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I. REFERENCE

PPM 3-62 -     Evaluation of University Personnel

[PPM 9-9-      Due Process/General Statement](http://www.weber.edu/ppm/Policies/9-9_DueProcess.html)

[R481 -           Regent's Policy:  Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-                    Tenure Review](http://higheredutah.org/sbr/policy/pdf/R481.pdf)

II. POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. Purpose

The post-tenure review shall be based on criteria separately defined from the award of tenure with the intent of:

1.  Demonstrating the tenured faculty member's growth and development in the discipline;

2.  Communicating to the faculty member specific areas in need of improvement related to performance in teaching, scholarship, and service; and

3.  Enhancing each individual's future productivity.

B.  Procedures

After tenure is granted, faculty will be evaluated every five years, or more often at the discretion of the department chair or dean or at the request of the faculty member.  Each College Tenure document shall specify procedures to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member in a manner and frequency consistent with institutional and professional accreditation standards.  The criteria for such review shall include multiple indices, and be discipline- and role-specific, as appropriate, to evaluate:

1.  Teaching, through student, collegial, and administrative assessment;

2.  The quality of scholarly and creative performance and/or research productivity; and

3.  Service to the profession, school and community.

C. Student Evaluations

In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be administered and compiled by an impartial third party.  Each year, all post-tenured faculty members shall have student evaluations administered in at least two of the courses. The two courses to be evaluated each year will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. If the faculty member and the chair cannot come to agreement on which two courses should be evaluated by the students, the choice of courses to be evaluated will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean, after consultation with the faculty member and the chair. The results of those evaluations shall be seen by the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries will be kept on file in the office of the chair.

D.  Remedial Actions Based on Post-Tenure Review

If, as a result of the post-tenure review process, the faculty member is found to not be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his or her discipline, he or she is responsible for remediating the deficiencies, and both the University and College are expected to assist through developmental opportunities.  A faculty member's failure to successfully remediate deficiencies may result in disciplinary action governed by due process pursuant to the standards described in PPM 9-9 through 9-17.

III. TENURE REVIEW

A. Definitions and Eligibility

The University shall extend tenure to approved members of the teaching faculty who are holders of tenure track appointments and to certain others as hereafter defined. Tenure track appointments shall be given only to those faculty who, at the time of such appointment, meet the minimum degree requirements specified below in this policy.

Appointment to a tenured position is considered permanent and not subject to termination or substantial reduction in status without cause, provided that in all cases the services of an individual in that position continue to be needed and that funds are available to pay them.

Granting tenure implies a commitment by the University. Likewise, the faculty member who is granted tenure makes an equally strong commitment to serve students, colleagues, their discipline and the University in a manner befitting an academic person. It also raises a strong presumption that those granted tenure are competent in their disciplines and are capable of scholarly contributions. It is, therefore, imperative that a responsible screening process be followed before such commitments are made to insure selection of the most competent candidates.

Any faculty member or administrator may petition the Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Senate to consider changes in tenure policy. Petitioners for tenure policy changes in a particular college must invite comments from faculty, the department chair and the dean of that college.

A tenured instructor specialist may move to another tenure bearing rank. However, this constitutes a move to a new position. Tenure is neither retained in the old position nor automatically transferred to the new position. Years of service may be negotiated at the time of the move.

B. Minimum Degree Requirements

The following minimum degree requirements have been established for each department. Although higher standards may be desirable, no departmental criteria will be approved which fall below these minimums.

1. For the colleges of Education, Science, and Social and Behavioral Sciences:

Attainment of the earned doctorate in the discipline of primary responsibility. In the event a doctorate is not the general recognized terminal degree in a candidate’s discipline, a doctorate in a closely related discipline (as approved in writing by the provost in consultation with the Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the appropriate dean) shall be required.

2. For the school of Business and Economics and the college of Arts and Humanities, the requirement specified in (1) shall be required with the following exceptions (which represent equivalency):

Business Administration - An earned Juris Doctorate accompanied by a master’s degree in a related business field will be considered equivalent to the earned doctorate for those whose primary responsibility is in the area of business law.

Accounting - An earned Juris Doctorate accompanied by (1) a master’s in accounting or (2) a B.S. in accounting and an M.B.A. will be considered equivalent to the earned doctorate for those whose primary responsibility is in the area of taxation and/or accounting law.

Information Systems & Technologies - An earned doctorate in the field (e.g., Systems Management Information Systems, Computer Information Systems, Information Systems) or equivalent, the latter to be satisfied by either (1) an earned doctorate in a related field of business or (2) an earned doctorate in a field outside the traditional areas of business with a graduate business degree; plus, in either case,

a. relevant, practical experience in Computer Information Systems, or

b. additional educational training sufficient to demonstrate competency and currency in the field.

