

Department of Mathematics
Procedure for the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

Version 1.4

Original Approved 12/9/2011

Revisions Approved 12/2/2013

Revisions Approved 9/19/2016

Revisions Approved 12/4/2024

Table of Contents:

[Section 1: Procedures for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion Actions](#)

[A. Introduction](#)

[B. Prior to Personnel Review](#)

[C. Departmental Feedback and External Letters](#)

[D. Preparing the Personal Statement and Portfolio](#)

[E. Portfolio Review and Agenda Formation](#)

[F. Unit Discussion Meeting and Unit Recommendation Report](#)

[G. Formative Feedback about the Personnel Process](#)

[Section 2: Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest](#)

[Section 3: Schedule Guidelines for Personnel Reviews](#)

[Section 4: Roles and Responsibilities](#)

[Section 5: Class Visit Record \(CVR\)](#)

Section 1: Procedures for Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion Actions

A. Introduction

This document describes the procedures for evaluating tenure-track faculty within the Department of Mathematics. The policies and procedures outlined are either required by the *Faculty Handbook* (specifically, [SG 3.07](#) and [BOT 4.2.10.1-7](#)) or serve to supplement the *Faculty Handbook* policies and provide additional details specific to the Department of Mathematics.

The procedures defined in this section are time-intensive. When necessary, the Department of Mathematics will work closely with the Dean's Office and CLAS Personnel Committee (CPC) to set internal deadlines that will accommodate both CPC and departmental processes while still meeting university deadlines.

B. Prior to Personnel Review

1. The Department of Mathematics will maintain a list of guidelines and suggestions for the preparation of personal statements and portfolios at <https://www.gvsu.edu/mthpolicies/ttpersonnel>. Each candidate will maintain a current vita that will be made public at the start of the review process. Each candidate may choose to name an *Advocate*. The Advocate will work with the Personnel Committee (PC) throughout the process for the candidate under consideration. The Advocate must be a tenure-track faculty member of the Department of Mathematics, but may not be the Unit Head. Note: For brevity, these procedures assume the candidate has selected an Advocate; if no Advocate has been named, any reference to the Advocate's role in the personnel process shall be disregarded.
2. Class Visit Records:
 - 2a. Each academic year (typically in the fall semester), the PC will conduct one classroom visitation for each untenured faculty member using the attached Class Visit Record (Section 5). In addition, tenured faculty members seeking promotion within three years are encouraged to request classroom visitations from the PC. The Class Visit Records produced by the PC will be shared with the candidate and retained by the department for future reviews.
 - 2b. Untenured faculty who are under consideration for contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion must include in their portfolios all Class Visit Records produced by the PC prior to their review. Tenured faculty who are under consideration for promotion must include all Class Visit Records produced by the PC in the most recent three years of the relevant period for review (see [BOT 4.2.10.5](#)). These Class Visit Records will be added to the portfolio by the PC chair or delegate.
 - 2c. If any candidate (untenured or tenured) has not been visited by the PC at least twice in the three most recent years of the relevant period for review, then the PC will conduct classroom visitations during the semester prior to the review (winter semester for promotions to Professor; fall semester for all other personnel actions) to ensure that the candidate's portfolio includes at least two recent Class Visit Records.

C. Departmental Feedback and External Letters

3. Student Perception Data (LIFT Evaluations): The PC chair (with support from the office staff) will create a spreadsheet containing all numerical data from the relevant years of student perception data. The PC and department will have the opportunity to review the student perception data to provide feedback and raise potential challenges or strengths the candidate might consider addressing in their portfolio materials. The spreadsheet and full copies of relevant student perception data will be included in the candidate's portfolio by the PC chair or delegate.
4. Initial Departmental Feedback:

