

# TEMPLATE: Role, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

---

Updated: May 8, 2012

## College of CCCCC Department of DDDDD

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Role and Scope</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	University Role and Scope	3
1.2	College Role and Scope	3
1.3	Department Role and Scope	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Workload</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	University Workload	5
2.1.1	Responsibility to Manage Workload	5
2.1.2	Individual Teaching, Research, and Service Loads	6
2.1.3	Authority to Adjust Role Assignments	6
2.2	College Workload	7
2.3	Department Workload	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Annual Reviews</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Annual Reviews: University Requirements	7
3.2	Annual Reviews: College Requirements	7
3.3	Annual Reviews: Department Requirements	8
3.3.1	Criteria for Merit Rankings	8
<b>4</b>	<b>Retention, Tenure and Promotion: Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Applicability of Standards	8
4.1.1	Area of Emphasis	9
4.2	Joint Appointments	9
4.3	Retention Reviews	10
4.3.1	Standards: Retention Review: TT Faculty	10
4.3.2	Criteria: Retention Review: TT Faculty	10
4.3.3	Evidence: Retention Review: TT Faculty	12
4.4	Tenure Reviews	13
4.4.1	Standards: Tenure Review: TT Faculty	14
4.4.2	Criteria: Tenure Review: TT Faculty	15
4.4.3	Evidence: Tenure Review: TT Faculty	17

<b>4.5</b>	<b>Promotion Review</b>	<b>19</b>
4.5.1	Standards: Promotion Review: TT Faculty	19
4.5.2	Criteria: Promotion Review: TT Faculty	20
4.5.3	Evidence: Promotion Review: TT Faculty	23
<b>5</b>	<b>Advancement in Rank: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Advancement in Rank: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Requirements</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1.1	University Requirements	25
5.1.2	College Requirements	25
5.1.3	Department Requirements	25
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards</b>	<b>26</b>
5.2.1	Standards: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	26
5.2.2	Criteria: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	26
5.2.3	Evidence: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	26
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards</b>	<b>27</b>
5.3.1	Standards: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	27
5.3.2	Criteria: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	27
5.3.3	Evidence: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	27
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards</b>	<b>28</b>
5.4.1	Standards: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	28
5.4.2	Criteria: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	28
5.4.3	Evidence: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor	29
<b>6</b>	<b>Promotion Reviews: Research Faculty</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Promotion Reviews: Research Faculty: Requirements</b>	<b>30</b>
6.1.1	University Requirements	30
6.1.2	College Requirements	30
6.1.3	Department Requirements	31
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Promotion to Associate Research Professor: Criteria and Standards</b>	<b>31</b>
6.2.1	Standards: Promotion to Associate Research Professor	31
6.2.2	Criteria: Promotion to Associate Research Professor	31
6.2.3	Evidence: Promotion to Associate Research Professor	32
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Promotion to Research Professor: Criteria and Standards</b>	<b>32</b>
6.3.1	Standards: Promotion to Research Professor	33
6.3.2	Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor	33
6.3.3	Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor	33
<b>7</b>	<b>Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Advancement Review Procedures</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>34</b>
7.1.1	University Timelines	34
7.1.2	College Timelines	35
7.1.3	Department Timelines	35

# 1 Role and Scope

Each department and college shall develop and annually review a document describing its role and scope, defining its responsibilities and obligations in furtherance of the mission of the University, and setting forth the criteria, standards and procedures for review of faculty members. If the document is not updated annually, the last updated and approved document shall be effective. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 10.01.01]

## ***From the CBA...***

Each department and college shall develop ... a document describing its role and scope, defining its responsibilities and obligations in furtherance of the mission of the University... [10.01.01]

Role, scope, criteria, standards and procedures documents shall be approved by the department faculty, department head, the college dean, the RSCSP Committee, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## 1.1 University Role and Scope

The Role and Scope of the Institution devolves from the mission:

***Montana State University, the State's land-grant institution, educates students, creates knowledge and art, and serves communities, by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement.***

Montana State University-Bozeman is committed to undergraduate and graduate education, research<sup>1</sup>, and professional and public service<sup>2</sup> and outreach to the state, region, nation, and globe.

The addition of the Mission statement is new, but much of the other text in this section came from previous Role and Scope documents.

Faculty dedicated to this mission produce substantial benefits for society, including advances in fundamental and applied knowledge, technological innovation, new aesthetic experiences, improved health and well-being, and a broadly educated citizenry.

## 1.2 College Role and Scope

The faculty, staff, and administrators in the College of CCCC support the fulfillment of the Institution's teaching, research, and service mission in the area(s) of <general description of disciplines in the college>. The College is made up of the following departments:

- Department 1
- Department 2
- Department 3

The College is home to the following research centers and institutes:

- Center 1

Colleges may only modify text shown here in green, and Departments may only modify text shown here in blue.

Generally, the College sections should be completed before the Department sections.

<sup>1</sup> In this document the term "research" is sometimes used for brevity, but it should always understood to refer to "research/creative activity", since this is the term used in the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure.

<sup>2</sup> In this document the term "service" is sometimes used for brevity, but it should always understood to refer to "service/outreach", since this is the term used in the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure.

- Center 2

The College sponsors the following service and outreach programs:

- Program 1
- Program 2

### 1.3 Department Role and Scope

The faculty, staff, and administrators in the Department of DDDDD support the fulfillment of the Institution's teaching, research, and service mission in the area(s) of <general description of disciplines in the department>.

The Department offers the following degree programs:

- Degree 1 (e.g., B.S. in Architectural Engineering)
- Degree 2
- Minor 1
- Certificate 1

Faculty research areas include:

- Area 1
- Area 2
- Area 3

The Department also supports service and outreach in the following ways:

- University Service – faculty from the department regularly serve on department, college and university committees.
- Public Service and Outreach
  - Public Service 1
  - Public Service 1
  - Outreach 1
- Professional Service – faculty from the department participate in their professional organizations to advance their disciplines.

#### SECTION 1.3

In general, the lists of degrees awarded and types of research and service will be in the Department Role and Scope category – but if there are Degree Programs, Research Centers, or Service Programs that are organized at the College level, they should be listed in the College Role and Scope section.

The degree program list should include all majors, minors, and certificate programs offered by the department.

Faculty research areas should be limited to a 5 to 10 areas, but include the work of all faculty members in the department.

When listing service areas, the comments on University and Professional service are there to acknowledge that these types of service are valued. It is not necessary to list all of the committees. In the public service and outreach area, major service activities should be listed. Small acts of service (e.g., a presentation at an elementary school) should not be listed.