Logistics - An earned doctorate in logistics or in a related field with evidence of completed graduate course work in logistics. A Juris Doctorate with relevant experience for those whose primary teaching responsibility is in contracting and procurement.

Visual Arts - The recognized and accepted terminal degrees are the M.F.A. or M.G.D. for studio areas including: ceramics, drawing, jewelry and metals, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture, weaving and textiles, and graphic design.

Performing Arts - The recognized and accepted terminal degree is the M.F.A. in the following disciplines: costume design, scene design, lighting design, technical directing, dance, acting, and directing.

English - A recognized and accepted terminal degree is the M.F.A. for the area of creative writing.

3. For the Dr. Ezekiel R. Dumke College of Health Professions:

Attainment of the earned doctorate in Health Professions or master’s degree in the field or related discipline, plus current professional certification or license within the candidate’s primary area of responsibility.

4. For the College of Applied Science & Technology:

For Computer Science and Telecommunications/Business Education, attainment of the earned doctorate plus two years of experience or a master’s degree plus five years of experience and appropriate certification; for Automotive Technology, Construction Management Technology, the Engineering Technologies, and Sales and Service Technology, attainment of the earned doctorate plus two years of experience or a master’s degree plus five years of experience.  All degrees and experience must be in approved fields/competencies and at appropriate levels, as outlined in the college promotion and tenure policy.

5. For the Stewart Library:

Attainment of the master's of Library Science or its equivalent from a program accredited by the American Library Association.

C. Tenure Review Process

Weber State University shall maintain review procedures to evaluate and record the progress of probationary faculty members toward tenure. Full evaluations shall be made during the third and sixth probationary years. In exceptional cases, the tenure review process may be temporarily suspended (one may leave and re-enter at the same point), upon recommendation by the department chair and the dean, in consultation with the provost. If and when such a request is granted, the conditions of the extension shall be explained in writing by the dean with a copy to the provost. A faculty member, their department chair, the dean or the provost may also request an additional review in other probationary years. A progress report, including written evaluations of a non-tenured faculty member, shall be placed in the file of the faculty member recording the findings of the review and shall be transmitted to the faculty member. The faculty member shall be given appropriate opportunity to discuss strengths, weaknesses, goals, etc. at each review level.

In addition, in the second year of a candidate’s progress toward tenure, the department chair will do an assessment of the candidate’s progress. This assessment may be done with or without the assistance of a departmental committee at the sole discretion of the department chair. The candidate’s teaching, service and scholarship shall be evaluated and an overall written assessment of progress made. The department chair shall send a written report to the candidate and the candidate’s dean and shall submit the report for inclusion in the candidate’s professional file. There is no evaluation beyond the department level. When candidates in their second year of progress toward tenure are either to be evaluated in that year for promotion or have requested an additional review, the department chair may choose to let that promotion evaluation serve in place of the second year assessment of progress toward tenure.

During the third and sixth years of the probationary period, and other years when requested, the full review process shall include evaluation by the dean and the ranking tenure evaluation committees at the levels of the department and the college. At his/ her sole discretion, the provost may review and make separate recommendations for or against a candidate’s tenure or evaluation of a candidate’s progress towards tenure. An exception is that in the event that there is a conflict among recommendations from the dean, the college Tenure Evaluation Committee and the department Tenure Evaluation Committee, the provost must make a separate recommendation. Furthermore, after the Department Tenure Evaluation Committee, the College Tenure Evaluation Committee, and the dean have completed their respective reviews, the candidate may request an additional review by the University Tenure Evaluation Committee. The University Committee evaluates the substantive issues of teaching, scholarship, service and ethics. The University Committee shall review the files of all candidates for advancement in rank or tenure who request such a review (see 8-19A). The recommendation(s) of the University Committee will be forwarded to the provost. The provost makes the final institutional recommendation unless overturned by the president or the Faculty Board of Review, as is the dean’s recommendation when the provost makes no recommendation. All these reviews shall follow established procedures allowing for formal evaluative contributions from students, faculty peers, and supervisory administrators and shall give faculty members under review written evaluations with the right of due process review by the Faculty Board of Review (as described in PPM 9-9 through 9-17).

Faculty members who have been granted extensions of the probationary period beyond the normal six years shall annually be subject to formal review. For those faculty members who have been granted reductions in the normal probationary period of six years under the policies described in PPM 8-23 and/or 8-24 herein, a determination shall be made by the dean during the first year of appointment on the tenure track with respect to the proper scheduling of the formal review process. The findings of that determination shall be placed in writing in the candidate’s professional file described in PPM 8-13.

