EAST PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY

I. Promotion and Tenure – Policy Development and Dissemination

A. Dissemination

The standards for promotion and tenure shall be determined by the College of Engineering, Applied Science and Technology under the conditions described in this document, subject to approval by the APAF&T Committee of the Faculty Senate and ratification by the Faculty Senate. These standards are incorporated by reference into the PPM. These standards must be endorsed by a two-thirds vote of the faculty voting in the college and approved by the dean. Only tenured or tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote.

Candidates for promotion or tenure shall be provided written copies of the most recent standards in effect at the time they apply for promotion or are due for a tenure review. Recommended changes to this policy must be approved by a two-thirds vote of tenured or tenure-track faculty and must be submitted by the dean to the APAF&T Committee of the Faculty Senate on or before February 1 prior to the academic year in which they take effect. Approval by the Faculty Senate must be given on or before May 1 prior to the year in which they are to take effect and disseminated to the faculty on or before June 1 of that same year.

B. Department Tenure Documents

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. Department tenure documents must be approved by a two-thirds vote of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department from which the document originates. The document must meet the approval of the dean and two-thirds of the department chairs. Because additions of or modifications to department tenure documents are effectively changes to the college tenure document, the guidelines for university approval specified above will be followed. 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 of review (peer review, department, college, dean, university, provost).

C. Definitions

Promotion refers to advancement in rank based upon a candidate having met the standards for that rank as defined in the standards for promotion to that rank. If a candidate is denied promotion, the standards in effect at the time of reapplication shall apply.

Tenure refers to the practice of granting to ranked faculty the contractual right to permanent and continuous appointments with no substantial reduction in status until the faculty member resigns, retires, becomes medically unable to perform required duties, is dismissed for adequate

cause, is dismissed pursuant to a reduction in force resulting from a bona fide financial exigency, or is dismissed as the result of a formal discontinuance of a degree or program area.

II. Promotion and Tenure - Documentation

A. The candidates shall provide the following documentation for review:

1. Professional File

The professional file for promotion or tenure shall contain the following evidential elements in the order listed:

a. The candidates will provide a brief (two pages or fewer) summary of their work. Candidates should address the three areas, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. This summary should not just repeat the information contained in the autobiographical form, but should highlight the candidate's accomplishments in each area.

b. A current standard autobiographical form, which is available from the office of the provost and shown in the online template for promotion and tenure.

2. Portfolio

Candidates should include the following types of items, as appropriate. These supplemental materials could include such items as:

a. copies of peer-reviewed papers and where and when they were published

b. copies of peer-reviewed presentations and where and when they were presented

c. copies of non-peer reviewed papers and where and when they were published

d. copies of non-peer reviewed presentations and where and when they were presented

e. titles, publishers, table of contents, and dates published of any books authored or co-authored

f. copies of laboratory manuals developed by the candidate

g. copies of reviews of papers, books, or other scholarly works

h. copies of engineering or consulting reports if not in violation of confidentiality agreements

i. copies of patents issued or applied for

B. The college will provide the following documentation for the Department and College Review Committees, which will be included in the candidate's professional file:

2

1. An evaluation report by the peer review committee summarizing the teaching materials for a sample of representative courses taught by the faculty member since the last tenure evaluation or for the last five years for a candidate being promoted from associate professor to professor.

2. Any previous peer, department, and college reviews.

C. The burden of proof that a candidate is deserving of promotion and tenure lies with the candidate. The candidate is responsible for seeing that his/her professional file and portfolio reflects his/her contributions to the college and university.

1. In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be administered and compiled in a confidential online program. Student evaluations shall be compiled for every course for tenure-track faculty. Candidates are responsible for placing their evaluations in their professional file. The requirements for student evaluation for tenured faculty are found under Post-Tenure Review found in this document.