- 4a. The PC will provide a mechanism for tenure-track faculty to share formative feedback for the candidate about strengths and potential issues to address in the personal statement and portfolio.
- 4b. This mechanism will include providing tenure-track faculty access to the spreadsheet of numerical data from the relevant years of student evaluations and the candidate's vita, and (upon request) access to full copies of student perception data. At this stage in the process, the spreadsheet as well as full copies of relevant student perception data will be made available to the PC, Advocate, and candidate.
- 4c. The PC chair will compile the feedback and share it with the candidate with names redacted. In addition, the Unit Head will communicate directly with the candidate about possible items for the candidate to address. Although the exact content of this communication will remain confidential, the Unit Head, as a member of the department, may raise issues discussed with the candidate in subsequent stages of the personnel process.
- 5. External Letters: All candidates are strongly encouraged to solicit 1-3 letters from professional colleagues outside the Department of Mathematics, including, if appropriate, professional colleagues outside of Grand Valley. Such external letter writers will be charged with providing information and their professional opinions about one or more relevant aspects of the candidate's work, especially in the areas of scholarship, service, or other work that extend beyond the department, in light of departmental standards and expectations. Although the PC and Advocate will work with the candidate to identify external letter writers, their selection ultimately rests with the candidate. The PC chair will communicate with and formally request the letters from the external letter writers; the letters will be addressed and submitted to the Unit Head, with copies sent to the PC chair; the requested deadline shall normally be at least one week before the candidate's portfolio is due to the Department. The PC chair will share the candidate's vita and the departmental evaluation criteria with external letter writers; upon request, the PC chair will solicit additional relevant materials from the candidate and share these with the external letter writers.
- 6. Optional Formative Feedback on Personal Statement: All candidates have the option to receive feedback on a draft personal statement. The process varies by personnel action:
 - 6a. Contract renewal, tenure, and promotion to associate professor: The candidate may share with the PC and Advocate a draft personal statement. The PC chair will correspond with the candidate to remind them of this option and will propose dates for a formative feedback meeting for that purpose. If accepted, the PC and Advocate, after reviewing the draft as well as the candidate's student perception data and departmental feedback from Item 4, will meet with the candidate to provide formative feedback with regard to the completeness, clarity, and coherence of the personal statement as it pertains to the relevant evaluation criteria. During this meeting, the candidate will also be given an opportunity to discuss the feedback provided by department members in Item 4 above and/or any supplemental materials for their portfolio. The feedback provided during this meeting will not be documented in writing and should not be construed as necessary or sufficient to guarantee a positive outcome of the personnel action under consideration. Candidates are also encouraged to take advantage of FTLC portfolio mentoring workshops, if available. The choice to meet or not meet with the PC regarding a draft personal statement or to participate in any FTLC portfolio mentoring workshops rests with the candidate; this choice, by itself, will not be viewed favorably or unfavorably in subsequent steps of the evaluation process.
 - 6b. Promotion to full professor: The preceding paragraph (Item 6a) also applies to promotion to full professor if the candidate has a draft statement ready to share in time for a formative feedback meeting between the 10th and 13th weeks of the Winter semester; if not, the feedback may instead be provided by the PC chair, Unit Head, and/or Advocate, or by other members of the department who may be available during the summer months, instead of by the full PC.

D. Preparing the Personal Statement and Portfolio

7. Faculty considered for personnel actions are required to submit a portfolio. Common sources of evidence for effective teaching, scholarly activity, and service are as follows:

7a. Effective teaching must be documented by: a) self-evaluation, b) peer evaluation, and c) student evaluations ([BOT 4.2.9.1.A](#)). Self evaluation may be demonstrated through the personal statement narrative and supplemental teaching materials that include teaching artifacts. Peer evaluation is demonstrated through Class Visit Reports. Student perception data (student evaluations) encompass both LIFT comments and numerical items.

Note about student evaluations: The department agrees with the [CLAS Personnel Committee View On Student Evaluations](#) statement, which states: “It is necessary for faculty to show that they take the evaluations seriously, reflect on what they have to say about the effectiveness of the instruction, and respond when changes are appropriate. The CPC looks for evidence of that reflection and pedagogical evolution, not for an absence of complaints.” The department expects faculty members to reflect on student evaluations and themes in student feedback across sections and different courses over time.