D. Criteria for Granting Tenure

Each college has formulated a written policy statement, the college tenure document, containing the criteria to be used in tenure review. Review criteria in college tenure documents may be further specified in written department standards or department tenure documents.  In that case, each department's tenure document will be considered as a part of the college tenure document.  The criteria set in the department tenure documents must meet or exceed the criteria specified in the college tenure document.  The approval process for new or revised department standards or department tenure documents needs to be specified in the college tenure document.  Department standards or department tenure documents shall be used in conjunction with the college tenure document when reviewing and evaluating a candidate's materials at every level or review (peer review, department, college, dean, university, provost).  A college tenure document must include (1) the criteria, consistent with the minimum criteria outlined below; (2) the rationale for the criteria; and (3) the method for measuring performance with respect to the criteria.

Any change in the college tenure document shall be submitted through the dean to the Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee for analysis and recommendation to the Faculty Senate. Upon the approval of the Faculty Senate, the revision in the college tenure document shall be forwarded to the provost. Upon approval by the provost and Board of Trustees, the changed college tenure document will be considered adopted. The date of the final approval of the college tenure document will be affixed to the policy statement, and that date will be considered as the effective date. Thereafter, the approved and dated college tenure document will apply until any revision is channeled through the steps outlined herein and a new effective date is affixed. Copies of the approved revised college tenure document will be on file in the offices of the department chair, the dean, the Faculty Senate and the provost and will be accessible online at the provost homepage..

Minimum criteria include:

1. A rating consistent with college standards in teaching. Teaching activities may include instruction, laboratory activities, supervising projects, preparation of course materials and other types of teaching activities.

2. A rating consistent with college standards in professional activities such as research and other contributions to knowledge, leadership in professional organizations, and active pursuit of professional competence.

3. A rating consistent with college standards in service, which includes professionally related community service as well as service to the institution, i.e., service on department, college or other University committees and task forces; student advisement; and other types of service.

4. Adherence to professional ethics.

5. Possession of terminal degree as defined above.

6. A rating consistent with college standards in other criteria stated in specific college documents, such as professionally related experience.

IV. EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC RANK

It shall be the policy of the University that the minimum evaluative criteria established in this document are applicable to all academic colleges and the Library. Except as outlined for exceptional persons or early promotions, no individual will be advanced in rank without satisfying these minimum requirements. Individual colleges may establish additional requirements and further delineate the items addressed in this document.

It shall be the policy of the University to make promotions in rank to competent and deserving members of the faculty. Upon their request, faculty members will be considered for advancement in rank by the dean and the ranking tenure Evaluation Committees at the levels of the department and the college. At his or her sole discretion, the provost may review and make separate recommendations for or against a candidate’s advancement in rank. An exception is that in the event that there is a conflict among recommendations from the dean, the College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee and the Department Ranking Tenure Evaluation committee, the provost must make a separate recommendation. Furthermore, after the Department Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee, the College Ranking Tenure Committee, and the dean have completed their respective reviews, the candidate may request an additional review by the University Tenure Evaluation Committee. The University Committee evaluates the substantive issues of teaching, scholarship, service and ethics. The University Committee shall review the files of all candidates for advancement in rank or tenure who request such a review (see 8-19a). The recommendation(s) of the University Committee will be forwarded to the provost. The provost makes the final institutional recommendation unless overturned by the president or the Faculty Board of Review, as is the dean’s recommendation when the provost makes no recommendation. All these reviews shall follow established procedures allowing for formal evaluative contributions from students, faculty peers, and supervisory administrators and shall give faculty members under review written evaluations with the right of due process review by the Faculty Board of Review (as described in PPM 9-9 and following).

Faculty members have the right at any stage of the review proceeding to withdraw themselves from consideration for advancement in rank. Notice of such request shall be made by the candidate to his/her dean, who, in turn, shall then advise the appropriate reviewers that they are no longer to consider the candidate for advancement in rank. Years of service in rank at other institutions may be substituted for years at Weber State University in accordance with the agreement reached at the time of appointment. (See PPM 8-8) Promotions in rank are effective as of the beginning of the fiscal year following the notice of promotion.

A. Channels

In order to allow for the legitimate different talents, aptitudes, preferences and assignments of individuals as well as the needs and goals of the institution, several equivalent channels of evaluation are made available. These channels consist of minimum requirements and/or performance levels that must be met within four different categories before an individual is eligible for consideration for advancement in rank.

