

# CLARION UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## Inter-Office Correspondence

TO: Spring Term 2010 Tenure Candidates

FROM: Dr. Joanne Washington, Chair  
University-Wide Tenure Committee

SUBJECT: Informational Items Relative to the Tenure  
Recommendation Process

DATE: October 5, 2009

C: Department Chairperson of Applicant  
Department Tenure Committee Chairperson of Applicant  
University-Wide Tenure Committee Members:

- Dr. Jonathan Brown, Education
- Dr. William Buchanan, Library Science
- Dr. Marite Haynes, Psychology
- Dr. Cynthia Kennedy, History
- Dr. David Lott, Venango, Biology
- Dr. Colleen McAleer, Communication Sciences and Disorders

The following information is provided to address some of the more commonly asked questions concerning the procedures, application materials, and documentation to be included with the Tenure Application.

1. The Tenure Committee is following all items related to tenure in the current CBA book dated July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2011 (and available online at [www.apscuf.com](http://www.apscuf.com)). The appropriate section is Article 15, pages 33-37 and related sections throughout the CBA (see CBA index for other pages).
2. The candidate is to submit to the department tenure committee, by December 31, 2009, an application placed in a three-ring binder, addressed to the President of the University, which presents substantively yet succinctly the candidate's performance and achievements that warrant his/her receiving tenure at Clarion University. The candidate is encouraged to organize the narrative in accordance with the three categories for performance review as outlined in Article 12 of the CBA (pages 23-24 in the print contract): 1) teaching effectiveness and fulfillment of professional responsibilities, 2) continuing scholarly growth, and 3) service to the university and/or community.
3. The department chair and the department tenure committee chair shall forward the application, placed in a three ring binder, to the University-Wide Tenure Committee

with their respective recommendations by February 15, 2010. Each recommendation should be prefaced with a cover sheet. Copies of the cover sheet for the committee and for the chair are included herewith; please photocopy them if additional sheets are needed.

4. The recommendation for or against tenure probably has the most questions focused on what kind of documentation, or comments, are needed in both letters coming from the department to the University-Wide Tenure Committee. In order to be as uniform and fair as possible to all candidates, the University-Wide Tenure Committee requests that each candidate provide documentation to support either a yes or no recommendation. However, this does not need to be nearly as plentiful as one would use for a promotion application.
5. The University-Wide Tenure Committee requests that comments be made relative to the steps in the evaluation process as outlined in Article 12 of the CBA. This means to comment on the categories for performance review as listed (for example): 1) teaching effectiveness and fulfillment of professional responsibilities, 2) continuing scholarly growth, and 3) service to the university and/or community.

The three categories should be addressed from a point of view that provides sufficient information to the University-Wide Tenure Committee members to make an informed and knowledgeable fair judgment. If the department tenure committee and/or the department chairperson believe that support documentation would be helpful to make an informed judgment, then documentation should be included. Documentation is particularly important if the tenure candidate is being given a “no” recommendation for tenure. The members of the University-Wide Tenure Committee then must make their judgment on the basis of what was submitted to them and from a review of the candidate’s personnel file, **if the University-Wide Tenure Committee is given permission to review the applicant’s file**. Their recommendation will be a very significant factor in the final recommendation to the President.

The University-Wide Tenure Committee will also be reviewing the candidate’s personnel file, if permission was granted, to verify eligibility, conditions of employment, and documents from probationary reviews along with student evaluations on file. As a result, this type of documentation need not be included unless specific reference is made to it as a means of alerting the University-Wide Tenure Committee to a specific point. Please see the lists below in which needed documents are specifically identified.

**Items to be submitted to University-Wide Tenure Committee (UWTC) by all applicants:**

Application letter addressing the highlights of activities in the categories reviewed as part of performance review and evaluation during the probationary period

A current vita listing earned degrees and activities completed during the five year probationary period according to the categories in CBA Article 12, pp. 23-24

A transcript showing highest degree earned and credits beyond the highest earned degree (if applicable)

**Items to be submitted to UWTC by those applicants who do not give permission to the UWTC to review the applicant's personnel file:**

**All of the following for the five year probationary period:**

All student evaluations completed each semester

All peer observations completed by peers and department chair

All departmental performance review and evaluation committee reports

All department chair performance review and evaluation reports

All deans' performance review and evaluation reports

All annual letters from the president to the probationary faculty renewing employment

The initial offer of employment letter sent by the university president, specifying any conditions of employment

Enclosures:

Chairperson: Recommendation to the University-Wide Tenure Committee

Department Tenure Committee: Recommendation to the University-Wide Tenure Committee