7b. Scholarly activity is documented through peer-reviewed and peer-validated dissemination as presented in the CV, personal statement, and supplemental scholarly activity materials and artifacts, and (optional) letters from external references.

7c. Service is documented through the CV, personal statement, supplemental service materials, and (optional) letters from external references.

8. Assembling the portfolio: Some portfolio items are included by the candidate, others by the unit.

8a. Candidate: Items provided by the candidate shall include: a personal statement that explains how the candidate meets unit, college, and university standards; a curriculum vita; supplemental materials consisting of supporting evidence in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; and documentation of years toward tenure or joint appointment (if applicable).

8b. Unit: Unless otherwise specified by the CLAS personnel committee, the following unit-supplied materials will be added to the portfolio by the PC chair or delegate: student evaluations (including the compiled spreadsheet described in Item 3); Class Visit Records (Item 2); external letters (Item 5); and Faculty Workload Reports (FWRs), Faculty Workload Plans (FWPs), and Written Performance Summaries (WPSs) from the relevant period (see [BOT 4.2.10.5](#)); and, for tenure personnel actions, Unit Recommendation Reports from prior tenure-track contract renewal(s). The candidate may request copies of the unit-supplied materials before the portfolio is due.

9. The candidate will submit their portfolio materials, including their finalized personal statement, to the PC chair. Candidates also have the option of submitting their materials as one integrated PDF file; rather than as separate files for each area of evaluation.

E. Portfolio Review and Agenda Formation

10. Each tenure-track faculty member is expected to review the candidate’s portfolio. At the very least, they will review: the candidate’s vita, personal statement, Class Visit Records, spreadsheet of numerical student evaluation data, and external letters. In addition, faculty should seek additional information and/or clarification from the candidate or the candidate’s portfolio whenever such information is necessary to ensure informed and responsible participation in the candidate’s review.

Based on their review of the candidate’s portfolio, each tenure-track faculty member will be invited to submit suggested bullet items for each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarly activity, and service)

identifying matters for discussion at the unit meeting regarding the candidate's achievements. Faculty may also submit questions, issues, and concerns relevant to the criteria for the personnel action ([BOT 4.2.10.7](#)). Faculty are encouraged to include a brief rationale for their suggested bullet items and for any questions, issues, and concerns they submit, but the rationale will not be included in the Initial Agenda. Questions submitted typically aim to provide the candidate an opportunity to share or clarify information that strengthens their case for the personnel action, to address any significant omissions in the portfolio, or to request clarification on potential issues or concerns that may affect support for the personnel action if not sufficiently addressed during the unit discussion meeting. All items will be submitted directly to the Unit Head for use in creating the *Draft Initial Agenda* (see Item 12).