## 2 Workload

The faculty and department head in each department will develop written workload expectations for the department. The dean and provost will review the proposed workload expectations taking into account the department's level of activity in the degree programs it offers and the role and scope documents of the departments and college. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 7.03]

### SECTION 2.1

The *total workload value* is specified by the CBA for NTT faculty, but not for TT faculty. MSU uses a value of 24 cr/year for TT faculty.

### 2.1 University Workload

Workload is expressed in terms of the number of credits per year that a full time faculty member would be expected to teach if he or she had a 100% teaching appointment. The number of credits such an individual would be expected to teach is termed the *total workload value*.

- For NTT faculty the CBA specifies a total workload value of **30** credits per year. [CBA<sub>NTT</sub> 7.03]]

Note: The CBA<sub>NTT</sub> [7.03] specifies that:

- NTT faculty who were appointed on a 12-credit per semester threshold for 1.0FTE determination as of Fall 2011 have the right to remain at that threshold (i.e., total workload value = 24 credits per year) through June 30, 2013 (i.e., for the duration of the current CBA) if they continue to be employed.
  - NTT faculty who were appointed on a 15-credit per semester threshold for 1.0FTE determination as of Fall 2011 shall remain at that threshold if they continue to be employed.
- The total workload value for TT faculty at MSU is **24** credits per year.

Few, if any, TT faculty have a 100% teaching assignment. Instead, each faculty member has role assignments that specify the percentage of the faculty member's time that should be spent on teaching, research, and service.

The difference between the NTT and TT total workload values reflects different expectations of these groups of faculty. In particular, TT faculty are expected to perform such tasks as attending the meetings necessary to keep the institution functioning, and providing professional advising and guidance to students. When NTT faculty members engage in these basic institutional support activities, the time spent on such activities should be accounted for in the NTT faculty member's workload.

#### 2.1.1 Responsibility to Manage Workload

The department head is responsible for the department's contributions to the college and university teaching, research and service missions. Each department is required to provide instructional staff to cover the department's teaching commitment. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 7.03] Therefore the department head is responsible for adjusting individual role assignments to ensure that the department's obligations and budgetary constraints are met.

### 2.1.2 Individual Teaching, Research, and Service Loads

The *teaching load* is the number of credits that a faculty member would be expected to teach. This value is calculated based on the *total workload value*, and the individual's *role assignment* (i.e., % teaching).<sup>3</sup>

$$(\text{total workload value}) \times (\% \text{ Teaching}) = \text{teaching load}$$

Research and service loads are similarly computed using the *total workload value*, and the individual's *role assignment*. Like the teaching load, the research and service loads are expressed as credits per year. This should be understood to mean an invested effort equivalent to a teaching load of the same number of credits per year. There should also be research or service productivity proportional to the invested effort.

#### Balancing Actual Workloads

It is understood that total credits taught may not accurately reflect total teaching load. At best, credits are intended to reflect student effort rather than instructional effort. A 5-credit, project-based course that is largely self-directed may (or may not) require less instructor effort than a 3-credit writing intensive course.

We rely on the knowledge of department heads to make teaching assignments that balance the teaching workload (appropriate to the role assignments) of their faculty members. Total credits taught is important, but not the only consideration used by department heads when determining teaching assignments.

#### SECTION 2.1.2

Department heads are responsible for managing workloads to fulfill the department's teaching, research, and service obligations.

Any individual faculty member's actual teaching load depends on:

1. Applicable total workload value
2. FTE
3. Role Assignment (% teaching)

#### Example

For a full-time TT faculty member with a 50% teaching assignment, the *teaching load* value is calculated as

$$(24 \text{ cr/yr}) \times (0.50) = 12 \text{ cr/yr}$$

#### Example

An NTT faculty member with a 30 cr/year total workload has assigned responsibilities for academic advising. The department head has determined that the advising responsibility takes as much time as a typical 3-credit course. Therefore the NTT faculty member has role assignments of 90% teaching and 10% non-teaching (advising).

### 2.1.3 Authority to Adjust Role Assignments

Each faculty member's *teaching, research, and service loads* depend on the faculty member's role assignment. Role assignments may vary widely between faculty members, even within a single department. A faculty member's role assignments may vary over time. It is recommended that faculty members discuss role assignments with their department heads during annual reviews. Annual review forms will provide a mechanism for updating role assignments.

Changing a faculty member's role assignment is typically initiated by the faculty member or a department head when necessary. Any change in role assignment is at the discretion of the department head, requires approval by the dean of the college, and must be documented in the faculty member's file.

<sup>3</sup> If a faculty member is part time (FTE < 1.0), the faculty member's FTE must be accounted for. Non-tenured TT faculty members are not allowed to work less than 1.0 FTE. [BOR Policy 702.1]

## 2.2 College Workload

The College of CCCC has adopted the University policies and procedures for adjusting and documenting role assignments.

## 2.3 Department Workload

The Department of DDDDD has adopted the College's policies and procedures for adjusting and documenting role assignments.

## 3 Annual Reviews

All TT faculty members will be reviewed annually. Union-represented NTT faculty members are required to have annual reviews starting in their third consecutive year of employment. [CBA<sub>NTT</sub> 8.08]

Annual review assesses the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year with the major aim of improvement ("formative") and is based on the faculty member's letter of hire, role statements, annual assignments, self-assessment, and review of the individual's performance. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.03]

### 3.1 Annual Reviews: University Requirements

Annual review procedures may vary by college and department, but must include the following elements:

- All faculty members will provide data on their activities over the preceding year. This data must be submitted no later than the end of January. Individual colleges or departments may specify an earlier date.
- Annual reviews will cover the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in the preceding calendar year.
- All areas of the faculty member's responsibility must be reviewed.
- Annual reviews must be completed by the end of March.
- Annual review documents must be communicated to the college dean by March 31.
- Annual review documents are retained as part of the faculty member's personnel file.

While annual reviews of TT faculty take place in early Spring semester, department heads may elect to schedule annual reviews of NTT faculty in Fall semester, if desired. Merit rankings will be based on the most recent annual review results.

### 3.2 Annual Reviews: College Requirements

In the College of CCCC, each department head will assign a proposed annual review score to each faculty member. These proposed scores are reported to the Dean by the end of February. The Dean will review the scores for inter-departmental consistency. If inconsistencies are identified, the Dean will meet with the department heads to resolve the issue. Department heads will

#### SECTION 2.2

If the College uses any procedures that differ from those described in the University Workload section, those procedures must be described here.

#### SECTION 2.3

If the Department uses any procedures that differ from those described in the University or College Workload sections, those procedures must be described here.