III. Timetable for the Promotion and Tenure Review Processes

A. For Tenure

Faculty will be informally reviewed as follows:

1. Faculty on tenure track shall be informally reviewed by their department chair annually except in their third and sixth years when they will be formally reviewed as described in this document.

2. Faculty who have been granted one year of credit toward tenure will be informally reviewed by their department chair annually except in their second and fifth years when they will be formally reviewed as described in this document.

3. Faculty who have been granted two years of credit towards tenure will be informally reviewed by their department chair annually except in their second and fourth years when they will be formally reviewed as described in this document.

4. Faculty who have been granted three years of credit towards tenure will be informally reviewed by their department chair annually except in their second and third years when they will be formally reviewed as described in this document.

These informal reviews are to be completed on or before March 31 except for faculty who are in their first year of a tenure-track appointment where the review is to be completed on or before February 15. The chair is to send his/her written report of the review to the candidate, with a copy to the dean and a copy for insertion into the candidate's professional file.

B. For Promotion

1. Faculty may request to be promoted at any time provided they meet the time in rank requirements as described in Section IV.B.; the exception is that 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 to associate professor.

C. Dated Guidelines for the Promotion or Tenure Evaluation Process

The dated guidelines for the ranking and tenure review process are given in Appendix A. These guidelines are established for use in the ranking and tenure review processes each year. These dates are approximate and shall be considered as guidelines, not exact procedural time lines. Exceptions to these dated guidelines may be made with good cause. The guidelines identify when the various ranking-tenure evaluation committees are established and when these committees and individuals must complete their review of candidates' documentation but do not contain all of the details of the process. All faculty who will be absent for cause during the review period should leave a forwarding address with their department chair.

IV. Channels for Tenure and Promotion

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 or granting tenure.

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 and granting of tenure are as follows:

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

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.

The 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.

To be promoted or tenured, faculty members shall be expected to fulfill basic responsibilities in teaching, scholarly activity, and service in accordance with principles of academic freedom and professional ethics as described in the PPM 9-1 through 9-8. Specific basic responsibilities include the following, together with other such responsibilities appropriate to and approved by mutual consent of faculty members and their department chairs and the dean.

A. Minimum Credentials Required

Appropriate degree and experience, by department, as defined below are required for tenure-track appointment and for the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor:

Network Management Technology
a. Doctorate in Network Management Technology or related field plus two years professionally related business experience OR

b. Master's degree in Network Management Technology or related field plus five years business related experience plus appropriate certification by a recognized subject-related professional organization.

2. Business/Multimedia Technologies
a. Doctorate in Business Multimedia or related field plus two years professionally related business experience OR
b. Master's degree in Business Multimedia or related field plus five years business related experience plus appropriate certification by a recognized subject-related professional organization.

3. Computer Science

a. Doctorate in Computer Science or related field plus two years professional industry/business experience beyond the level of a four-year Computer Science graduate OR

b. Master's degree in Computer Science or related field plus five years industry/business experience beyond the entry level of four-year graduates plus official certification by a recognized professional computing agency.

4. Engineering Technology

a. Doctorate in Engineering, Science, or Technology plus three years of industry experience beyond the entry level of an Engineering Technology graduate OR

b. Master's degree in Engineering, Science, Technology or a closely related field if the degree is primarily analytical and the subject clearly appropriate plus five years industry experience as a technologist, engineer, consultant, or manager.

5. Construction Management Technology

a. Doctorate in Engineering or Construction plus two years of increasingly responsible project management experience in the US construction industry OR

b. Master's degree in Engineering, Construction, Architecture, Business, or related degree plus five years of increasingly responsible project management experience in the US construction industry.

6. Professional Sales

a. Doctorate in Business, Education, or Technology plus two years of applied business experience beyond the entry level of a four-year Business, Education, or Technology graduate OR

b. Master's degree in technology-related discipline (i.e. Technology, Industrial Technology, Engineering Technology, Vocational-Technical Education) plus five years industrial/business experience with at least three years beyond the entry level of a four-year graduate OR

c. Master's degree in a Professional Sales-related discipline (i.e. Distributive Education, Vocational-Technical Education, Cooperative Education, Master's of Business Administration) plus five years business experience beyond the level of a four-year Professional Sales graduate.