11. Each member of the PC and the Advocate will review the entire portfolio, including the external letters and supplemental materials, and will submit suggested bullet items regarding the candidate's achievements in each of the three areas of evaluation; they may also submit questions, issues, and concerns as described in Item 10. These items will be submitted directly to the Unit Head.
12. The Unit Head will compile the suggested bullet items (including questions, issues, and concerns) and rationales (with names redacted) from Items 10 and 11, share them with the PC and the Advocate, and use them in addition to the external letters to create a *Draft Initial Agenda* for the candidate's unit discussion meeting. It is expected that this agenda will normally be 2-4 pages for a contract renewal, and 3-5 pages for a tenure or promotion decision.
13. The Unit Head will share the *Draft Initial Agenda* with the PC and the Advocate. The PC and the Advocate will then meet to discuss the *Draft Initial Agenda*. After the meeting, the Advocate and each of the individual members of the PC will communicate suggestions to the Unit Head for any suggested changes to the *Draft Initial Agenda*. At their discretion, the Unit Head will revise the *Draft Initial Agenda* based on these suggestions to produce the *Initial Agenda*.
14. The Unit Head will share the *Initial Agenda* with the PC and the Advocate. The PC and the Advocate will then vote on whether to endorse the *Initial Agenda*. If there is not a majority vote in favor of endorsing the *Initial Agenda*, the Unit Head will revise the *Initial Agenda*, submit the revised version to the PC and to the Advocate, and a new vote will be taken. After the final vote is taken, the Advocate and/or any member(s) of the PC may write a dissent (at most one page in length) that will be appended to the *Initial Agenda*. All dissents will be signed by their author(s). The final vote will be made public along with the *Initial Agenda*.
15. The Unit Head will distribute the *Initial Agenda* (including the final PC vote and any dissents) to all tenure-track faculty. At this time, the Unit Head will also share an edited copy of the compiled suggested bullet items, with names redacted, from Item 12 with the candidate so that the candidate has full information in order to address questions, issues, or concerns at the unit discussion meeting. (The Unit Head, in consultation with the PC, will determine if any submitted bullet items, questions, issues, or concerns are not relevant to the personnel action, such as items based on inaccurate information or information not relevant to the criteria for the personnel action, and will delete them from the compiled suggested bullet items document before forwarding it to the candidate.)
16. Once the *Initial Agenda* has been distributed, any tenure-track department member, including the candidate, may propose changes. The Unit Head, at their discretion, will use faculty feedback and the *Initial Agenda* to produce the *Final Agenda* for the unit discussion meeting. It is expected that significant questions, issues, or concerns be raised earlier in the agenda-formation process. If any such information is raised at this stage, the Unit Head shall share the new information with both the PC chair and Advocate, and if they are not in unanimous agreement about adding the new information to the *Final Agenda*, then the Unit Head will incorporate the new information into a draft *Final Agenda* for review by the PC and the Advocate. The PC and the Advocate will then follow the procedures outlined in Item 14 to vote on whether to endorse the draft, including the possibility of revotes and written dissents; the final vote and any dissents

will be made public along with the *Final Agenda*. Upon completion of the *Final Agenda*, the Unit Head will distribute it (including any dissents) to all tenure-track faculty.

F. Unit Discussion Meeting and Unit Recommendation Report

17. The unit discussion meeting will last at most 50 minutes and will be scheduled in advance at a normal department meeting or seminar time. The meeting will have three stages: discussion with the candidate, deliberation, and voting, and shall be conducted in accordance with [BOT 4.2.10.7](#). During the discussion portion of the meeting, the candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to any items listed on the *Final Agenda*. If time permits, tenure track department members will be given the opportunity to ask follow-up questions. After the discussion portion of the meeting has concluded, the candidate will leave the room, and the Unit Head will provide a verbal summary of the preceding discussion. Department members will then deliberate, discussing the personnel action or actions under consideration. Eligible departmental faculty members will vote by secret ballot. To the extent possible given the aforementioned time limitations, it is the Unit Head's responsibility to organize and facilitate each candidate's unit discussion meeting in a way that promotes meaningful discussion of salient issues.
18. After the candidate's unit discussion meeting, the Unit Head and PC chair will count and tally the votes in the presence of the candidate (or a designate chosen by the candidate). The Unit Head will share the result of the vote with the department via email.
19. Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms: The Unit Head will distribute *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms* to all tenure-track members of the department (including the candidate). All department members who agree with the majority vote and have no additional perspectives to add to the discussion should not submit *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms*. *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms* should only be submitted when an individual disagrees with the vote and/or has a substantive comment to make. Candidates may submit a *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Form* and may attach any materials that address specific concerns raised in the unit discussion meeting. The Unit Head will use the unit discussion and comment forms to prepare a *Draft Unit Recommendation Report*. However, at their discretion, the Unit Head may reconvene the department, returning to Item 17, if substantive new issues or concerns are raised in the *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms*.
20. The Unit Head will distribute the candidate's *Draft Unit Recommendation Report* to all tenure-track faculty. The Unit Head will solicit suggestions for changes to the *Draft Unit Recommendation Report* within three (3) business days of the issuance of the draft report ([BOT 4.2.10.7.C](#)) and will, at their discretion, incorporate these suggestions into the final *Unit Recommendation Report*. The Unit Head will distribute the final *Unit Recommendation Report* to all tenure-track faculty.
21. Following the guidelines in the university (see [BOT 4.2.10.7.C](#)), the Unit Head will forward the *Final Agenda*, the tally of the departmental vote, copies of all submitted *Post-Meeting Faculty Comment Forms*, the candidate's portfolio (including, letters from external letter writers), and the final Unit Recommendation Report to the Dean. The candidate may submit a post-meeting comment form and may attach materials that address specific concerns raised in the meeting or *Unit Recommendation Report* (see [CLAS Personnel Committee Guidelines For Unit Heads and Colleagues, 3/18/16](#)). The Unit Head or delegate will also post all required materials to the CLAS Personnel Committee (CPC) Blackboard site.

