

Comprehensive Reappointment Review Process Suggested Timeline

Comprehensive reappointment reviews are sometimes referred to as “second- and fourth-year reviews” because they are typically conducted during the second and fourth year of appointment for tenure-track faculty who are not counting any previous years of service toward their probationary period. In such reviews, the majority of the work occurs in the spring semester of the year of the review; however, some preparatory work earlier in the academic year is necessary to enable the spring semester activities to be completed in a timely way. The timeline below presumes a spring semester evaluation schedule, but the same sequence of activities would occur during a fall semester review.

Fall semester (if the review is to take place in the fall then this process begins during the spring semester of the academic year prior to the fall review)

- **Provost notifies department chair.** The Provost notifies the department chair of the name of the candidate who will be reviewed. The Provost’s office provides the chair with access to an electronic review folder and in the case of a second comprehensive review, provides a copy of the letter of guidance from the first comprehensive review.
- **Chair notifies the candidate.** The chair notifies the candidate that the review will take place and refers the candidate to the [information about comprehensive reappointment reviews](#) on the website of the Provost and Dean of the College. The chair also confers with the candidate as to whether interdisciplinary teaching should be included in the review (*FM Section 4.III.K.4.e*).
- **Chair reviews college policies and procedures for comprehensive reviews.** The chair should read Sections 4.III.K and 4.VI of the *St. Olaf Faculty Manual* before beginning the review. The chair should also review the information on the Provost’s website concerning departmental responsibility for student reviews of teaching for [first comprehensive reviews](#) and/or for [second comprehensive reviews](#), and for [conducting peer reviews of teaching](#). Any questions should be addressed to the Associate Dean or Provost.
- **Chair provides a list of department members who should be given access to review materials.** The chair consults with the Associate Dean to generate a list of faculty members who should be given access to the review materials and provides the list to doc@stolaf.edu. Be mindful of those who may have a conflict of interest and therefore should not be allowed access to the review materials.
- **Chair appoints a tenured member of the department or Faculty to serve as a peer reviewer of teaching.** The comprehensive review process includes two peer reviews of teaching, one prepared by the chair and the other prepared by another tenured member of the candidate’s department or Faculty. Chairs may confer with the candidate and the tenured members of the department in selecting the second peer reviewer. Making this determination prior to the semester of the review allows the second reviewer to plan accordingly and to begin the peer review process earlier in the academic year, if that is agreeable to the reviewer and the candidate (see below).

Late fall semester and/or Interim (if the review is to take place in the fall then this process begins during the spring semester and summer prior to review)

- **Candidate begins compiling written materials for review.** These should include the candidate's:
 - CV
 - Professional statement
 - Samples of recent scholarly and/or artistic work
 - Samples of teaching materials.

It is often helpful for the candidate to begin compiling these materials in the fall semester, particularly in relation to teaching, in the event that the candidate and peer reviewers agree to begin the peer review process in the fall (see below).

- **Peer reviewers of teaching may begin the peer review process.** The time frame for the [peer review of teaching](#) is negotiable; it may begin in the fall semester, during Interim, or at the beginning of the spring semester. The chair and candidate should confer to determine when it would be most helpful to initiate the peer review process. Two advantages of beginning during the fall semester are that (1) it eases the time pressures on the spring semester, especially for the chair, and (2) it allows the candidate to receive some initial feedback and make adjustments, which permits the peer reviewers to observe the candidate's process of "continuing his or her own development as a teacher," a new criterion in the "contributions to student learning and development" category of the Standards for Faculty Evaluation.
- **Chair arranges for administration of Student Review of Teaching questionnaire.**

First Comprehensive Reappointment Reviews:

In a first comprehensive reappointment review, the *student reviews of teaching are administered and summarized by the department*. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (IE&A) sends the chair a customized sampling instructions form for each faculty member undergoing a first comprehensive reappointment review and provides the chair with a sample of students selected in accordance with the chair's [instructions](#). The *department* then determines which [Student Review of Teaching form](#) to use and how to customize the content to the faculty member's instructional responsibilities and practices. Typically, chairs work with their department Academic Administrative Assistants to solicit, gather, and summarize the student reviews. IE&A recommends that questionnaire administration begin in late February, and continue for approximately three weeks, to allow time for at least two reminders and increase the chances of a good response rate (ideally, 60% or better). The Provost's website includes information about [preparing questions](#), [administering the questionnaire](#), and [sample letters from the chair](#) to the selected students inviting them to complete the questionnaire.