7. Automotive Technology

a. Bachelor's degree in an automotive related field plus a Master's degree in a technology related discipline (i.e. Technology, Industrial Technology, Engineering Technology, Vocational-Technical Education or other department approved discipline) plus five years

industrial/business experience with at least three years beyond the entry level of program graduates.

8. Engineering

   a. Doctorate in engineering plus two years of engineering industrial experience.

B. Probationary Periods

   1. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor

   Six years of satisfactory performance at the rank of assistant professor will be the minimum probationary period unless an exception is noted at the initial time of appointment. 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.

   2. Promotion from associate professor to professor

   Five years of satisfactory performance at the rank of associate professor will be the minimum probationary period. To be promoted from associate professor to 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. 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 this document. 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 Appendix A, 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.

C. Teaching

1. Ratings

   a. Unsatisfactory. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined in this document OR 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.

   b. Satisfactory. Candidates shall be rated satisfactory if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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.

   c. Good. Candidates shall be rated good if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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.

   d. Excellent. Candidates shall be rated excellent if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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.

2. Basic Expectations for Teaching

   Basic expectations in the category of teaching shall include:

   a. Subject Knowledge (as determined by the candidate's peer review committee)

      i. command of one's subject

      ii.   ability to organize subject matter and to present it clearly, logically, and imaginatively

      iii. knowledge of current developments in one's discipline

      iv. ability to stimulate and broaden student interest in the subject matter

      v.   ability to utilize effective teaching methods and strategies

b. Curriculum Development. Although administrators and students may make proposals, the primary responsibility for the development of new courses, deletion, or changes in existing courses, the initiation of new programs, the discontinuance of existing programs, or other program modifications lies with the faculty.

c. Course Offerings and Content. Faculty members are responsible for planning and presenting course material; establishing student learning outcomes, course objectives, and requirements including grading policies in accordance with University policy and making them known to students; selecting and ordering texts and supplemental materials in accordance with University policy; preparing, administering, and grading assignments; and assigning grades on or before the university specified deadlines for grade submission.

d. Absence and Class-Related Duties

      i.   Faculty members shall meet their classes punctually unless the department chair has approved a substitute instructor, class cancellation, reschedule, or replacement by a substitute activity. This obligation extends from the first day of classes through the end of final examination week. If for some valid reason faculty members are unable to meet classes, they shall immediately notify their department chair and shall do so daily unless their absence was prearranged for a predetermined period of time. The chair, in conjunction with the faculty member, shall make arrangements to offer alternate instruction or cancellation.

      ii. If suitably qualified ranked faculty members serve as teaching substitutes upon assignment by the department chair for a period beyond one week, they shall be paid for the total time that they serve as substitutes at the prevailing overload rate, dependent upon the availability of funds; exceptions shall be approved by the dean.

      iii. Faculty members shall report evaluation of student work to students within a reasonable time with appropriate comments and/or grades.

      iv. Faculty members shall participate in the approved college program for collecting data regarding students' perceptions of teaching and learning.

      v.   By the end of the first week of classes, faculty members shall submit to their department chair a syllabus or outline for each course being taught.

vi. Faculty members shall establish an absence policy for students and inform students in writing of the policy during the first week of each class.

vii. Faculty members shall maintain for one calendar year appropriate records of student progress in each course to support final grades. In the event of severance from the University, faculty members shall leave such records with the department chair, who shall retain them for one calendar year.

viii. Faculty members shall administer final examinations at the officially scheduled times during final exam week unless, for sound pedagogical reasons, the department chair and/or dean approve alternative arrangements.

ix. Faculty members shall exercise adequate supervision of students in classroom and laboratory activities and officially scheduled related activities, such as field trips.

