via the Interfolio site or by bringing a hard copy and any supplemental materials to the Dean's Office by the appropriate deadline (see I, A above). The chair should not share the review committee's letter with the faculty member at this time. The Dean's Office will review the dossier to ensure it is in compliance with the Guidelines, and then notify the chair of its acceptance for consideration. After the Dean's Office accepts the dossier, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development will inform the faculty member of the review committee's recommendation.

The divisional representative to the Personnel Committee will schedule a meeting of the divisional personnel committee to review and discuss the faculty member's performance. The divisional personnel committee will then vote on the dossier. The divisional representative will present a written report of this meeting and its recommendation to the Personnel Committee, and will also attach their separate appraisal of this recommendation, as described in the [Faculty](#)

[Handbook](#). This recommendation and the representative's appraisal will become part of the dossier.

Subsequently, the Personnel Committee will review the dossier, and any supplemental materials it requests, discuss the case, and the members will vote on a recommendation by secret ballot. The Dean will convey the Personnel Committee's recommendation to the President along with the dossier and any requested supplemental materials.

The Dean will notify the faculty member of the outcome of the review before the Spring Board of Trustees meeting. The chair of the review and the chair of the department (if different) will be sent a copy of the Dean's letter. The Dean's Office will share a copy of the review committee's letter with the faculty member.

#### **D. Review for Promotion to Professor**

A faculty member is typically reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor no sooner than the sixth year in rank as Associate Professor. The process for initiating a promotion review and the criteria that pertain are set out in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

Normally, the guidelines that pertain to a review for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor also pertain to a review for promotion to the rank of Professor. Colleagues should have in mind that promotion to the rank of Professor acknowledges a faculty member's continuing demonstration of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service to the College community and the profession. It is exceptionally difficult for any candidate to demonstrate excellence in all categories in fewer than eight semesters. One must be exceptionally strong in all three areas.

It is customary for the Dean to meet in person, when a promotion review gets underway, with the person under review and also the review chair. This meeting provides a chance to go over the process and timetable, addressing questions that either person may have. While these meetings are generally brief, usually there are at least a few questions--either about the specific case, or about the process and expected timeframe for each stage, including notifications, of the review and its outcome.

#### **E. Post-FMLA Interim Review (prior to the tenure review):**

Faculty members who have postponed their tenure clocks due to a family or medical leave (in consultation with the Dean) are no longer required to have an extensive interim review for re-contracting. Department chairs should submit a one-paragraph letter to the Dean in which the department requests that the faculty member's contract be extended for an additional year.

#### **F. Dossier Contents (Checklists)**

The items on the attached checklists should appear in faculty review dossiers. All other materials are considered supplemental material and will not be reviewed by the Personnel Committee unless formally requested by the Committee.

**Second Year Interim Review**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letter (up to three pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all members of the review committee
  - \_\_\_ Does it address teaching, scholarship, and service?
  - \_\_\_ Does it give dates of class visits and cite what colleagues observed?
  - \_\_\_ Did colleagues evaluate course materials?
  - \_\_\_ Are tenured colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter summarize a report (either oral or written) by the SRC?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress?
  - \_\_\_ If the faculty member has not completed the terminal degree, has the chair provided evidence of the expected time of completion?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, for the period under review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Most recent Faculty Activity Report
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letter from Dean following previous review (if applicable)
- \_\_\_\_\_ List by semester of courses taught, with enrollments
- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary of quantitative data from end-of-course ratings forms

## Complete Review

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letter (up to six pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all members of the review committee
  - \_\_\_ Does it address teaching, scholarship, and service?
  - \_\_\_ Does it give dates of class visits and cite what colleagues observed?
  - \_\_\_ Does it indicate an awareness of when the faculty member (if tenure track) is scheduled to come up for tenure?
  - \_\_\_ Did colleagues evaluate course materials?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the results of the Dean's survey?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Are tenured colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ Does the committee address tutorial teaching (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)?
  - \_\_\_ Has the SRC Report been taken into account and placed in context?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress and quality?
  - \_\_\_ If the faculty member has not completed the terminal degree, has the chair provided evidence of the expected time of completion?
  - \_\_\_ Is there an assessment of the faculty member's development since the last review?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, for the period under review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Activities Reports for the past two years
- \_\_\_\_\_ Context statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ List by semester of courses taught, with enrollments for the past two years
- \_\_\_\_\_ SRC Report
  - \_\_\_ Report signed by SRC members who participated in the review
  - \_\_\_ Report explains methodology, e.g., sample size, selection criteria, response rate
  - \_\_\_ Report lists questions that the SRC asked; presents analysis of answers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letter from the Dean following previous review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letter from previous review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tutorial evaluations (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student, alumni, and advisee surveys solicited by the Dean's Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary of quantitative data from end-of-course ratings forms for the past two years