G. Formative Feedback about the Personnel Process

22. After the conclusion of Item 21, each candidate will be given an opportunity to meet with the PC and the Advocate. The purpose of this meeting is for the candidate, Advocate, and PC to share formative feedback about the process with each other. The formative feedback provided by the PC to the candidate makes no commitment regarding future personnel actions or salary adjustments since performance of the projected activities will continue to be determined by evaluation criteria

established by the *Faculty Handbook* and carried out by specific procedures determined by the departmental faculty.

Section 2: Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest

A. *Confidentiality*. The personnel process involves candid discussion and evaluation of the candidate's performance. In addition, a number of formal evaluation documents, such as letters from external letter writers, agendas, and the *Unit Recommendation Report*, are created throughout the process. This appendix describes the policies of the Department of Mathematics with regard to the confidentiality of these materials.

- External letters are not considered confidential, and the unit will include them in their original form in the candidate's portfolio.
- Unless otherwise specified, all submitted bullet items, formative feedback, preliminary drafts, and other works-in-progress pertaining to the personnel process, are confidential and may be viewed only by the PC, the Unit Head, and (when applicable) the Advocate.
- Individual PC member and Advocate votes on the Draft Initial Agenda are sent to the PC Chair but are not shared except in summary form with the Unit Head. The PC Chair may opt to share an overview of the PC / Advocate discussion including general themes. However, specifics of the PC / Advocate discussion of the Draft Initial Agenda are not shared with the Unit Head. The PC Chair may also communicate with the Unit Head to emphasize points viewed as important by certain members of the PC / Advocate group while protecting the identity of those individuals.
- At the discretion of the PC, drafts of Class Visit Records may be shared with the candidate as part of the class visitation process.
- Suggestions for the *Draft Initial Agenda* submitted by faculty and the PC will be shared only with the Unit Head, PC, Advocate, and, in edited form as described in Item 15, the candidate.

B. *Conflicts of Interest*. In the event that the Unit Head is under consideration for a personnel action, a designate shall be appointed to oversee the personnel process and carry out all personnel-related Unit Head responsibilities for the Unit Head's personnel action. In addition, any member of the PC who is under consideration for a personnel action (including the PC chair) will be excluded from all PC discussions and deliberations pertaining to that member's personnel action. In the event that the PC chair is under consideration for a personnel action, the PC will select a committee member or the other Assistant Chair to oversee the committee's work with regard to the PC chair's personnel action. In accordance with the *Faculty Handbook* ([BOT 4.2.10.6](#)) faculty with conflicts of interest due to familial or business relationships, or due to denial of tenure or contract renewal, will be completely excused from all involvement and participation in the department's personnel process.

Section 3: Schedule Guidelines for Personnel Reviews

Because of workload and scheduling constraints, it is necessary to allow the PC and Unit Head some degree of flexibility in completing their work. However, the initial steps of the personnel process will typically follow the scheduling guidelines specified below.