These Categories are: (1) credentials and probationary periods, (2) teaching, (3) scholarship and (4) administration and/or professionally related service. Definitions and descriptions of these categories are found later in this policy.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The channels appropriate for evaluating a candidate for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Channel** | **Credentials Probationary Periods** | **Teaching** | **Scholarship** | **Administration and/or Professionally Related Service** |
| A | Satisfied | Satisfactory | Good | Good |
| B | Satisfied | Satisfactory | Excellent | Satisfactory |
| C | Satisfied | Excellent | - - | Good |
| D | Satisfied | Good | Good | Satisfactory |
| E | Satisfied | Good | Satisfactory | Good |

Channels appropriate for evaluating a candidate for promotion from associate professor to professor are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Channel** | **Credentials Probationary Periods** | **Teaching** | **Scholarship** | **Administration and/or Professionally Related Service** |
| A | Satisfied | Good | Good | Good |
| B | Satisfied | Good | Excellent | Satisfactory |
| C | Satisfied | Excellent | Good | Satisfactory |

B. Evaluations

Many items related to an individual’s credentials and performance are considered to be essential for performing at an adequate level. Such items are considered to be the base upon which a case is built to justify promotion. Their lack is a negative factor in promotion considerations. Examples of adequate level performance requirements include the following:

1. Teaching a share of the more difficult or less popular courses

2. Completing a share of departmental committee assignments and other departmental duties

3. Completing such class work, work experience, journal reading, etc. as is necessary for maintaining credentials and keeping current in the field

4. Updating lecture notes and supplementing test material to keep courses current

5. Occasionally accepting and completing assignments at the college and University level

6. Doing other work for which the individual was specifically hired and for which provisions are made in assigned workload

When the candidate has achieved the minimum credentials, completed the probationary period, applied for promotion or has been recommended for early promotion, ranking tenure evaluation committees and other reviewers will evaluate the candidate in each of the categories and compare the results with the standards established in each channel. To be recommended for promotion, a candidate’s evaluation in each category must meet or exceed the standards in any one channel. Promotion shall not be attained by satisfying parts of two or more channels. The candidate need not select any specific channel.

Some channels do not require performance in a particular category. Where a channel does include performance, ranking tenure evaluation committees and other reviewers will evaluate an individual’s performance as (low to high) (1) unsatisfactory, (2) satisfactory, (3) good or (4) excellent

 C. Definition of Channels

1. Credentials and Probationary Periods

a. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor

1. The doctorate, where offered, shall be required for advancement to the rank of associate professor. Where the doctorate is not offered in the discipline, either a doctorate in a closely related discipline or a master’s degree will be accepted upon approval of the faculty of the discipline, the chair, the dean and the provost.  Approval shall be attained for the exception to the required degree prior to the initiation of the review process for that academic year. The following are approved exceptions to the doctorate for advancement in rank to associate professor:

College of Health Professions

Master’s degree plus current professional certification and three (3) years of work experience.

College of Arts and Humanities

Master of Fine Arts or Master of Graphic Design for the disciplines of ceramics, drawing, jewelry and metals, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture, weaving and textiles, graphic design, costume design, scene design, technical directing and dance.

College of Applied Science & Technology

For Telecommunications/ Business Education and Computer Science, a master’s degree plus five years of experience and appropriate certification; for Automotive Technology, Construction Management Technology, the Engineering Technologies and Sales and Service Technology, a master’s degree plus five years of experience. All degrees and experience must be in approved fields/competencies and at appropriate levels, as outlined in the college promotion and tenure policy.

Stewart Library

Master’s degree in Library Science, or its equivalent, from a library school accredited by the American Library Association.

2. Six years of satisfactory performance at the rank of assistant professor will be the minimum probationary period. However, up to one year for professionally related activities can be counted toward fulfilling this requirement.

3. To be promoted from assistant professor to associate professor one must either have been granted tenure or be granted tenure at the same time as the promotion. A candidate who fails the tenure review process cannot be advanced in rank. A candidate who has been granted an extension to the normal probationary period for tenure cannot be considered for advancement in rank to associate professor until the candidate is also considered for tenure.

d. Promotion from associate professor to professor

1. The doctorate, where offered, shall be required for advancement to the rank of professor. Where the doctorate is not offered in the discipline, either a doctorate in a closely related discipline or a master’s degree will be accepted upon approval of the faculty of the discipline, the chair, the dean, the provost and the Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. Approval shall be attained for the exception to the required degree prior to the initiation of the review process for that academic year. The following are exceptions to the doctorate for advancement to the rank of professor.

College of Arts and Humanities

Master of Fine Arts or Master of Graphic Design for the disciplines of ceramics, drawing, jewelry and metals, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture, weaving, and textiles, graphic design, costume design, scene design, technical directing and dance.

College of Applied Science & Technology

For Telecommunications/ Business Education and Computer Science, a master’s degree plus five years of experience and appropriate certification; for Engineering Technology and Sales and Service Technology, a master’s degree plus five years of experience; for Design Graphics and Machine Tool Technologies, a master’s degree plus six years of experience. (All degrees and experience must be in approved fields/competencies and at appropriate levels, as outlined in the college promotion and tenure policy.)