## Physical Education:

### Sixth Year Interim Reviews should also use this checklist

- \_\_\_\_\_ Department letter (up to six pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all Associate members of the department
  - \_\_\_ Does it address teaching, scholarship, and service?
  - \_\_\_ Does it give dates of class visits and cite what colleagues observed?
  - \_\_\_ Did colleagues evaluate course materials?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the results of the Dean's survey?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Are Associate colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ Does the department address tutorial teaching (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)?
  - \_\_\_ Has the SRC Report been taken into account and placed in context?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress and quality?
  - \_\_\_ Is there an assessment of the faculty member's development since the last review?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, for the period under review or since last salary review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Activities Reports for the past three years
- \_\_\_\_\_ Context statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ List by semester of courses taught, with enrollments for the past three years
- \_\_\_\_\_ SRC Report
  - \_\_\_ Report signed by SRC members who participated in the review
  - \_\_\_ Report explains methodology, e.g., sample size, selection criteria, response rate
  - \_\_\_ Report lists questions that the SRC asked; presents analysis of answers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letter from the Dean following previous review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Department letter from previous review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tutorial evaluations (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student, alumni, and advisee surveys solicited by the Dean's Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary of quantitative data from end-of-course ratings forms



**Library:****Sixth Year Interim Reviews should also use this checklist**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Department letter (up to six pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all Associate members of the department
  - \_\_\_ Are Associate colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ (If Applicable) Does the letter comment on EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Has the SRC Report been taken into account and placed in context?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress and quality?
  - \_\_\_ If the faculty member has not completed the terminal degree, has the chair provided evidence of the expected time of completion?
  - \_\_\_ Is there an assessment of the faculty member's development since the last review?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, for period under review or since last salary review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Activities Reports for the past three years
- \_\_\_\_\_ Context statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ SRC Report
  - \_\_\_ Report signed by SRC members who participated in the review
  - \_\_\_ Report explains methodology, e.g., sample size, selection criteria, response rate
  - \_\_\_ Report lists questions that the SRC asked; presents analysis of answers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letter from the Dean following previous review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Department letter from previous review

### Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letter (up to six pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all members of the review committee
  - \_\_\_ Does it address teaching, scholarship, and service?
  - \_\_\_ Does it give dates of class visits and cite what colleagues observed?
  - \_\_\_ Did colleagues evaluate course materials?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the results of the Dean's survey?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Are tenured colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ Does it comment on most recent tutorial teaching (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*) and please also note the academic year in which the tutorial was last taught?
  - \_\_\_ Has the SRC Report been taken into account and placed in context?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress and quality?
  - \_\_\_ Does it put the research and its venue into context (if department members feel competent to speak to this)?
  - \_\_\_ Is there an assessment of the faculty member's development since the last review?
- \_\_\_\_\_ External reviews of scholarship (make sure reviewers' institutional affiliations are indicated on their letters but that they are referred to anonymously -- e.g., reviewer 1, 2, 3 and without mention of their institutional affiliations -- in the review committee letter)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, since complete review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Activities Reports for the past three years
- \_\_\_\_\_ Context statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ List by semester of courses taught, with enrollments for the last five years
- \_\_\_\_\_ SRC Report
  - \_\_\_ Report signed by members of the SRC who participated in the review
  - \_\_\_ Report explains methodology, e.g., sample size, selection criteria, response rate
  - \_\_\_ Report lists questions that the SRC asked; presents an analysis of the answers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letters from the Dean following previous reviews (*not needed for promotion to Professor*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letters from previous reviews (*not needed for promotion to Professor*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tutorial evaluations (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student, alumni, and advisee surveys solicited by the Dean's Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary of quantitative data from end-of-course ratings forms for the last five years

## Promotion to Professor

- \_\_\_\_\_ Review committee letter (up to six pages)
  - \_\_\_ Does it state a recommendation?
  - \_\_\_ The letter is signed by all members of the review committee
  - \_\_\_ Does it address teaching, scholarship, and service?
  - \_\_\_ Does it give dates of class visits and cite what colleagues observed?
  - \_\_\_ Did colleagues evaluate course materials?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the results of the Dean's survey?
  - \_\_\_ Does the letter comment on the EOC evaluations appropriately?
  - \_\_\_ Are tenured colleagues quoted verbatim, or whose individual comments are paraphrased as distinct voices in the letter?
  - \_\_\_ Does it comment on most recent tutorial teaching (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*) and please also note the academic year in which the tutorial was last taught?
  - \_\_\_ Has the SRC Report been taken into account and placed in context?
  - \_\_\_ Is there a substantiated assessment of scholarly progress and quality?
  - \_\_\_ Does it put the research and its venue into context (if department members feel competent to speak to this)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ External reviews of scholarship (make sure reviewers' institutional affiliations are indicated on their letters but that they are referred to anonymously -- e.g., reviewer 1, 2, 3 and without mention of their institutional affiliations -- in the review committee letter)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Current curriculum vitae provided and approved by the faculty member for purposes of the review
  - \_\_\_ Month and year listed for each publication, since last salary review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Activities Reports for the past three years
- \_\_\_\_\_ Context statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ List by semester of courses taught, with enrollments for the past five years
- \_\_\_\_\_ SRC Report
  - \_\_\_ Report signed by members of the SRC who participated in the review
  - \_\_\_ Report explains methodology, e.g., sample size, selection criteria, response rate
  - \_\_\_ Report lists questions that the SRC asked; presents an analysis of the answers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Tutorial evaluations (*if faculty member has taught tutorial*)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student, alumni, and advisee surveys solicited by the Dean's Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Summary of quantitative data from end-of-course ratings forms for the past five years