Task	Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion to Associate	Promotion to Professor
For promotion decisions, candidate notifies Unit Head and PC of intention to accept a nomination	At least two weeks before the start of Fall semester classes	By February 1st
Unit Head submits form to apply in writing for promotion to CLAS Deans Office	September 30 - set by college; verify with CLAS each semester	March 30 - set by university; see Handbook
Candidate provides current vita to Unit Head and PC	By Monday of the 3rd week of Fall semester	By the end of spring break
Candidate selects Advocate (optional)	By Monday of the 3rd week of Fall semester	Within 3 weeks after the end of Winter Semester
Selection of external letter writers	By Monday of the 3rd week of Fall semester	Within 3 weeks after the end of Winter Semester
Formative feedback from department members	During Fall semester, before the end of the 6th week of classes	During Winter semester, before the end of the 12th week of classes
Classroom visitations, if necessary	During the 3rd through 12th weeks of classes of Fall semester	During the 3rd through 12th weeks of classes of Winter semester
Draft personal statement due / meeting with PC and Advocate (optional)	During the 10th thru 13th weeks of classes of Fall semester, with the draft due one week earlier.	If meeting with PC, the meeting shall occur during the 10th thru 13th weeks of Winter semester classes, with drafts due one week earlier. Otherwise, for options for summer feedback, see Step 7.
Portfolio due (and made available the next business day); external letters due one week prior.	First day of Fall semester final exams <i>*see note about university portfolio deadlines, below</i>	One week prior to the first day of Fall semester classes <i>*see note about university deadlines</i>
Items 10-21	First half of Winter semester, per CPC deadlines and other department commitments	First half of Fall semester, per CPC deadlines and other department commitments
Formative feedback between candidate, PC, and Advocate (optional)	Second half of Winter semester, after each candidate's unit meeting and vote.	Second half of Fall semester, after each candidate's unit meeting and vote.

**Note about university portfolio deadlines:* The department sets an internal deadline for candidates to submit their portfolios, as specified in the table, to allow time for faculty to review the portfolio and submit bullet items with enough time to carry out the multi-step process of drafting of the *Final Agenda*. The department's internal deadline tends to be much earlier than the deadline set by the university. If a

candidate opts to follow the university deadlines, the period of time for the initial departmental review of the candidate's materials and submission of bullet items will be shortened.

By the end of the first week of classes each semester, the PC chair will distribute detailed timelines with specific dates for each of the Items in the personnel process for each candidate under review. Items 10-21 in the process will be scheduled based on CPC deadlines and other department business (such as meetings related to faculty searches).

Whenever possible, candidates and department members will be given at least 2 business days to respond to requests for information (such as suggestions for *Final Agendas* or *Unit Recommendation Reports*) and to review relevant documents prior to unit discussion meetings. Exceptions to this rule will occur only if necessary to meet CPC deadlines.

Section 4: Roles and Responsibilities

Candidate: It is the candidate's responsibility to present a complete and thorough case for the personnel decision under consideration. The candidate should document their qualifications (relevant to the personnel decision at hand) through a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and other supplementary materials included as part of the candidate's portfolio-and should also actively participate in the personnel process. The candidate is encouraged to make use of resources such as department and college personnel documents and guidelines, and FTLC resources, and to consult with the PC, Unit Head, and other members of the department as needed.

PC: The PC conducts class visitations, provides support and assistance to the candidate, and, along with the candidate's Advocate, provides oversight of the review process, including providing formative feedback (Items 4 and 6) and the development of each candidate's *Initial Agenda* (Item 14). Each member of the PC is expected to thoroughly review all of the candidate's portfolio and assist the Unit Head by providing suggested bullet points for the candidate's *Draft Initial Agenda* (Item 11).

PC Chair: Per department bylaws, the PC chair "is responsible for the review process, including scheduling meetings of the committee, preparing and distributing reports, and communicating with the department." In particular, the responsibilities of the PC chair include overseeing the schedule for all aspects of the personnel process and communicating with all involved parties (including the candidate, external letter writers, department members, members of the PC, and the Unit Head). Although the PC chair does not conduct class visitations, they will work with the PC to schedule class visits and facilitate the committee's review of drafts of the Class Visit Records.