Stewart Library

Master’s degree in Library Science, or its equivalent, from a library school accredited by the American Library Association.

2. Five years of satisfactory performance at the rank of associate professor will be the minimum probationary period. However, up to one year for professionally related activities can be counted toward fulfilling this requirement.

3. If one is hired at the rank of associate professor, then to be promoted from associate professor to professor one must either have been previously granted tenure or be granted tenure at the same time as the promotion.

D. Criteria for Early Promotion:

Exceptional candidates who have not completed the appropriate probationary period shall also be eligible for consideration for advancement in rank, provided they make timely application for promotion, or timely nomination of them is made by a tenured full professor.

Candidates who are within two years of satisfying the applicable time in rank requirement may apply or be nominated for early promotion. To receive a positive recommendation for promotion at a level of review, a candidate must receive a rating of excellent in teaching and scholarship and at least a good in service. Such ratings, however, do not insure early promotion. The opportunity for early promotion is intended for candidates who have established a national or international reputation in their discipline. A candidate must prepare a portfolio that includes documented evidence for extraordinary accomplishments in all of the three categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. A cover letter will be included which summarizes why a candidate feels they are extraordinary and deserving a consideration for early promotion. A statement of teaching philosophy and specific pedagogic accomplishments should also be included. This portfolio will be read and summarized by two groups of reviewers. Teaching and service accomplishments will be summarized by a Peer Review Committee operating in accordance with PPM 8-11. The scholarship portion of the portfolio will be sent for review to a minimum of three nationally recognized scholars in a candidate’s discipline. These outside reviewers must reside at institutions other than Weber State University, and are selected through a mutual agreement between the candidate and department chairperson. A summary outlining the results of the outside review of scholarship, and a summary of teaching and service accomplishments will be compiled as a written document by the Peer Review Committee and added to the candidate’s Professional File. The promotion process will continue as per PPM 8-12, Dated Guidelines for the Ranking Tenure Review Process.

The final decision to grant early promotion will rest at each level in the review process. Early promotion cases move forward from one review level to the next in the usual course even when the recommendation at a particular review level is negative. Successful early promotion cases remain possible despite negative recommendations by earlier reviewers.

E. Teaching

Teaching is defined as instruction conducted under the auspices of Weber State University. This category includes formal classroom instruction and student activities directly related to classroom instruction including supervision of laboratory activities, research projects, co-op education and course-related field trips. This category also includes the preparation and use of teaching materials such as course syllabi and other materials intended for instructional use.

It shall be the responsibility of the candidate and department to provide evidence of successful teaching experiences; therefore, teaching performance shall be evaluated by students, peers and appropriate administrators. Two or more teaching evaluations must be completed in each year of the candidate’s probationary period. The evaluations shall include department or college-wide comparisons.

To be evaluated in the teaching category and to have the year count towards the probationary period, a candidate must teach a minimum of 12 hours or its equivalent as determined by the department chair and the dean. However, up to one year for professionally related activities can be counted toward fulfilling this requirement. Equivalency for the Library will be determined by the director of the Library and the provost.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness includes:

1. Student Evaluations

In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be administered and compiled by an impartial third party.  Each year, all contract, non-tenured, and adjunct faculty members will have student evaluations administered in every course taught, and each tenured faculty member shall have student evaluations administered in at least two of the courses. The two courses to be evaluated each year will be determined through consultation between each faculty member and his/her department chair. If the faculty member and the chair cannot come to agreement on which two courses should be evaluated by the students, the choice of courses to be evaluated will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean, after consultation with the faculty member and the chair. The results of those evaluations shall be seen by the chair, the faculty member, and those specified in the review process. The summaries shall be kept on file in the office of the chair. In the case of the faculty member who is on tenure track or who is seeking promotion, the chair shall send to the faculty member’s professional file summaries of that faculty member’s student evaluations mentioned above, plus department averages for similar courses.