x. Faculty members shall provide instruction in safety procedures to students who are engaged in academic activities where a known potential danger is present, such as in laboratory work where potentially dangerous equipment or chemicals are in use.

xi. Faculty members shall ensure that safe practices are followed by students under their supervision where a known potential danger is present.

xii. Faculty members and department chairs shall report in writing unsafe conditions of equipment or facility to their immediate supervisors.

e. Availability and Office Hours. Full-time faculty members shall establish, post, and make students aware of at least five (5) regularly scheduled office hours each week of the semester so distributed as to be of reasonable convenience to the students. Additional office hours may be required during advising and registration periods. Faculty are expected to be present and available during their posted office hours.

f. Assessment of Student Outcomes. Faculty shall participate in the measuring of course and program outcomes; and use the outcomes data to improve their teaching.

g. Use of Copyrighted Material. Faculty are responsible for knowing and observing the laws concerning the use of copyrighted material. Applicable federal laws on the use of copyrighted material are available in the University Library. Faculty members who have questions regarding use of copyrighted material should consult the University Librarian.

h. Software Use. Faculty members are responsible for knowing and obeying the laws concerning software use. Faculty members with questions regarding the use of software should consult the campus Information Technology Division.

3. Sources of Evidence

a. self-report of activities

b. evaluation of course materials such as syllabi, handouts, quizzes, and exams (as reviewed by peers/colleagues and/or department chair)

c. peer/colleague evaluations

d. student perceptions of teaching and learning

e. student outcomes such as results on certification exams

f. professional development activities such as participation in course work, seminars, conferences, or workshops which cover skills and knowledge of teaching

g. peer/colleague, department chair or supervisor observations

4. Examples of Teaching

a. teaching and administration of regular course offerings

b. developing and updating course/lab materials and methods

c. developing replicable systems of instruction

d. providing academic assistance to students as required

e. innovative approaches to teaching such as cooperative learning, community engaged learning, team teaching, use of instructional technology and writing across the curriculum

f. fostering active student participation and involvement in learning both in and out of the classroom

D. Scholarship

1. Ratings

The University's Policy and Procedures Manual allows colleges to "elect to substitute equivalent activities in lieu of regional or national refereed publications" (see PPM 8-11). In accordance with this provision, the College of Engineering, Applied Science and Technology defines scholarship as set forth in this section. Departments may further define scholarship as outlined under Department Tenure Documents in this document.

a. Unsatisfactory. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined below OR provide little or no evidence of creating, publicizing, and presenting original disciplinary-specific work admissible by academic and/or professional peers. No record of completing a formal continuing education program or a work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline shall also be viewed negatively, as would little or no evidence of presenting papers or relevant

topics in a professional setting, developing courses and/or programs, or writing grants in the area of expertise.

b. Satisfactory. Candidates may be rated satisfactory if they meet the basic expectations defined below AND provide sufficient evidence of creating, publicizing, and presenting original disciplinary-specific work admissible by academic and/or professional peers. Evidence of a candidate completing some formal continuing education and/or work experience which would help the candidate keep current in the discipline shall be viewed positively. Evidence of presenting papers or relevant topics in a professional setting, developing courses and/or programs or writing grants in the area of expertise shall be viewed positively. A positive rating in all of these indicated activities should not be necessary to receive a satisfactory rating in this area.

c. Good. Candidates may be rated good if they meet the basic expectations defined below AND provide evidence of (1) a regional and/or national refereed publication, (2) a substantial publication, such as a textbook, OR (3) a substantial quantity of other scholarly activities defined in this document since the date of their last promotion AND evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence that his/her scholarly activity is deserving of a good rating.

d. Excellent. Candidates may be rated excellent if they meet the basic expectations defined below AND provide evidence of more than one (1) refereed publication at the regional and/or national levels, (2) substantial publication, such as a textbook, (3) approved scholarly grants from regional and/or national levels, or (4) combination of these since the date of their last promotion AND evidence of a plan of continuing scholarly activity. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence that his/her scholarly activity is deserving of an excellent rating.