#### SECTION 3.2

It is not required that Colleges add additional requirements, but this text illustrates a mechanism (optional) that can be used to try to reduce inter-departmental variability in annual review scores.

provide each faculty member with their final annual review score by March 31.

### 3.3 Annual Reviews: Department Requirements

The Department of DDDDD uses the College of CCCC's procedures for annual review.

#### 3.3.1 Criteria for Merit Rankings

The Department of DDDDD uses the following criteria to rank faculty for merit increases:

- All TT faculty members in the department with annual review scores of ME (met expectations) or higher are eligible to be ranked for merit increases; faculty members are not required to apply to be considered for merit increases.
- The annual review scores will be used in the Department to rank faculty members for merit, with faculty members receiving the highest annual review scores at the top of the merit ranking.
- All faculty members with the same annual review score will receive the same merit ranking.

The TT CBA requires that the criteria used to create the rankings used to determine merit increases be specified in the Department's Role and Scope document. The text in section 3.3.1 is intended as an example and can be modified.

The merit rankings are used by the dean, who distributes merit increases.

## 4 Retention, Tenure and Promotion: Tenure-Track Faculty

Significant differences exist between the criteria and standards for various types of faculty, as such they will be presented separately:

- Section 4: Tenure-Track Faculty
- Section 5: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
- Section 6: Research Faculty

*Criteria* represent categories of performance (what was done) while *standards* represent a level of accomplishment (how much and how well it was done). *Evidence* (new in this document) indicates the types of information that can be used to demonstrate performance.

The standards for TT faculty are articulated in Section 9.07 of the TT CBA:

- Effectiveness
- Accomplishment
- Excellence

### 4.1 Applicability of Standards

The standards listed above are the current University standards for retention, tenure, and promotion – but faculty members are permitted to use prior RSCSP documents (which, prior to 2011, did not have the “Accomplishment” standard) as follows:



- **Retention Review** – candidates are expected to use the RSCSP document in effect when the faculty member was hired.
- **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review** – candidates may use the RSCSP document in effect when the faculty member was retained, or may elect to use the current RSCSP document.
- **Promotion to Professor Review** – candidates must use the current RSCSP document.

#### 4.1.1 Area of Emphasis

Candidates for tenure and promotion reviews must indicate an *area of emphasis*.

- TT faculty with instructional expectations:<sup>4</sup> The candidate chooses either teaching or research. They must choose only one.
- TT faculty with professional practice expectations: The candidate chooses either teaching, research, or service unless the area of emphasis is specified in the candidate’s letter of hire or subsequent appointment document.

The area of emphasis is not used during retention reviews. Candidates for retention reviews should not indicate an area of emphasis.

It is not required that a faculty member select the area of greatest assigned effort (i.e., highest percentage in the role assignment) as the area of emphasis.

A faculty member with a 30% Research assignment can select “research” as his or her area of emphasis. The expected quality of the candidate’s research performance is the same whether the candidate has a 30% research assignment or a 70% research assignment – but the expected quantity will be quite different.

#### 4.2 Joint Appointments

The following additional procedures must be followed for TT faculty holding joint appointments in two departments, or a department and a center:

- Joint appointments must be approved by all relevant department heads; center directors; deans; the Vice President of Research, Creativity, and Technology Transfer; and the Provost.
- Joint appointments are recorded as part of the faculty member’s personnel file.
- The faculty member has one home department. This is the department with the larger percentage of the faculty member’s appointment. In the case of an even split, the designation of home department must be determined when the joint appointment is made.
- Annual, retention, tenure, and promotion reviews use the procedures and committees of the home department.
- If the faculty member’s joint appointment is 20% or greater in the non-home department, the department head or center director from the non-home department or center will provide a written evaluation of the faculty member’s activities relative to assigned responsibilities in the non-home department or center to the home department head prior to any annual, retention,

At present, there are few, if any, joint appointments at MSU. This section is included to illustrate how joint appointments will be handled in the RSCSP document.

<sup>4</sup> “TT faculty with instructional expectations” is the term used for faculty members at Montana State University who have assigned responsibilities in all three areas: teaching, research, and service.

tenure, and promotion review. This evaluation will be included in any retention, tenure, or promotion dossier, and will be part of the home department's review of the faculty member.

### 4.3 Retention Reviews

All TT faculty members are reviewed for retention during the third year of service unless one or more years of credit towards tenure were awarded when the faculty member was hired. A faculty member with years of credit towards tenure will be reviewed for retention during the second year of service.

#### 4.3.1 Standards: Retention Review: TT Faculty

A candidate for retention must meet the following standards:

- **Sustained effectiveness in every area of assignment.**
- **Promise of future effectiveness in every area of assignment.**

##### 4.3.1.1 Definition of Effectiveness

Candidates must demonstrate sustained effectiveness in each area of assignment.

- Faculty performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service will be judged effective if it demonstrates competent execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]

"Potential for continuing effectiveness" (mentioned in CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.04) is demonstrated by continuity of performance over time.

For TT faculty with instructional expectations, the areas of assignment are teaching, research, and service. For TT faculty with professional practice expectations, the areas of assignment are specified in the candidate's letter of hire.

In-depth assessments of teaching, research and service are not included as part of a retention review dossier (unless required by department or college).

External reviews are not included as part of a retention review dossier (unless required by department or college).

#### 4.3.2 Criteria: Retention Review: TT Faculty

##### 4.3.2.1 University Retention Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness

The University criteria are examples of typical performance by many faculty members across campus, but it is understood that the items in these criteria lists may not apply universally to all disciplines. The Colleges and Departments should address this issue and provide lists of criteria that apply to faculty in their units.

The headings of sections describing **Standards**, **Criteria**, and **Evidence** all begin with those terms to make the document easier for faculty to use.

Colleges and Departments cannot modify standards, but they can interpret them for faculty members in their units. This is done in the College (green) and Department (blue) sections of this document.

**Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (undergraduate learning, graduate student mentoring)
- Guides student academic progress (advising)

**Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to define and develop research ideas, create successfully funded grant proposals
- Ability to manage a research program
- Ability to publish research products (peer-reviewed papers and presentations)
- Ability to produce MS and/or PhD graduates

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Supports the functioning of the Institution (University service)
- Takes the knowledge available through the Institution out to the public (public service)
- Supports the development of the faculty member’s discipline (professional service)

**4.3.2.2 College Retention Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

**Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

**4.3.2.3 Department Retention Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

**Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

Adopting the University criteria is a minimum requirement. It is anticipated that most Colleges or Departments will provide additional (tighter) criteria than the University criteria.

Colleges and Departments can define tighter criteria, and are encouraged to do so.

The new **evidence** sections are an attempt to distinguish between “what we are looking for” (criteria) and “how to demonstrate that you are doing what we are looking for” (evidence).