Also please note that as per faculty resolution 2021/22-05 passed in December 2021 and effectively immediately, you should include an anti-bias statement.

St. Olaf College recognizes that evaluations of teaching are often influenced by unconscious and unintentional biases and expectations related to the race and gender of the instructor. Women and persons of color are systematically rated lower in their teaching evaluations than white men, even when there are no actual differences in the instruction or in what students have

learned. As you fill out this review, please remain aware of your own frame of reference and focus on the effectiveness of the instruction. 3

Second Comprehensive Reappointment Reviews:

In a second comprehensive reappointment review, IE&A administers and summarizes the student review of teaching, using a standard form customized to the candidate in consultation with the department chair. IE&A also selects the sample of students to be invited to complete the form, using [information](#) provided by the chair in a sampling instructions form. For the second comprehensive review, IE&A uses the [Student Review of Teaching for Reappointment questionnaire](#) that closely resembles the form for tenure and promotion reviews. Using the [questionnaire preparation guidelines](#), the department chair, in consultation with the faculty member under review, can prepare up to two additional questions for the form.

The anti-bias statement (see above) applies for 2nd comprehensive reviews as well.

Early spring semester (February) (for fall reviews, September)

- **Chair administers the student reviews of teaching for first comprehensive reviews.** As prepared above, using the sample supplied by IE&A, the chair administers the student reviews of teaching and advising. IE&A will administer the reviews for second comprehensive reviews at this time.
- **Candidate completes the compilation of written materials for review.** The candidate updates his or her CV, professional statement, samples of recent scholarly and/or artistic work, and samples of teaching materials to include materials for spring courses.

Mid-spring semester (March) (for fall reviews, October)

- **Peer reviewers of teaching complete the peer review process.** The chair and the second peer reviewer each [prepare a written report](#) that:
 - 1) Addresses the candidate's contribution to student learning and development; and
 - 2) Draws on evidence from a variety of sources, including a discussion with the faculty member about his/her teaching perspectives, his/her practices and professional development, the candidate's sample of teaching materials, and at least two observations of classroom instruction.
- **Chair confers with tenured members of the department.** The chair confers with the other tenured members of the department for an appraisal of the candidate's contributions in relation to the standards for faculty evaluation in the *Faculty Manual* and the Department's Statement of Significant Scholarly/Artistic Work and, in the case of a joint appointment, the faculty member's joint statement of expectations. The tenured members will have access to the candidate's:
 - CV
 - Professional Statement
 - Samples of scholarly and/or artistic work
 - SSSAW (joint statement of expectations if a joint appointment)
 - Student reviews
 - A sample of teaching materials compiled by the candidate
 - Any letters of guidance from a previous comprehensive review

The Faculty Manual does not stipulate the manner in which the chair consults with tenured members of the department, but the chair should describe the manner of consultation in the chair's letter of recommendation and rationale (see below) 4

- **Chair invites appraisals from non-tenured members of the department.** The chair invites appraisals from non-tenured members of the department who are full-time during the year of the candidate's review and who have completed at least two years of full-time service at the College prior to the year of the review. The non-tenured members have access to the candidate's CV and samples of scholarly/artistic work.

The Faculty Manual does not stipulate the manner in which the chair consults with non-tenured members of the department, but the chair should describe the manner of consultation in the chair's letter of recommendation and rationale (see below).

Late spring semester

The complete dossier and the Chair's letter of recommendation and rationale are due to the Associate Dean by April 25. (For Fall reviews, due January by 15)

- **Chair prepares a letter of recommendation and rationale to the Associate Dean.**
The chair's letter of recommendation and rationale shall: (*Faculty Manual Section 4.III.K.4.h*)
 - Address the faculty member's contributions in relation to each of the categories and criteria for faculty evaluation and the department's SSSAW
 - Refer to any previous letters of guidance
 - Summarize appraisals by other department members
 - Summarize information from peer and student reviews of teaching
 - Refer to other evidence of the quality and development of the faculty member's work.
- **Review materials are electronic and are located in a folder on the shared Google drive. Access to this folder is provided to the Chair, Associate Dean, and Provost.**
Review materials for the departmental faculty members are made available electronically via Google Drive to faculty who have been granted access.
- **The Associate Dean prepares a letter of recommendation and rationale and submits it to the Provost by May 1. (For Fall reviews, due to the Provost by February 1.)**
- **The Chair(s) in consultation with the associate dean(s) and the Provost, shall deliver a letter of guidance to the faculty member by June 15 (by March 1, For Fall reviews).**