2. Basic Expectations for Scholarship

Faculty members have the basic responsibility to engage in scholarship in accordance with the accepted professional practices of their academic disciplines.

Expectations in scholarship shall include, where disciplinarily applicable:

a. publication of books and manuals and publication in refereed journals, magazines, and monographs

b. presentations at conferences or workshops

c. sustained inquiry in one's discipline

d. scholarly inquiry or the use of scholarly inquiry in curriculum development or improvement of teaching

e. theoretical and/or applied technical investigations

f.   studies of educationally relevant problems

g.   completion of advanced/additional degrees, certifications, or courses

h.   application of one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community

i.   sharing of expertise within the academic community

j.   sharing of expertise within the business and industrial communities

k.   academic work related to grant awards or other sources of external funding

Adherence to applicable law and to institutional, state, or federal policies regarding copyright, patent, uses of human or animal subjects, facility use, safety rules, and regulations, or other related policies contained in the PPM is expected.

3. Sources of Evidence

a.   self-report of activities

b.   assessment or statements by peers/colleagues regarding scholarly works by the faculty member

c.   publication in refereed journals or in discipline related published works

d.   citations of research in other's works

e.   preparation and/or award of grants, prizes, or commendations, resulting from scholarly or creative activity

f.   demonstrated skill resulting from scholarship

g.   discipline related patents

h.   awards, grants, prizes, or commendations from professionally accepted organizations

i.   election or appointment to prestigious registrations or official academic duties in professional organizations

j.   participation in course work, seminars, workshops, or conferences of professional significance

k.   consulting in discipline-related activities

l.   presentations in departmental, college or university seminars, colloquia, or lecture series

m. department chair or supervisor observations

    n.   presentations of papers at external seminars, workshops, or conferences of professional significance

4. Examples of Scholarship

    a.   publication of books and manuals

    b.   publication in refereed journals, magazines, and monographs

    c.   presentations at conferences or workshops

    d.   theoretical and/or applied technical investigations

    e.   studies of educationally relevant problems

    f.   reviewing grant applications for state, regional and national organizations

    g.   reviewing or editing journals and other publications for professional organizations

    h.   awards, honors, invited presentations

    i.   completion of advanced/additional degrees, certifications, or courses

    j.   application of one's academic expertise that has a significant impact in the local, state, or national community

E. Professionally Related Service and/or Administration

1. Ratings

    a.   Unsatisfactory. Candidates shall be rated unsatisfactory in service if they fail to meet the basic expectations defined in this document OR unreasonably 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 meet the basic expectations defined in this document OR fail to perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated by their immediate superiors and subordinates as unsatisfactory.

    b.   Satisfactory. Candidates shall be rated satisfactory in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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 meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND perform routine duties in an acceptable manner and are consistently rated satisfactory by their immediate superiors and subordinates.

c. Good. Candidates shall be rated good in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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 meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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.

d. Excellent. Candidates shall be rated excellent in service if they meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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 meet the basic expectations defined in this document AND 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.

2. Basic Expectations for Professionally Related Service and/or Administration

a. Service. Expectations in service shall include, where applicable:

i. service on departmental, college/library, or University committees or task forces

ii. service to students

iii. service in some extramural activity as an employee or representative of the University or as an expert in one's discipline

iv. service to business and industry

v. service involved with departmental laboratories including acquisition, installation, integration and maintenance of software and hardware

b. Academic Advising. The college emphasizes the role of its faculty in the academic advising of students. The central element in advising is a genuine and sustained concern for students as persons and for their academic and personal growth.