The intent is to show the types of activities that we are looking for in the **criteria** sections, and then list the ways to document these activities in the (new) **evidence** sections.

### 4.3.3 Evidence: Retention Review: TT Faculty

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate effectiveness in retention reviews. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list. The goal is to document performance/accomplishment in each area of responsibility.

#### 4.3.3.1 University Retention Review Evidence: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness

##### Teaching Evidence – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness

Items required of all candidates with teaching assignments:

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations\*<sup>5</sup>
- Peer evaluations of teaching\*

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate effectiveness (examples):

- Sample course materials
- Examples of assessment of student performance
- Honors and awards
- Student awards related directly to faculty member

##### Research Evidence – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness

Items required of all candidates with research assignments:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts, juried works

##### Service Evidence – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness

- Service Statement
- Active participation in professional societies
- Leadership roles in professional societies
- Service on University, College, Department committees
- Journal and proposal reviews
- List of public service activities related to the discipline

Candidates are advised to consider their role assignments when determining the amount of information to present in each area. A candidate with a high percentage assignment in an area will be expected to show more evidence of performance than a candidate with a low percentage assignment in the same area.

---

<sup>5</sup> In some departments, student evaluations and peer evaluations are added to the candidate's dossier by department staff or the primary review committee.

#### **4.3.3.2 College Retention Review Evidence: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

##### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCCC uses the University evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

##### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCCC uses the University evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

##### **Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCCC uses the University evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

#### **4.3.3.3 Department Retention Review Evidence: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

##### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

##### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

##### **Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

## **4.4 Tenure Reviews**

The criteria and standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are identical. In this section, the term “tenure review” is used to indicate this level of review.

Any candidate who has not already achieved the rank of Associate Professor will be reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously. Tenure reviews are typically in the faculty member’s sixth year of service, but any years of credit towards tenure awarded at the time of hire will move the review forward.

Faculty members may choose to be reviewed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor early (before their required review year) provided they can demonstrate an “exceptionally meritorious” case [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.05.01]. The tenure and promotion reviews are not separated; it is not possible to be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor without simultaneously being reviewed for tenure. Individuals considering early tenure review are strongly cautioned to consider the consequences of a failed tenure review.

An *in-depth assessment* of performance is required for each area of the candidate’s assignment. If the candidate has role assignments in teaching, research, and service, then three in-depth assessments of performance

#### **New approach to in-depth assessments:**

- An in-depth assessment is a written assessment of performance in an area of responsibility, performed by a group of individuals (the primary review committee unless otherwise specified in a College or Department’s Role and Scope document), and included in the candidate’s dossier.
- An in-depth assessment is required in teaching, research, and service whenever the % effort in the area is 20% or higher.
- In-depth assessments are based on the information in the dossier, including external reviews.
- External reviews are required in the *area of emphasis* (teaching or research). Colleges and departments can require external reviews in research (even when not the area of emphasis) if desired.
- Colleges and departments can define who does the in-depth assessments (defaults to the primary review committee).

should be included with the dossier, with the following provision:

- When a candidate has a role assignment of less than 20% in one area, the in-depth assessment in that area can be performed by the primary review committee as the dossier is reviewed, a separate in-depth assessment document is not required.

External reviews are required as part of the in-depth assessment of the candidate's area of emphasis. If the candidate's area of emphasis is teaching, then external reviews of the candidate's teaching performance should be obtained, and external reviews of research are not required (at least, not required by the university.) If the candidate's area of emphasis is research, then external reviews of the candidate's research performance should be obtained, and external reviews of teaching are not required (at least, not required by the university.)

#### **4.4.1 Standards: Tenure Review: TT Faculty**

The standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are identical:

- **Sustained effectiveness in every area of assignment.**
- **Promise of future effectiveness in every area of assignment.**
- **Accomplishment in the candidate's area of emphasis.**

##### ***4.4.1.1 Definition of Effectiveness***

Candidates must demonstrate sustained effectiveness in each area of assignment.

- Faculty performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service will be judged effective if it demonstrates competent execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]

##### ***4.4.1.2 Definition of Accomplishment***

Candidates must demonstrate Accomplishment only in their area of emphasis.

#### **Accomplishment: [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]**

- A. Accomplishment in Teaching: Faculty performance in the scholarship of teaching will be judged accomplished if it:
  1. demonstrates meritorious execution of scholarly activities and products related to teaching, in both quantity and quality,
  2. receives recognition from peers and colleagues as having made positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession, and
  3. receives recognition from former students/clientele as having made positive contributions to their education.
- B. Accomplishment in Research/Creative Activity: Faculty performance in research/creative activity will be judged accomplished if it:
  1. demonstrates meritorious execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality, and

2. receives recognition from peers and colleagues as having made positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

#### **4.4.2 Criteria: Tenure Review: TT Faculty**

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate sustained effectiveness in all areas of his or her assignment, and accomplishment in the area of emphasis.

##### **4.4.2.1 University Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

###### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (undergraduate learning, graduate student mentoring)
- Guides student academic progress (advising)

###### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to manage a research program
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations)
- Ability to produce MS and/or PhD graduates

###### **Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

Note: It is expected that faculty members with limited assignments in service (e.g., 10% service) will not provide evidence supporting all of these items.

- Supports the functioning of the Institution (University service)
- Takes the knowledge available through the Institution out to the public (public service)
- Supports the development of the faculty member's discipline (professional service)

##### **4.4.2.2 College Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

###### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

###### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

###### **Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

##### **4.4.2.3 Department Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

###### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The decision to organize this document by type of review rather than by standards and criteria creates a significant amount of redundancy in the lists of standards and criteria – but it also allows a faculty member going forward for a particular type of review to find all of the information that they need in one section of the document.

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

#### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

#### **Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

#### **4.4.2.4 University Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Accomplishment**

For the tenure review, TT faculty must go beyond sustained effectiveness in one area, the candidate's area of emphasis. In that area, the candidate must demonstrate accomplishment, defined in the TT CBA in Article 9.07.

##### **Teaching Criteria – Accomplishment**

If the candidate is seeking tenure with a teaching emphasis, he or she must demonstrate a higher level of performance in this area. In general, it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a deeper level of involvement in the teaching enterprise, and greater success. Examples include:

- Ability to develop new, innovative approaches to teaching
- Ability to impact the discipline beyond the walls of the classroom (e.g., texts or methods adopted by others, curriculum redesign)
- Ability to generate scholarly (non-research) products (e.g., papers or presentations) that impact the discipline
- Success in pedagogical research
  - Ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
  - Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

##### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

If the candidate is seeking tenure with a research emphasis, he or she must demonstrate a higher level of performance in this area. In general, it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate that he or she has built a foundation for a research effort that will significantly contribute to his or her discipline.

