**Mid-Tenure Assessment Letter**

**Department Chair**

**Date:**

**From: Dr. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Department Chair, Department**

**Possible Outcomes:**

1. The candidate is making strong progress in all three areas, i.e., teaching, scholarship/creative activities/service, and should continue developing all three areas in the same manner.
2. While the candidate is making strong progress in most areas, some areas need to be strengthened. Nonetheless it is the assessment of the Chair (and Department/School TAP Committee) that the candidate can sufficiently improve their standing in all three areas so that tenure and promotion are likely.
3. The candidate has made weak or no progress in the critical areas of teaching and/or scholarship/creative activities and/or service, and the deficits are too serious to overcome in the time remaining before the tenure and promotion review. In such a case, a recommendation to terminate the tenure-track appointment is issued and the candidate receives a terminal year appointment. The Dean and Associate Dean must approve the recommendation before communicating it to the candidate.

*(In the case where remedial action is required (outcome 2 above), the candidate should be provided with specific recommendations for improvement to make a successful tenure and promotion review likely.)*

**Re: Mid-Tenure Review**

The mid-tenure review meeting took place on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The following were in attendance: Dean, Associate Dean, Department Chair, and Candidate. The major focus of the meeting was to discuss candidate’s accomplishments to date relative to the tenure probationary period, as well as future activities in all three areas, in preparation for the tenure and promotion review in their sixth year.

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*After reviewing candidate’s dossier, the consensus was that their accomplishments to date indicate fair/good/excellent (****pick the appropriate adjective****) progress toward tenure and promotion in the three areas of evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service. Specific comments about each area of evaluation are below.*

**Use this form to *assess*, not summarize, details of the candidate's dossier. This letter should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate’s qualifications and the reasons for the recommendation such that each subsequent reviewing body, officer, or candidate is informed on the basis for their conclusions.**

For the past years, the candidate’s average faculty assignment has been **%** in teaching, **%** in scholarship, and **%** in service.

**TEACHING**

*Address each element: Peer evaluations of candidate's teaching effectiveness; Student evaluation of candidate's teaching effectiveness; Assessment of candidate’s instructional duties and effectiveness, other teaching duties (e.g., mentoring) and professional development pursued; Course Assignments (any interdisciplinary courses) and student engagement; active learning and HIP/pedagogical techniques.*

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*Dr…has clearly excelled in teaching. There is ample evidence that they are an effective instructor and curriculum designer. OR While Dr...has worked diligently, their teaching effectiveness has not been measurably great, as shown in their teaching ratings and classroom observations by several faculty members in their department or from other departments.*

**RESEARCH**

*Address each element: Progress toward advanced degree (if applicable); Evaluation of candidate's scholarly productivity (quantity of output); Evaluation of candidate’s scholarly impact (quality of scholarship, including sustainability or trajectory); Evaluation of candidate's participation in professional scholarly activities, evidence of external recognition; Collaborations with students; suggestions for future work on scholarship.*

*Department* *Chairs will provide an assessment of the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of scholarship work, such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance, including the quality of electronic publications.* ***This assessment is required****. The quality and stature detailed in the assessment may be reflected by acceptance rates, the nature of peer review, the quality of the reviewing agency/organization, or other measures; whenever possible, these indices should be cited.*

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*Continue to publish articles in peer-reviewed journals. Aim for acceptance of at least one more peer-reviewed article and one more submitted by the time you apply for tenure and promotion. When preparing your dossier for the CDFPT, we recommend the following:*

* *Make clear the scope of your contributions in your co-authored publications such as the books you have edited or papers you have jointly authored. One way to do this is to ask your co-author(s) to write a letter of reference in which they provide details of your contributions versus theirs.*
* *Make clear the nature of the refereeing of your papers in conference proceedings: were all papers accepted or only a select few? What was the refereeing process in terms of who reviewed the works? Were the reviews blind as to author? What was the acceptance/rejection rate for papers presented at the conferences?*
* *Ask for recommendations from colleagues who do not have a personal stake in your work. These recommenders should be able to attest to the quality of that work, the importance of the work within the field, and the impact/significance of the work overall.*

**SERVICE**

*Possible element to address: Evaluation of candidate's impact in their profession (External service); Evaluation of candidate's INTERNAL service to students, department, school, University, and (if relevant) community*:

**Departmental Service:**

**Dyson Service:**

**University Service:**

**Professional Service:**

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*Some suggestions for the future are to do the following:*

* *Make yourself visible outside the department, particularly through the Faculty Councils, so colleagues get to know you.*
* *Separate out each Service level in your dossier, as is done here, so your contributions to each area are clear.*

**SUMMARY**

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*The Candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service have a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ focus, which blends well with the vision of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ department. They have made \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (excellent/good/fair) progress to date.*

**Indicate agreement or disagreement with department/school TAP committee recommendation**.

*Possible feedback (delete or edit):*

*My recommendation is consistent with the judgment of faculty on our departmental TAP committee. OR While I respect the judgment of the faculty on our departmental TAP committee, I do not concur with their majority vote …*

This letter has been reviewed and approved by the below personnel.

Chair (Type Name to indicate agreement with this assessment) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate (Type Name to indicate agreement with this assessment): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Associate Dean (Type Name to indicate agreement with this assessment): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_

School Dean (Type Name to indicate agreement with this assessment): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_