The responsibilities of those faculty engaging in academic advising include, but are not necessarily limited to:

i. scheduling office hours to meet advising responsibilities

ii. advising of the student with regard to the student's performance in classes

iii. assisting the student in setting academic goals, informing the student of University curriculum requirements, and maintaining a record of the advisement

iv. providing referrals to appropriate student services

Faculty members serving as academic advisors are not authorized to make representations or commitments on behalf of the University which are contrary to or not supported by University policies, regulations, or procedures.

c. Share in Governance. Faculty members shall attend and take part in meetings of the department, the college, and the University, and shall serve if elected or appointed with their consent to University, college or departmental committees, provided that such service does not seriously interfere with scheduled classes.

d. Recruitment of Prospective Students. Faculty members may be involved in the recruitment of prospective students.

e. Academic Community Cooperation. While members of the faculty have a primary responsibility to their own department, they are also members of the larger collegial community and should, therefore, make a demonstrable effort to work cooperatively with members of other departments, colleges, or institutional entities in matters affecting the overall welfare of the University.

f. Committee Membership. Faculty members shall not be allowed to serve on more than a total of two University committees each academic year, unless special circumstances so require and as approved by their dean.

g. Meetings and University. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to attend all regularly scheduled program, department, college or University meetings which affect them and which do not conflict with scheduled classes.

h. Deadlines. Faculty members shall meet appropriate deadlines established by policies contained in the PPM or by the provost, the dean, the department chair, and the registrar.

i. Administration. Expectations in the area of service for department chairs, program coordinators, or directors shall include, where applicable:

   i. proper preparation of budget requests and appropriate allocation of funds received

   ii. proper and timely preparation of course schedules, committee assignments, and recommendations on appointments, promotions, tenure, leaves, and dismissals

   iii. holding of department and/or program meetings as needed with properly recorded minutes

   iv. completion of routine duties and assignments

3. Sources of Evidence

   a. Service. Sources of evidence shall include:

      i. self-report of activities

      ii. assessment by student advisees

      iii. leadership in some area of University (including college and department) life: governance, faculty development, curriculum design

      iv. service as a chair or sponsor of a student club, organizer of a committee, or director of a program

      v. service as a representative of the University to the local, regional, national, or international community

      vi. appointment or election to a state or national post of significance to the profession or the University

      vii. participation in professional organizations

      viii. service as a volunteer to the University community

      ix. service as a reviewer for professional journals, magazines, or publishing companies

      x. department chair or supervisor observations

      xi. involvement in accreditation or certification activities

   b. Administration. Sources of evidence in the area of Service for department chairs, Program Coordinators, or Directors shall include, where applicable:

      i. self-report of activities regarding your service as a chair, coordinator, or director

ii. survey of subordinates by the immediate supervisor

iii. observations by the immediate supervisor as to whether the basic expectations have been met

4. Examples of Service

   a. serving on the faculty senate; on faculty senate committees; and on departmental, college, and university committees

   b. sponsoring or advising student groups

   c. managing projects, studios, laboratories, shops, and computer systems

   d. technology specialization administration (management of a program or area within a department)

   e. advising students on programs of study

   f. serving on master's supervisory committees

   g. service to business and industry

   h. preparing and applying for grant awards or other sources of external funding

V. 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 (Appendix A).

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 Tenure Review 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. The department chair ensures that a copy of the peer review is placed in the faculty member's college professional file. 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.

VI. Post-Tenure Review

A. Review

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed by their department chair (department chairs by the dean) on or before March 15 at least every five years after their last formal review which is defined as the latter of (1) the receipt of tenure, (2) promotion to professor, or (3) last post-tenure review. As a basis for these reviews, faculty members must provide their chair (or dean) a self-report of their activities, not to exceed three pages, since their last formal review covering the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty must receive (1) a good rating in teaching and a satisfactory rating in scholarship and service OR (2) a good rating in scholarship and a satisfactory rating in teaching and service to be deemed as meeting basic expectations required of a tenured member of his or her discipline. The chair shall provide a written report of the review to their faculty with a copy to the dean for inclusion in the faculty members' professional files by April 15 of the year of the review. All faculty undergoing review have the right to provide a written response to the dean or request that additional review(s) be performed by the college promotion and tenure committee or the dean. The written response or request for additional review(s) must be completed on or before May 1.