Examples include:

- Sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

##### **Service Criteria – Accomplishment**

Service is rarely the area of emphasis, since it is not an option for TT faculty with instructional expectations. A TT faculty member with professional practice expectations could be hired with service specified as his or her area of emphasis. In this rare situation, the faculty member would need to document a higher level of performance in the service area than that expected for sustained effectiveness.



#### **4.4.2.5 College Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Accomplishment**

##### **Teaching Criteria – Accomplishment**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Accomplishment in Teaching.

##### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Accomplishment in Research, with the following added requirements:

- Impact the discipline will be demonstrated using an h-factor.

##### **Service Criteria – Accomplishment**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Accomplishment in Service.

Adopting the University criteria is a minimum requirement. It is anticipated that most Colleges or departments will provide additional (tighter) criteria than the University criteria.

#### **4.4.2.6 Department Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Accomplishment**

##### **Teaching Criteria – Accomplishment**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Accomplishment in Teaching.

##### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Accomplishment in Research.

##### **Service Criteria – Accomplishment**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Accomplishment in Service.

#### **4.4.3 Evidence: Tenure Review: TT Faculty**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate effectiveness and accomplishment in tenure reviews. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list. The goal is to document performance in each area responsibility.

##### **4.4.3.1 University Tenure Review Evidence: TT Faculty**

###### **Teaching Evidence**

Note: Bolded items in this list are more likely to be included when the candidate's area of emphasis is teaching.

###### **Teaching Evidence**

Items required of all candidates with teaching assignments:

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations\*<sup>6</sup>
- Peer evaluations of teaching\*

Candidates are advised to consider their role assignments when determining the amount of information to present in each area. A candidate with a high percentage assignment in an area will be expected to show more evidence of performance than a candidate with a low percentage assignment in the same area.

---

<sup>6</sup> In some departments, student evaluations and peer evaluations are added to the candidate's dossier by department staff or the primary review committee.

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance (examples):

- Sample course materials
- Honors and awards
- Student awards related directly to faculty member
- **Examples of assessment of student performance**
- **Publications in pedagogical journals**
- **Presentations**
- **Grant activity**
- **Student work samples**
- **Evidence of innovation**
- **Contributions beyond the classroom**
- **Educational portfolio**

### Research Evidence

Note: Bolded items in this list are more likely to be included when the candidate's area of emphasis is research.

Items required of all candidates with research assignments:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance (examples):

- **Invited papers and presentations, books, book chapters, review articles**
- **Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing**
- **Awards or honors for research or similar recognition**

### Service Evidence

- Service Statement
- Active participation in professional societies
- Leadership roles in professional societies
- Service on University, College, Department committees
- Journal and proposal reviews
- List of public service activities

#### Section 4.4.3.1

The bolded items are an attempt to show candidates that different amounts of information are expected, depending on the standard they are asked to meet.

#### 4.4.3.2 College Tenure Review Evidence: TT Faculty

The College of CCCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of teaching.

The College of CCCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of research, with the following addition.

- **h-index**

The College of CCCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of service.

#### 4.4.3.3 Department Tenure Review Evidence: TT Faculty

The Department of DDDDD adopts the College lists of evidence for review of teaching, research, and service.

### 4.5 Promotion Review

Reviews for promotion to full professor typically take place five or more years after the faculty member's tenure review, but the timing of the promotion review is up to the faculty member.

An in-depth assessment of performance is required for each area of the candidate's assignment. If the candidate has role assignments in teaching, research, and service, then three in-depth assessments of performance should be included with the dossier, with the following provision:

- When a candidate has a role assignment of less than 20% in one area, the in-depth assessment in that area can be performed by the primary review committee as the dossier is reviewed.

External reviews are required as part of the in-depth assessment of the candidate's area of emphasis. If the candidate's area of emphasis is teaching, then external reviews of the candidate's teaching performance should be obtained, and external reviews of research are not required (at least, not required by the university.) If the candidate's area of emphasis is research, then external reviews of the candidate's research performance should be obtained, and external reviews of teaching are not required (at least, not required by the university.)

#### 4.5.1 Standards: Promotion Review: TT Faculty

The standards for promotion to Professor are:

- **Sustained effectiveness in every area of assignment.**

#### Section 4.4.3.2

This is an example of a College modifying the University evidence list. It is intended that Colleges and Departments will modify the lists to more closely fit what is used in their disciplines.

The use of the h-index is controversial, so it can be used in colleges that think it is appropriate, and omitted by other colleges.

#### New approach to in-depth assessments:

- An in-depth assessment is a written assessment of performance in an area of responsibility, performed by a group of individuals (the primary review committee unless otherwise specified in a College or Department's Role and Scope document), and included in the candidate's dossier.
- An in-depth assessment is required in teaching, research, and service whenever the % effort in the area is 20% or higher.
- In-depth assessments are based on the information in the dossier, including external reviews.
- External reviews are required in the *area of emphasis* (teaching or research). Colleges and departments may require external reviews in research (even when not the area of emphasis) if desired.
- Colleges and departments may define who does the in-depth assessments (defaults to the primary review committee).

- **Promise of future effectiveness in every area of assignment.**
- **Excellence in the candidate's area of emphasis.**

#### ***4.5.1.1 Definition of Effectiveness***

Candidates must demonstrate sustained effectiveness in each area of assignment.

- Faculty performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service will be judged effective if it demonstrates competent execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]

#### ***4.5.1.2 Definition of Excellence***

Candidates must demonstrate Excellence only in their area of emphasis.

#### **Excellence: [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]**

- A. Excellence in Teaching: Faculty performance in the scholarship of teaching will be judged excellent if it:
  1. demonstrates sustained superior execution of scholarly activities and products related to teaching, in both quantity and quality,
  2. receives national recognition from peers and colleagues as having made significant, positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession, and
  3. receives recognition from former students/clientele as having made significant, positive contributions to their education.
- B. Excellence in Research/Creative Activity: Faculty performance in research/creative activity will be judged excellent if it:
  1. demonstrates sustained superior execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality, and
  2. receives national recognition from peers and colleagues as having made significant, positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

#### **4.5.2 Criteria: Promotion Review: TT Faculty**

A candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate sustained effectiveness in all areas of his or her assignment, and excellence in the area of emphasis.

##### ***4.5.2.1 University Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness***

#### **Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (learning, graduate student mentoring)
- Guides student academic progress (advising)

#### **Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

- Ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to manage a research program
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations)

- Ability to produce MS and/or PhD graduates

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

Note: It is expected that faculty members with limited assignments in service (e.g., 10% service) will not provide evidence supporting all of these items.