2. Candidate’s Teaching Profile

While student evaluations are important in demonstrating certain skills related to excellence in teaching, they are not sufficient for a complete evaluation of a candidate’s teaching abilities. Therefore, it is incumbent upon candidates to provide evidence that they are competent in three different elements of teaching: Subject Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Assessment of Student Learning. Clearly courses are taught in context. Candidates are encouraged to discuss this context in cases where it impacts their teaching and/or techniques they use in the classroom. All candidates shall establish documentation for assessment by a peer review committee demonstrating their teaching skills.

a. Subject Knowledge

Candidates shall demonstrate that they possess the current knowledge and/or skills necessary to provide up-to-date instruction for the courses they teach. Candidates may choose among, but are not limited to, the following:

* Presentation of the candidate’s view of the discipline, knowledge of the discipline, and the state of the discipline.
* Narrative of the state of the discipline.
* An assessment of the candidate’s knowledge by outside experts.
* Exhibit of a focused evaluation by an outside expert
* Class materials, handouts, syllabi, class notes, etc.
* Web pages that the candidate is using for classes.
* Attendance at professional meetings with a statement by the candidate on how it impacts his/her teaching.
* Narrative on how the candidate’s scholarship connects to the classroom.

b. Pedagogy:

Candidates shall demonstrate an acquaintance with the pedagogy of their disciplines. They should demonstrate knowledge of the issues surrounding the pedagogical approach they choose and articulate their purposes for their choices. They should also demonstrate a continuing effort to improve instruction. Candidates may choose among, but are not limited to, the following:

* Attendance at professional meetings with a narrative describing how that meeting helped the candidate improve his/her teaching.
* Videotape of the candidate’s teaching with analysis by the candidate.
* Student evaluations.
* Narrative on how the candidate views teaching.
* Classroom observations by peer review committee.
* Examples of collaborative teaching statements from collaborator on the candidate’s skills.
* Documentation of research the candidate has conducted with students.
* Interviews with students discussing their level of satisfaction with the course and instructor.

c. Assessment of Student Learning:

Candidates must demonstrate that they assess students' learning with valid, reliable assessment methods and tools. Candidates may choose among, but are not limited to, the following:

* Examples of research with students.
* Student work (outcomes) presentations, publications, projects, etc.
* Examples of classroom assessment techniques.
* Assessment narrative.
* Examples of exams, quizzes, tapes of conferences with students, etc.
* Recommendation from employers, cooperating teachers, supervisors, or other individuals in the position to competently comment on the preparation of the candidate’s students.

3. Peer Review

Every candidate for promotion or tenure review shall undergo peer review. (Peer review may also occur prior to the formal review as part of a mentoring process designed to cultivate the candidate’s potential in an atmosphere separate from evaluation.) The purpose of the peer review is to facilitate the evaluation process primarily through evidence-gathering. In particular, peer review promotes a more accurate understanding of teaching effectiveness by compiling and assessing documentation provided by the candidate demonstrating teaching effectiveness. The peer reviewers may also gather materials regarding the candidates’ scholarship and service activities. Peer reviewers should interpret this information in terms of department and college expectations and summarize, without rating, the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the designated areas. The summary of the peer review is subsequently placed in the candidate’s file to be evaluated by the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee, the College Ranking and Tenure Committee, the Dean and others as described in the Dated Guidelines for the Ranking Tenure Review process (PPM 8-12).

The peer review committee may be the department Ranking Tenure Review Committee. (PPM 8-15) If the peer review committee is not the department Ranking TenureReview Committee, it shall consist of a minimum of three members who are familiar with the program. If the faculty member and the chair cannot agree, the makeup of the committee will be subject to binding arbitration by the dean, upon consultation with the faculty member and the chair.

At a minimum, all candidates for promotion or tenure shall undergo a peer review of their teaching during the year of their formal review. The peer review committee shall select a chairperson to coordinate all meeting dates/interviews, and assure that the peer review summary is placed in the faculty member’s professional file prior to the faculty member’s evaluations. Copies of the peer review shall be sent to both the candidate and the department chair.

Departments may set policy as to whether peer reviews in other years are to be conducted and placed in the professional file. A signed copy of the peer review of a faculty member shall be forwarded to the candidate by the department chair along with a notification that the faculty member has the right to respond. Should the candidate wish, the candidate may place a written response in the file or may ask to appear before the department Ranking and Tenure Committee. If the faculty member is not up for promotion or tenure, then the candidate may wait until the next promotion tenure review or petition for the removal of the peer review as provided in PPM 8-13.

F. Scholarship

The scholarship category includes the following types of activities (the listing is not intended to be exhaustive).

1.  Publications, i.e., books and/or publications in refereed regional or  national journals.

2.  Formal, post-graduate education or work experience beyond the attainment of the terminal degree.

3.  Development of new areas of expertise which are of benefit to both the candidate and the department.

4.  Development of new courses and/or programs within a college as well as significant modifications of existing course or programs.

5.  Presentation of professional papers at regional or national scholarly meetings.

6.  Funded research and/or grants at a regional or national level.

7.  Creative activities that significantly impact the appropriate discipline on a regional and national level.

8.  Organizing and presenting of regional and/or national workshops for one’s peers.

9.  Development of technically oriented improvements or inventions that have a significant impact at the regional and/or national level.