Advocate: At the invitation of the candidate, an advocate participates with the PC in the portions of the review process described above, including: (1) providing formative feedback to the candidate on the draft personal statement and supplemental portfolio materials; (2) submitting bullet items for the creation of the Draft Initial Agenda and participating in the PC's discussion and vote(s) pertaining to the candidate's *Draft Initial Agenda*; (3) if desired, submitting a dissent to the *Initial Agenda*; and (4) participating in the formative feedback exchange described in Item 22 above. To ensure meaningful and informed participation in the review process, advocates are expected to thoroughly review all of the candidate's portfolio.

External Letter Writers: External letter writers provide information and their professional opinions about one or more relevant aspects of the candidate's work, especially in the areas of scholarship, service, or other work that extends beyond the department, in light of departmental standards and expectations.

Unit Head: The Unit Head's primary responsibilities include developing the agenda for each candidate's unit meeting (as described in Items 12-16 above), chairing the unit discussion meeting (Item 17), and writing the *Unit Recommendation Report* (Item 20). The Unit Head also ensures that all processes detailed in the *Faculty Handbook* (notably, [SG 3.07](#) and [BOT 4.2.10.1-7](#)) are followed.

Department Members: Tenure-track members of the department have responsibilities at several points in the process. In addition to potentially serving as advocates and members of the PC, all tenure-track faculty have the opportunity to give initial feedback to the candidate, as described in Item 4 of the process. Each tenure-track faculty member is expected to review the candidate's portfolio and related materials (see Item 10). Tenure-track faculty also have the opportunity (and are strongly encouraged) to submit suggested bullet points for each candidate's *Initial Agenda*, as described in Item 10 of the process. All tenure-track faculty are expected to read and respond to personnel communications from the Unit Head and PC in a timely manner, especially those pertaining to the *Initial* and *Final Agendas*.

Section 5: Mathematics Class Visit Record

Teacher:	Observer:	Date of lesson:
Course:	Topic:	Course experience (# of times previously taught):

An explanation of the use and purpose of this form is provided on the lastpage.

Lesson Preparation (teacher, 1 paragraph):

Lesson Summary (observer, 1 page):

Lesson Response (observer, 1 paragraph):

Lesson Reflection (teacher, 1 paragraph):

By signing below, I agree that my portions of this record accurately reflect my perception of the observation.

Teacher

Observer

Description of the Mathematics Class Visit Record

As teaching is a primary responsibility of faculty, documenting a faculty member's teaching is an important task. The Department of Mathematics views teaching as work that extends beyond the classroom and involves assessment, planning, and evaluation, as well as instruction. This *Class Visit Record* strives to create an image of the teacher's classroom as well as the work that surrounds it.

In the first section, the teacher writes a paragraph that describes their preparation for the lesson to be observed. This paragraph should include a listing of the objective(s) for the lesson along with a description of the teacher's experience with the course and lesson. It may also include a description of how class activities were chosen or developed, or a short description of the reasoning behind the objective(s).

In the second section, the observer writes a brief summary (approximately one page) of the observed class. This summary is not evaluative. The focus of this summary is not to provide a transcript that conveys every detail of the class, but rather to capture the essence of the lesson, with selected details that help the reader understand the teacher's classroom. In the summary, the observer may wish to comment on the mode of instruction, student- teacher communication, student-student interaction, student engagement, the teacher's assessment techniques, and any other salient features of the class.

In the third section, the observer writes a one-paragraph response to the observation. In this paragraph, the observer reflects on what they thought was important or noteworthy about the class. This reflection may include questions, issues, praise, or commentary.

In the fourth and final section, the teacher writes a paragraph reflecting upon the observation. This paragraph may include consideration of the lesson objectives, reflection about what happened during instruction, explanation to assist the reader in understanding the lesson, or a response to what the observer has written.

The *Class Visit Record* is a result of collaboration between the observer and teacher for the purpose of communicating the teacher's teaching, and both will sign the final form. Communication between the teacher and observer is encouraged throughout the process, in particular before and after the observation and in the final editing of the record. For the personnel process, *Class Visit Records* are forwarded with the candidate's materials and should be both clear and concise.