- Supports the functioning of the Institution (University service)
- Takes the knowledge available through the Institution out to the public (public service)
- Supports the development of the faculty member’s discipline (professional service)

**4.5.2.2 College Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

**Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

**4.5.2.3 Department Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

**Teaching Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Research.

**Service Criteria – Sustained Effectiveness and Promise of Future Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Sustained Effectiveness in Service.

**4.5.2.4 University Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Excellence**

For promotion to full professor, TT faculty must go beyond sustained effectiveness in one area, the candidate’s area of emphasis. In this area the must demonstrate excellence. [CBA<sub>TT</sub> 9.07]

**Teaching Criteria – Excellence**

If the candidate is seeking tenure with a teaching emphasis, he or she must demonstrate a high level of performance in this area. In general it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a level of involvement in the teaching enterprise that shows significant impact within and beyond the classroom.

Examples include:

- Ability to develop new, innovative approaches to teaching
- Ability to impact the discipline beyond the walls of the classroom (e.g., texts or methods adopted by others, curriculum redesign)
- Ability to generate scholarly (non-research) products (e.g., papers or presentations) that impact the discipline

- Success in pedagogical research
  - Ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
  - Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

**Research Criteria – Excellence**

If the candidate is seeking tenure with a research emphasis, he or she must demonstrate a high level of performance in this area. In general it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate that he or she has contributed in a significant manner to his or her discipline. Examples include:

- Sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

**Service Criteria – Excellence**

Service is rarely the area of emphasis since it is not an option for TT faculty with instructional expectations. A TT faculty member with professional practice expectations could be hired with service specified as his or her area of emphasis. In this rare situation, the faculty member would need to document a high level of performance in the service area, documenting significant impacts resulting from the candidate’s service efforts.

Adopting the University criteria is a minimum requirement. It is anticipated that most Colleges or departments will provide additional (tighter) criteria than the University criteria.

**4.5.2.5 College Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Excellence**

**Teaching Criteria – Excellence**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Excellence in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Excellence**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Excellence in Research, with the following added requirement:

- In order to demonstrate excellence, the candidate will be expected to have an h-factor above the discipline average.

**Service Criteria – Excellence**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for Excellence in Service.

**4.5.2.6 Department Promotion Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Excellence**

**Teaching Criteria – Excellence**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Excellence in Teaching.

**Research Criteria – Excellence**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Excellence in Research.

**Service Criteria – Excellence**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for Excellence in Service.

### **4.5.3 Evidence: Promotion Review: TT Faculty**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence in promotion reviews. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list. The goal is to document performance in each area responsibility.

Candidates are advised to consider their role assignments when determining the amount of information to present in each area. A candidate with a 70% assignment in research will be expected to show more evidence of research activity than a candidate with a 30% research assignment.

#### **4.5.3.1 University Promotion Review Evidence: TT Faculty**

##### **Teaching Evidence**

Note: Bolded items in this list are more likely to be included when the candidate's area of emphasis is teaching.

Items required of all candidates with research assignments:

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations\*<sup>7</sup>
- Peer evaluations of teaching\*

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance (examples):

- Sample course materials
- Student awards related directly to faculty member
- **Examples of assessment of student performance**
- **Honors and awards**
- **Publications in pedagogical journals**
- **Presentations**
- **Grant activity**
- **Classroom observations**
- **Evidence of innovation**
- **Contributions beyond the classroom**
- **Educational portfolio**

##### **Research Evidence**

Note: Bolded items in this list are more likely to be included when the candidate's area of emphasis is research.

Items required of all candidates with research assignments:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results

---

<sup>7</sup> In some departments, student evaluations and peer evaluations are added to the candidate's dossier by department staff or the primary review committee.

- List of research funding
- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance (examples):

- **Invited papers and presentations, books, book chapters, review articles**
- **Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing**
- **Awards or honors for research or similar recognition**

#### **Service Evidence**

- Service Statement
- Active participation in professional societies
- Leadership roles in professional societies
- Service on University, College, Department committees
- Journal and proposal reviews
- List of public service activities

#### ***4.5.3.2 College Promotion Review Evidence: TT Faculty***

The College of CCCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of teaching.

#### ***4.5.3.3 Department Promotion Review Evidence: TT Faculty***

The Department of DDDDD adopts the College lists of evidence for review of teaching.



## 5 Advancement in Rank: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The NTT collective bargaining agreement provides the most detailed information on advancement in rank for NTT faculty (see Article 8 of the 2012-12 CBA<sub>NTT</sub>). The information provided here is intended to supplement and interpret the CBA.

### 5.1 Advancement in Rank: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Requirements

#### 5.1.1 University Requirements

It is implicitly assumed in the NTT CBA that NTT faculty members are hired almost exclusively for teaching. While this is largely correct, there are NTT faculty members hired with other responsibilities. When such faculty members apply for advancement in rank the faculty member's performance in all of his or her area(s) of responsibility will be reviewed.

The 2011-12 NTT CBA includes the following phrase in the criteria to be appointed at or promoted to every NTT rank above Instructor:

“...has a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department or equivalent professional experience (which may include professional certification)” [CBA<sub>NTT</sub> 8.05]

In general, the work performed as a NTT faculty member may not be considered as “equivalent professional experience”. In instances where it may be considered as equivalent professional experience, the rationale for the equivalency must be clearly documented by the Department Head.

NTT faculty members follow nearly the same procedures for advancement in rank as TT faculty, with the exceptions noted below. However colleges and departments may specify different requirements.

Exceptions:

- The candidate's dossier contains only materials relevant to the candidate's area(s) of responsibility.
- External reviews are not required.
- There are three levels of review of NTT faculty members:
  - primary review committee
  - department head
  - college dean
- The dean reports the results of the review to the department head who includes the result of the review in the faculty member's personnel file.

#### 5.1.2 College Requirements

In the College of CCCC, follows the University requirements for NTT advancement in rank.

#### 5.1.3 Department Requirements

The Department of DDDDD follows the College of CCCC requirements for NTT advancement in rank.

## 5.2 Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards

A NTT faculty member at the rank of Instructor may apply for advancement to the rank of Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor after three years of service at an FTE of 0.75 or higher, or after six years of service at an FTE less than 0.75.

### 5.2.1 Standards: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor

The standards for promotion to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor are:

- **A terminal degree appropriate to the field or department or equivalent professional experience**
- **Effectiveness in teaching**

The standards listed in the NTT section are adapted from the NTT CBA (Article 8).