10. Other evidence that indicates that the candidate is recognized for scholarly contributions.

NOTE: It should not be assumed that listing several different possibilities in this category implies that an individual should address all or even several of them. An excellent job of publication could very well be sufficient for a rating of "excellent" in this category. Likewise, a good job in each of several areas could result in an overall rating of excellent. Quality and quantity of effort and the results obtained are the standards of measure.

Final determination of which items in this category are of primary importance, secondary importance and so forth will be left to individual colleges with the exception that publication will be an item of primary importance in all colleges.

G. Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service

Types of activities relating to this area are as follows:

1.  Professionally related community service

2.  Speech making in the area of the candidate’s expertise

3.  Consulting and/or work experience

4.  Committee work

5.  Participation in projects relating to the operation of the department, college and University

6.  Membership in professional societies and attendance at professional meetings and similar activities that enhance the reputation of the individual and the college

7.  Assumption of offices or administrative positions within professional societies

8.  Performance as a department chair or director of a major program area

9.  Student advisement activities which assist students in achieving their educational potential

No requirement is included or intended to the effect that an individual must address more than one item within this category. In particular, no special emphasis is placed on University committee work as opposed to other items listed above. Heavy concentration in a single area might be evaluated the same as moderate concentration in several. Quality and quantity of effort and the results obtained are the standards of measure. For candidates who are submitting evidence of administrative and/or professionally related service, it should be noted that the emphasis should be on the quality of the service and not on the level of the service. Active committee service which is of high quality, whether it is on the department, college or University level, or if it is outside of the University and related to the professional role of the candidate, should count toward advancement in rank. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of successful administrative and/or professionally-related service. Therefore, it is recommended that ongoing evaluation be made concerning the candidate’s service.

H. Standards of Evaluation

Positive evaluations should be based on evidence to support such an evaluation. Consequently, each candidate is responsible for maintaining a complete and up-to-date file. A file containing insufficient supportive evidence may be considered as grounds for a low rating.

The type of evidence in a file is also of concern. The more concrete the evidence, the more weight evaluators should give it. Thus, an expressed opinion that someone is an excellent teacher when not accompanied by any indication that an evaluation was actually conducted would not normally be weighted as heavily as the same recommendation from a formal evaluation. Individuals, departments or colleges that refuse to utilize evaluations which distinguish among faculty should realize that they are handicapping candidates. Listed in several of the categories are areas of endeavor which would normally be considered as evidence of achievement, but may not, in some instances, be regarded as satisfying criteria for advancement in rank. For example, consulting and work experience would usually be considered as beneficial activities. The burden of proof is on the candidate to justify that consulting and/or work experience is of positive benefit. Similarly, not all work beyond the attainment of necessary credentials is automatically of benefit to individuals in their jobs. Community service, if not professionally related, would not normally be considered. Neither committee membership nor administrative positions in and of themselves should be given much consideration. Performance within the position is what evaluators should consider. In all questionable cases, the burden of proof lies with the candidate.

To facilitate obtaining concrete evidence, it is stipulated that departments should complete, at least annually, teaching evaluations and include them, along with departmental college comparisons, in the candidate’s file. Its is further recommended that chairs of University committees submit annual reports so that individuals’ contributions can be noted and placed in their files. The chair of the Faculty Senate shall evaluate the chairs of Senate committees, note their contributions, and place these evaluations in their files.

The performance of department chairs may be evaluated. Such evaluation would normally be made by the immediate superior of the individual but would not have to be restricted to that individual. Items that should be addressed are whether or not the candidate accomplished (and to what extent) one or more of the following:

1.  Improved working conditions

2.  Provided a stimulating intellectual climate

3.  Procured and allocated resources in an adequate and just fashion

4.  Completed routine duties and assignments

Some leeway is afforded in the final determination of the importance of many activities within individual colleges and departments. Each college and department should prepare, and have approved by the Faculty Senate, a document further delineating what relative importance should be placed on items within a category. Such documents may be more stringent than the general requirements within this document buy they may not be less. In particular, publication and research must be items of primary importance within the scholarship category. Other items may also be considered to be of primary importance but need not be.

Standards set by individual colleges and departments should conform to the following philosophy: each case is to be considered on its own merits, with quality and level of productivity being the major criteria for judging performance. It is generally understood that, lacking evidence to the contrary, achievements (speeches, publication, service, etc.) At the national level should be judged as being more important than that at the regional level and that participation at the regional level should be judged as being more important than that at the local level. Work at the University level is more important than at the college level and so forth.

Publications which are subject to formal acceptance processes and editorial review will normally be considered more favorably than those that are not. Likewise, publications arising from research will normally be considered more favorably than those which did not. Evaluations should take into account the quality of journals, the impact of articles or textbooks on the field, the length of the work and so forth.