## **GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS**

### **Appendix I: Selection of Students for Dean's Survey**

For the Dean's Survey, a list of students who have taken a course from the instructor is created. Typically, a sample is selected from among students who have taken a course with the instructor during the prior six semesters, including the semester of the last review. In the case of reviews for promotion, if required in order to secure an appropriate sample, the Dean may authorize a selection of students who have taken a course with the professor prior to the previous six semesters.

Then a computerized random sampling routine is used to select the set of students to be surveyed. To ensure representation from different course levels and types, the students are categorized by the courses they have completed: a) 100-level, b) 200-level, c) 300- and 400-level, and d) independent study and internships (students may fall into more than one category).

Random samples are taken from each stratum in a hierarchical process. A hierarchical approach is used because upper-level and independent study categories generally have fewer candidates. 18 candidates are drawn from each stratum (or as many as are available if fewer than 18 choices exist) and continues until a total of 72 students are selected (or as many as are available if fewer than 72 choices exist). The procedure is designed so that if the response rate were 55 to 60 percent, the process would yield about 10 responses per stratum. If the Dean's survey does not generate at least 30 responses, an additional sample is drawn using the same guidelines as above.

Tutorials are excluded from this process since tutorial evaluations are included in the review dossier.

**Appendix II: Selection of Students for the Advisee Survey**

For the Advisee Survey, the sampling frame (the list of students to whom a survey is sent) consists of:

- a) Current advisees for the candidate under review
- b) Tutorial students from the two academic years previous to the review
- c) Alumni who were advisees in the major or a concentration (including Education) and graduated within two academic years previous to the review.

All individuals who fit any one of the criteria listed above are sent a survey.

**Appendix III: Questions Asked in Dean's Survey**

1. The Registrar's records show that you took the following courses (list follows) with Professor NAME. Is this list correct? If not, please correct any errors.
2. Did you have any other contact outside the classroom with Professor NAME? (No; Yes-please explain)
3. How well do you remember Professor NAME? (Very well; Reasonably well; Not very well)
4. Compared to your other professors at Grinnell, is there any way that Professor NAME stands out in your mind? (No; Yes- please explain)
5. How much did you learn from your courses or other contact with Professor NAME? Please explain your answers. (An extremely small amount; A small amount; A large amount; An extremely large amount)
6. Apart from details of the subject matter, is there anything you learned from Professor NAME that has continued to be important for you? (No; Yes-please explain)
7. What did you consider to be the MOST effective aspects of Professor NAME's teaching?
8. What did you consider to be the LEAST effective aspects of Professor NAME's teaching?
9. In retrospect, is your current evaluation of Professor NAME's teaching at all different from your judgment at the time? (No; Yes-please explain)
10. What criteria do you use for judging whether a faculty member at Grinnell has been effective?
11. Using these criteria, which choice most closely reflects your rating of Professor NAME as a faculty member at Grinnell? Please explain your answer. (Extremely ineffective; Ineffective; Effective; Extremely effective)

#### Appendix IV: Questions Asked in Advisee Survey

1. How long did this faculty member serve as your adviser?  
This professor was my:  
    Tutorial Adviser (Less than 6 months) (6-12 months) (More than a year)  
    Major Adviser (Less than 6 months) (6-12 months) (More than a year)  
    Interim/Other (Less than 6 months) (6-12 months) (More than a year)  
Please comment on the advising relationship: (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim)
2. Was your adviser available at appropriate times?  
(Yes, always) (Yes, usually) (No, there were frequent problems arranging the appointments)  
Comments (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim):
3. During advising appointments did you have adequate opportunity to raise your academic and other concerns?  
(Yes, always) (Yes, usually) (No, seldom) (No, never) Comments (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim):
4. How helpful has your adviser been in thinking about the following items?  
Educational Goals: (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
Academic program (major, concentration, off-campus study, etc.): (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
Course selection: (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
Post-graduate options: (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
Graduation requirements: (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
College policies and procedures: (Very helpful) (Somewhat helpful) (Not helpful) (Not discussed)  
Comments (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim):
5. If you have consulted your adviser about something beyond his or her range of knowledge, has your adviser been able to suggest somewhere else for you to obtain advice?  
(Yes) (No) (Not applicable)  
Comments (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim):
6. How often did you have contact with your adviser?  
(Weekly) (Every two weeks) (Two or three times a semester) (Once a semester) (Never)
7. What are the major strengths of your adviser?
8. What could your adviser do to improve the quality of advising?
9. I would recommend my adviser to other students.  
(Strongly agree) (Agree) (Not sure) (Disagree) (Strongly disagree)

Please add any further comments you would like us to consider. (T=Tutorial; M=Major; I=Interim)