### 5.2.2 Criteria: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor

#### 5.2.2.1 *University Criteria: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness*

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (learning, graduate student mentoring)

#### 5.2.2.2 *College Criteria: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness*

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

Adopting the University criteria is a minimum requirement. It is anticipated that most Colleges will provide additional (tighter) criteria than the University criteria.

#### 5.2.2.3 *Department Criteria: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness*

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

### 5.2.3 Evidence: Advancement to Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate effectiveness in reviews for advancement. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

#### 5.2.3.1 *University Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Effectiveness*

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Sample course materials

### **5.2.3.2 College Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University evidence list for Effectiveness in Teaching.

### **5.2.3.3 Department Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College evidence list for Effectiveness in Teaching.

## **5.3 Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards**

A NTT faculty member at the rank of Assistant Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor may apply for advancement to the rank of Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor after six years of service at an FTE of 0.75 or higher, or after twelve years of service at an FTE less than 0.75.

### **5.3.1 Standards: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

The standards for promotion to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor are:

- **A terminal degree appropriate to the field or department or equivalent professional experience**
- **Sustained effectiveness in teaching**
- **A commitment to remaining current in the candidate's discipline**

### **5.3.2 Criteria: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

#### **5.3.2.1 University Criteria: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness**

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (learning, graduate student mentoring)
- Attends professional meetings and workshops, or uses other means to stay current

#### **5.3.2.2 College Criteria: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

#### **5.3.2.3 Department Criteria: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

### **5.3.3 Evidence: Advancement to Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate sustained effectiveness in reviews for advancement. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

### **5.3.3.1 University Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Sample course materials

### **5.3.3.2 College Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

### **5.3.3.3 Department Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Sustained Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College evidence list for Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching.

## **5.4 Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: Criteria and Standards**

A NTT faculty member at the rank of Associate Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor may apply for advancement to the rank of Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor after five years of service at an FTE of 0.75 or higher, or after ten years of service at an FTE less than 0.75.

### **5.4.1 Standards: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

The standards for promotion to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor are:

- **A terminal degree appropriate to the field or department or equivalent professional experience**
- **Sustained effectiveness in teaching**
- **A commitment to remaining current in the candidate's discipline**
- **Has made a significant contribution to the candidate's discipline**

### **5.4.2 Criteria: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

#### **5.4.2.1 University Criteria: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty – Effectiveness**

- Ability to organize, deliver, and manage courses (teaching)
- Ability to foster student learning (learning, graduate student mentoring)
- Ability to stay current by attending professional meetings and workshops, or other means
- Ability to impact the discipline beyond the walls of the classroom (e.g., texts or methods adopted by others)

#### **5.4.2.2 College Criteria: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty – Effectiveness**

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

#### **5.4.2.3 Department Criteria: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor: NTT Faculty –Effectiveness**

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for NTT advancement in rank to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor.

#### **5.4.3 Evidence: Advancement to Teaching/Clinical/Visiting Professor**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate sustained excellence in reviews for advancement. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

##### **5.4.3.1 University Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Excellence**

Items required of all candidates:

- Teaching Statement
- Course List
- Summary of student evaluations
- Sample course materials
- Peer evaluations of teaching

Items that could be included to demonstrate performance (examples):

- Publications in pedagogical journals
- Presentations
- Grant activity
- Examples of assessment of student performance
- Classroom observations
- Evidence of innovation
- Contributions beyond the classroom
- Educational portfolio

##### **5.4.3.2 College Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Excellence**

The College of CCCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of teaching.

##### **5.4.3.3 Department Review Evidence: NTT Faculty – Excellence**

The Department of DDDDD adopts the College lists of evidence for review of teaching.

## 6 Promotion Reviews: Research Faculty

Research faculty members have a 100% research assignment and the area of emphasis is research.

### 6.1 Promotion Reviews: Research Faculty: Requirements

University policy requires research faculty members to use the same criteria and standards for promotion as TT faculty except that only research performance is considered.

Research faculty members are reviewed using the processes and procedures of their home department.<sup>8</sup> When the research faculty member has a significant commitment in a second department, or a research center or institute, the department head or director of the non-home department should provide a written evaluation of the candidate's research performance for inclusion in the candidate's dossier.

#### 6.1.1 University Requirements

University policy requires research faculty members to use the same criteria and standards for promotion as TT faculty and to follow nearly the same procedures, with the exceptions noted below. However, colleges and departments may specify different requirements.

Exceptions:

- The candidate's dossier contains only materials relevant to research.
- External reviews are required.
- There are two levels of review of research faculty members:
  - primary review committee
  - department head
- The department head reports the results of the review to the dean and includes the result of the review in the faculty member's personnel file.

#### 6.1.2 College Requirements

In the College of CCCC, candidates for promotion to Associate Research Professor follow the University Requirements; however candidates for promotion to Research Professor use the same criteria and standards for promotion as TT faculty and to follow nearly the same procedures, with the following exceptions:

- The candidate's dossier contains only materials relevant to research.
- External reviews are required.
- There are four levels of review of research faculty members:
  - department review committee
  - department head
  - college review committee

The CBA does not require specifying how research faculty members are reviewed and promoted – but granting agencies require that this be clearly stated. The RSCSP document seems like a reasonable place to document this.

---

<sup>8</sup> For Extension faculty, the home department may be an Agricultural Research Center.

- college dean
- The department head reports the results of the review to the dean and includes the result of the review in the faculty member's personnel file.

### 6.1.3 Department Requirements

The Department of DDDDD follows the College of CCCCC requirements.

## 6.2 Promotion to Associate Research Professor: Criteria and Standards

The criteria and standards for promotion to Associate Research Professor are the same as those used for a TT faculty member, except the only area of responsibility is research.

Reviews for promotion to Associate Research Professor are typically in the faculty member's sixth year of service or later.

An in-depth assessment of performance of the candidate's research is required. External reviews are required as part of the in-depth assessment.

### 6.2.1 Standards: Promotion to Associate Research Professor

The standard for promotion to Associate Research Professor is:

- **Accomplishment in research.**

### 6.2.2 Criteria: Promotion to Associate Research Professor

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate accomplishment in research.

#### 6.2.2.1 *University Review Criteria: Promotion to Associate Research Professor – Accomplishment*

##### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

The candidate for promotion to Associate Research Professor must demonstrate accomplishment in research. In general it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate that he or she has built a foundation for a research effort that will significantly contribute to his or her discipline. Examples include:

- Sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

#### 6.2.2.2 *College Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Accomplishment*

##### **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

The College of CCCCC uses the University criteria for Accomplishment in Research, with the following added requirements:

- Impact the discipline will be demonstrated using an h-factor.