In cases in which there is a particular benefit to the department derived from a candidate’s having obtained additional credentials, such work will be judged positively. Some effort is expected in terms of maintenance. Therefore, judgments will be made as to whether or not such work is beyond maintenance. Furthermore, not all work serves to improve credentials to any great degree. In addition, judgments will be made as to the degree to which the University supported the attainment of improved or additional credentials. Work done entirely on one’s own will be viewed more favorably than work supported in whole or in part by the University.

Courses or programs developed or revised by an individual or individuals will be evaluated in terms of the effort required and the benefit to the University. A useful course which is innovative in a field will be considered more favorably than courses having definite models at other institutions. Presentations of papers at scholarly meetings is encouraged and considered to be worthwhile. However, formal publication will normally be considered as being preferable.

Funded research/grants will be judged in terms of the worth of the project to the University or profession, the type of grant and so forth. Innovative projects that would not be funded except for the excellence of the proposal will be considered more favorably than solicited proposals for which funding is more or less automatic.

When making final evaluations for promotion, individuals and ranking tenure evaluation committees should address a candidate’s performance throughout the probationary period. A candidate does not necessarily have to address each category within a specific channel each year. For example, one year a candidate might perform heavily in the administrative area and in another might engage mostly in teaching and research. Special attention should be given to improvements in performance. Candidates should exhibit the required levels of performance over a long enough period of time that it is reasonable to expect continued performance at or above such levels. However, performance during the entire probationary period, particularly during the early part, does not necessarily have to meet or exceed the designated performance levels.

I. Descriptions and Clarifications of Ratings

Unsatisfactory

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they are consistently rated by students and peers as inadequate relative to other faculty members and/or make no effort to develop new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they have no publications and/or have made no visible effort to write for publication. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. No record of completing a formal education program or a work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline would also be viewed negatively, as would no evidence of presenting papers, making speeches, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if they unreasonable decline to participate on departmental, college, or University committees, task forces, or advisory groups when asked. Refusal to serve in any capacity in their professions and/or being passive in interest and action in any of the above shall also be viewed negatively.

Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in administration if they fail to perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

Satisfactory

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory if they are consistently rated by students and peers as satisfactory relative to other faculty members and provide evidence of having occasionally developed new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated satisfactory when they provide evidence of writing and/or publication. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. Evidence of candidates’ completing some formal education and/or work experience which would support their keeping current in the discipline should be viewed as positive. Evidence of having presented papers, delivered speeches, written grant proposals, etc., shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of the indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they accept and perform in an acceptable manner those duties constituting an average share of the work load in the department, college, University or academic community.

Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in administration if they perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated satisfactory by their immediate superiors and subordinates.

Good

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated good if they are consistently rated by students and peers as good relative to other faculty members and provide evidence of having often developed new materials, new methods or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated good if they provide evidence of a regional and/or national refereed publication since the date of their last promotion and evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity.

A college may elect to substitute an equivalent activity in lieu of a regional or national refereed publication. However, in the cases of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to a regional or national refereed publication.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated good in service if their leadership within the department, college, University or academic community is recognized as stronger than average or if their influence in the development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs, improved operations or organizational changes is recognized as considerably above average.

Candidates shall be rated good in administration if they set ambitious goals and achieve many of them. Candidates should also be consistently rated as good by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate and procuring and allocating resources competently.

Excellent

Teaching

Candidates shall be rated excellent if they are consistently rated as excellent by students and peers relative to other faculty members and provide evidence that they are continually developing new methods, new materials or other innovative techniques to improve their teaching performance.

Scholarship

Candidates may be rated excellent if they provide evidence of more than one refereed publication at the regional and/or national levels since the date of their last promotion and evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. A college may elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications. However, in the case of equivalent activities, it will be the responsibility of the candidate, department and college to provide evidence that the particular activity is equivalent to regional or national refereed publications.

Administration and/or Professionally Related Service

Candidates shall be rated excellent in service if they provide leadership within the department, college, University or academic community, on a major project, committee or activity in which their work significantly influenced development and/or implementation of new curricula, new programs improved operations or organizational changes. The candidate’s being recognized locally, regionally and /or nationally for work in extra University activities usually serving in a working position of leadership in appropriate associations and organizations is evidence of significant service work in the academic community.

Candidates may be rated excellent in administration if they set ambitious goals and achieve most of them. Candidates should also consistently be rated excellent by their immediate superiors and subordinates in improving environmental conditions, stimulating a positive intellectual climate, procuring and allocating resources competently and facilitating the operation of the organization in setting up and achieving objectives.