A successful promotion from associate professor to professor may be substituted for a post-tenure review. In the case of an unsuccessful review for full professor, the standards in the previous paragraph will be in effect.

B. Student Evaluations

In an attempt to chart ongoing teaching performance, student evaluations shall be compiled in a confidential online program. Student evaluations shall be compiled for at least one course per semester (fall and spring). The 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. If a tenured faculty has more than one class evaluated each semester, the selection of which of those evaluations are to be

forwarded to the chair and dean will be jointly determined between the faculty member and the chair. If they cannot come to an agreement, the selection shall be subject to binding arbitration by the dean, after consultation with the faculty member and the chair.

C. 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 basic expectations 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.

Appendix A
Dated Guidelines for the Ranking Tenure Review Process

The following dated guidelines are established for use in the ranking and tenure review processes each year. Exceptions to these dated guidelines may be made for a good cause; for example, a deadline may be extended when a date falls on a weekend. The guidelines identify when the ranking tenure evaluation committees are to be established and when these committees and individuals must complete their review of candidates' files. All faculty who will be absent from campus during the year should leave a forwarding address with their department chair. Candidates should receive written notification of the recommendation made at each step of the review process.

To occur by:

Sept 8 – The department chair, in consultation with the dean, identifies the names of the candidates for tenure and for advancement in rank and their years of service under the present rank.

Sept 15 – Potential candidates for promotion or tenure during the next academic year are notified by deans as to their opportunity to form their peer review committee a year in advance.

Sept 15 – The faculty in each college shall nominate individuals to go on a college wide ballot for the election of the college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. (PPM 8-16) The college faculty shall also nominate individuals from the college for election to the University Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee. The individuals making the nominations shall check with the nominees to see if they are both willing and eligible to serve. Names of the eligible nominees shall then be forwarded to the dean for inclusion on the college ballot.

Sept 22 – Faculty members applying for promotion during their final year of the minimum eligibility period or thereafter must request a review in writing to their department chair with a copy to their dean. Application of, or nomination for, candidates wishing to receive early advancement in rank or early tenure shall be made by this date. If the provost, the dean or the department chair wishes to recommend early advancement in rank or early tenure of outstanding candidates with exceptional qualifications, the recommendation shall be made by this date.

Sept 22 – If a faculty member (candidate), the department chair, the dean or the provost wishes to request an additional tenure review of the candidate they shall do so by this date. (PPM 8-11).

Sept 29 – The departmental Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committees are established. (PPM 8-15) The deans shall provide them with copies of the promotion and tenure criteria and with the promotion and tenure summary sheets.

Sept 29 – If the department peer review committee is not to be the department Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee, then separate peer review committee(s) shall be established by this date.

Oct 1 – The department chair is to inform, in writing, all probationary faculty members up for review and all faculty who are being considered for advancement in rank that their files must be updated by January 15.

Oct 1 – The department chair forwards a list of all departmental candidates for review, for advancement in rank, and for tenure to all departmental faculty members, including those on leave or otherwise absent from campus for the year, and informs these faculty of their right to submit their written recommendations concerning those being considered for tenure or for advancement in rank. These written recommendations must be submitted to the department by January 8. (PPM 8-17)

Oct 1 – The dean informs the provost of the names of the candidates for tenure and for advancement in rank and their years of service under their present rank.

Oct 1 – Annual election of the members of the college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee (PPM 8-16) and election of the college's representative to the University Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee (PPM 8-16A).

