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MID-TENURE EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

|  |
| --- |
| Department Chair Review |

# Candidate Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty member name | Candidate Name | |
| Department | Department Name | |
| College | College Name | |
|  | | |
| Date of initial appointment | | Date |
| Years credited toward tenure with initial appointment | | Years Credit |
| Number of years of service at UCA, including current year | | Years of Service |
| Projected year of tenure decision | | Academic Year |

# Introduction

Granting tenure involves not only an evaluation of past performance but also an evaluation of potential for continued growth. Moreover, the granting of tenure means the acceptance of a new member into the university’s permanent scholarly community. The tenure decision, therefore, must involve consideration of a faculty member’s ability to work effectively in, and contribute significantly to, the department and university community. It must be recognized by the faculty member and all evaluators that various factors, including staffing plans, the department’s enrollment trends, and budgetary requirements may influence tenure recommendations.

During the third year of probationary status the performance of a tenure-track faculty member is reviewed and evaluated by the departmental tenure committee, the department chair, and the college dean in light of the standards enunciated in the UCA *Faculty Handbook*. In cases where credit toward tenure has been granted with the initial contract, the review and evaluation will be conducted two years prior to the year the tenure decision will be made. The purpose of the mid-probationary evaluation is to provide the faculty member with an index of how he or she is progressing toward achieving tenure. A favorable mid-probationary review implies no promise that the faculty member will ultimately be recommended for tenure; such a recommendation will be additionally dependent upon subsequent performance as well as programmatic needs. Similarly, a faculty member who receives unfavorable evaluations at the time of mid-probationary review will not be penalized if his or her subsequent performance and programmatic needs ultimately justify a positive recommendation. The faculty member may choose to include or not to include this mid-probationary evaluation with his/her final tenure application.

# Evaluation

Complete all sections of the evaluation: Effectiveness in Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, Service to the University and Community, and Professional Development, addressing Strengths, Weaknesses, and Suggestions for Development in each section. An optional additional section is provided for comments not fitting comfortably in the primary evaluative categories.

## Effectiveness in Teaching

### Strengths:

Strengths

### Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

### Suggestions for further development:

Suggestions

## Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

### Strengths:

Strengths

### Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

### Suggestions for further development:

Suggestions

## Service to the University and Community

### Strengths:

Strengths

### Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

### Suggestions for further development:

Suggestions

## Professional Development

### Strengths:

Strengths

### Weaknesses:

Weaknesses

### Suggestions for further development:

Suggestions

## Additional comments (optional)

Additional Comments

# Overall Evaluation by the Department Chair

After careful consideration, I find that during the initial years of the probationary period covered by this evaluation, the performance of Candidate’s Name demonstrates that she/he

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | is compliant with the standards in the UCA *Faculty Handbook*, and I believe that the candidate is making appropriate progress toward earning tenure. |
|  |  |
|  | is not compliant with the standards in the UCA *Faculty Handbook*, and I believe that the candidate is not making appropriate progress toward earning tenure. |

# Signatures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Date |
| Signature – Chair of the Department |  | Date |

My signature below indicates that I have read this evaluation and discussed it with my department chair listed above. It does not necessarily reflect agreement with the evaluation. I understand that I have the opportunity to disagree in writing with the chair’s written statement within ten working days. I further understand that a copy of the chair’s evaluation and any response from me will be forwarded to the dean.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Date |
| Signature – Faculty Member |  | Date |