#### 6.2.2.3 *Department Tenure Review Criteria: TT Faculty – Accomplishment*

This is an (optional) example of how a College might modify the University requirements to include reviews at the College level for research faculty.

## **Research Criteria – Accomplishment**

The Department of DDDDD uses the [College criteria for Accomplishment in Research](#).

### **6.2.3 Evidence: Promotion to Associate Research Professor**

#### **6.2.3.1 University Review Criteria: Promotion to Associate Research Professor – Accomplishment**

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate accomplishment. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

Items required by all candidates:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance:

- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- Invited papers and presentations
- Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing
- Awards or honors for research or similar recognition

#### **6.2.3.2 College Review Evidence: Promotion to Associate Research Professor**

The College of CCCC adopts the [University lists of evidence for review of research](#), with the following addition.

- **h-index**

#### **6.2.3.3 Department Review Evidence: Promotion to Associate Research Professor**

The Department of DDDDD uses the [College criteria for accomplishment in Research](#).

## **6.3 Promotion to Research Professor: Criteria and Standards**

The criteria and standards for promotion to Research Professor are the same as those used for a TT faculty member, except the only area of responsibility is research.

Reviews for promotion to Research Professor are typically at least five years after the faculty member's promotion to Associate Professor.

An in-depth assessment of performance of the candidate's research is required. External reviews are required as part of the in-depth assessment.



### **6.3.1 Standards: Promotion to Research Professor**

The standard for promotion to Research Professor is:

- **Excellence in research.**

### **6.3.2 Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor**

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Professor must demonstrate excellence in research. Excellence is defined in the TT CBA in Article 9.07.

#### ***6.3.2.1 University Review Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor – Excellence***

The candidate for promotion to Research Professor must demonstrate excellence in research. In general it is expected that the candidate will demonstrate that he or she has contributed in a significant manner to his or her discipline. Examples include:

- Sustained ability to define and develop research ideas, create successful grant proposals
- Ability to generate research products (papers and presentations) that impact the discipline

#### ***6.3.2.2 College Review Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor – Excellence***

The College of CCCC uses the University criteria for excellence in Research, with the following added requirements:

- Impact on the discipline will be demonstrated using an h-factor.

#### ***6.3.2.3 Department Review Criteria: Promotion to Research Professor – Excellence***

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for excellence in Research.

### **6.3.3 Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor**

#### ***6.3.3.1 University Review Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor – Excellence***

The following items are commonly used to demonstrate excellence. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive and candidates are not required to include every item on each list.

Items required by all candidates:

- Research Statement
- List of proposals submitted with results
- List of research funding
- List of research results: reports, conference presentations, refereed journal articles, conference articles, monographs, texts

Additional items that could be included to demonstrate performance:

- List of graduate and undergraduate students mentored
- Invited papers and presentations
- Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing
- Awards or honors for research or similar recognition

#### ***6.3.3.2 College Review Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor***

The College of CCCC adopts the University lists of evidence for review of research, with the following addition.

- **h-index**

### 6.3.3.3 *Department Review Evidence: Promotion to Research Professor*

The Department of DDDDD uses the College criteria for excellence in Research.

## 7 Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Advancement Review Procedures

The procedures for retention, tenure, promotion, and advancement reviews are specified in the following sections of the collective bargaining agreements:

- TT: Article 11
- NTT: Article 8
- Research Faculty: Follow the procedures used by TT faculty, with the exceptions noted in Section 6.1 of this document.

The review procedures are documented in the CBA. If we say much about them here we could create conflicts.

### 7.1 Timelines

Note: If a timeline must be adjusted, notification of the department head, college dean, and provost is required, but a full review of the Role and Scope document is not required if only the timeline is changed. The administrators are responsible for notifying their faculty of the change.

#### 7.1.1 University Timelines

The timelines shown here are a mixture of:

- **University deadlines** – these deadlines do not change.
- *Time estimates* – these should be specified in the College and Department sections if different values are used in different units.
- Typical values – these time values may slide slightly from year to year, but earlier reviews (department and college level reviews) **must be completed** in time for University-level reviews.

##### 7.1.1.1 *University Timeline for Retention Reviews*

1. **September 1:** Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
2. **September 7:** Department staff submit dossier electronically
3. September 15-30: Department Review\*
4. October 15-30: College Review\*
5. November 15-30: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
6. December 1-15: Provost's Review\*
7. January 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.

### 7.1.1.2 University Timeline for Tenure Reviews

1. *July 15*: Candidate submits materials required for external reviews
2. **September 15**: Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
3. **September 22**: Department staff submit dossier electronically
4. October 15-30: Department Review\*
5. November 15-30: College Review\*
6. December 1-January 15: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
7. February 1-15: Provost's Review\*
8. March 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.

### 7.1.1.3 University Timeline for Promotion Reviews

1. *July 15*: Candidate submits materials required for external reviews
2. **October 15**: Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
3. **October 22**: Department staff submit dossier electronically
4. November 15-30: Department Review\*
5. February 1-15: College Review\*
6. March 1-21: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
7. April 1-15: Provost's Review\*
8. May 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.

Colleges and departments cannot modify target dates outside of their own unit, or generate timelines that create conflicts with other units.

### 7.1.2 College Timelines

The College of CCCC uses the University timelines, including the dates indicated as estimates.

### 7.1.3 Department Timelines

The Department of DDDD uses the University timelines, with one exception:

Candidates for promotion have until August 15 to submit materials for external review. The Department timelines with this change are reproduced below.

#### 7.1.3.1 Department Timeline for Retention Reviews

1. **September 1**: Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
2. **September 7**: Department staff submit dossier electronically
3. September 15-30: Department Review\*
4. October 15-30: College Review\*
5. November 15-30: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
6. December 1-15: Provost's Review\*
7. January 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.

### **7.1.3.2 Department Timeline for Tenure Reviews**

1. **July 15:** Candidate submits materials required for external reviews
2. **September 15:** Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
3. **September 22:** Department staff submit dossier electronically
4. October 15-30: Department Review\*
5. November 15-30: College Review\*
6. December 1-January 15: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
7. February 1-15: Provost's Review\*
8. March 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.

### **7.1.3.3 Department Timeline for Promotion Reviews**

1. **August 15:** Candidate submits materials required for external reviews
2. **October 15:** Candidate submits completed dossier to department head
3. **October 22:** Department staff submit dossier electronically
4. November 15-30: Department Review\*
5. February 1-15: College Review\*
6. March 1-21: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) Review\*
7. April 1-15: Provost's Review\*
8. May 1-15: President's Decision\*

\* Committees and administrators have 10 days after the review period to notify the candidate and add their letters to the candidate's dossier.