Oct 10 – The dean convenes a meeting for all college faculty in the tenure review process (any faculty may attend) and for faculty who are being considered for advancement in rank. At that time, the dean distributes to all candidates for tenure and for advancement in rank appropriate tenure and promotion policy criteria and discusses criteria, professional files, tenure and promotion processes, including the dated guidelines for that year, and faculty rights and responsibilities pertaining to tenure and promotion processes. The college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee will also attend this meeting to answer pertinent questions from candidates.

Oct 15 – Candidates shall meet with the chair of the peer review committee. At that time the candidate and the chair shall agree upon a schedule for the candidate to provide appropriate documentation of teaching effectiveness for the peer review committee to review and assess.

Nov 15 – The dean convenes the college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee to elect a chair and set dates for meetings.

Dec 10 – The results of department peer evaluations shall be placed in the candidates' professional files along with any other materials the committee deems appropriate (PPMs 8-11 and 8-13).

Jan 8 – The department Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee chair forwards to the candidates copies of the recommendations from the departmental faculty and informs all candidates of their right to prepare a written statement and schedule a personal appearance if desired. (Meetings must not be held prior to one week after such notice.)

Jan 15 – The candidate may submit written statements on any information in the professional file to the department chair for placement in the candidate's professional file. Candidates' professional files are completed for review by the department Ranking Tenure Committees.

Jan 16 – Candidates' professional files are ready for review by the department Ranking Tenure Committees.

Feb 1 – The department Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee completes its reviews and the chair reports the findings and recommendations of the Committee, in writing, to the candidate and places a copy in the candidate's file. Candidates' professional files are completed for review by the college Ranking Tenure Committee.

Feb 1 – College Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee chairs shall inform candidates, in writing, that they have five (5) working days to request, in writing, a hearing before the Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee.

Feb 2 – Candidates' professional files are ready for review by the college Ranking Tenure Committee.

Feb 16 – The college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee completes its review of the files and makes their recommendations. The college Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee chair informs the candidates of the results of those evaluations, in writing, and places a copy in the candidates' files (PPM 8-18). Candidates' professional files are completed for review by the dean.

Feb 17 – Candidates' professional files are ready for review by the dean.

Mar 5 – The dean completes his/her reviews and informs the candidates, in writing, of his, her recommendation and places a copy in the candidates' file. The dean notifies the provost of those files that require action.

Mar 6 – Candidates' professional files are ready for review by the University Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee.

Mar 10 – All requests for review must be submitted in writing to the University Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee.

Mar 25 – The department chair completes the assessments of the probationary faculty within the department who are in their second year's progress towards tenure and reports his/her findings, in writing, to the candidate, the dean and places a copy of the findings in the candidate's professional file. (PPMs 8-11 and 8-13)

Mar 27 – The University Ranking Tenure Evaluation Committee completes its review and makes its recommendations.

The University Committee chair shall inform the Provost in writing of the committee's evaluation and recommendations. The University Committee chair shall also give copies of the committee's evaluation and recommendations to the department chair, the dean and candidate and place a copy of this report in the candidates' professional files. Candidates' professional files are completed for review by the provost.

Apr 6 – Candidates' professional files are ready for review by the provost.

Apr 6 – The provost completes reviews of all cases where there is a conflict in the recommendations at some level and any other cases he/she sees fit to review. The provost informs each reviewed candidates and corresponding chairs and deans, in writing, of his/her recommendations and places a copy of the recommendation in the candidates' file. In addition, the provost gives a copy of his/her recommendations to the president, if the president desires them. The provost also notifies all candidates of their right to file an appeal on due process grounds within ten working days to the Faculty Board of Review and their right to appeal before the Board of Review (PPMs 8-20 and 9-9).

Apr 7 – The president or the designate forwards the recommendation to the Board of Trustees. (The provost informs faculty members, committee chairs, deans and department chairs of action taken by the Board of Trustees as soon as the Board has acted.) The provost gives timely written notice (PPM 8-26) to regular full-time faculty members whose contracts will not be renewed at the end of the next academic year or who will be continued with substantially reduced status.