

APPENDIX VIII – UNIT CRITERIA GUIDELINES AND FACULTY REVIEW FORM

A8.1 Unit Criteria Guidelines

Standards for Unit Criteria: Each Unit will develop its criteria according to its accreditation, unit needs, and discipline standards while remaining aligned with University policy, mission statement, and employment responsibilities.

- A. Unit criteria should be aligned with the University's evaluative terms for review.
 - 1. Excellent
 - 2. Highly effective
 - 3. Effective
 - 4. Less than Effective
 - 5. Ineffective
- B. Unit criteria should address three categories of faculty work.
 - 1. Teaching/Librarianship
 - 2. Scholarship (scholarly and creative pursuits)
 - 3. Service (Unit, University, profession, and community)
- C. Unit criteria should indicate appropriate activity levels and define the evidence to support promotion and tenure based on rank eligibility.
 - 1. Tenure
 - 2. Associate Professor/Librarian
 - 3. Professor/Librarian
 - 4. Post-tenure
- D. Unit Criteria must meet the following additional conditions:
 - 1. Criteria must specify how faculty can demonstrate that they have met the University's standards for promotion and tenure, including specific examples of appropriate evidence.
 - 2. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with the university and state rules and laws.
 - 3. Criteria should closely relate to the appropriate department/school, program, college, and university mission.
 - 4. Criteria should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available and attainable resources.
 - 5. Criteria should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ them in making judgments. They should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by the criteria.
 - 6. Criteria should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated.
 - 7. Criteria should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments.
 - 8. Learning Evaluation Surveys (formally SOPs) are a criterion, please consider including this statement: "When considering student opinion polls, the peer review committee will acknowledge that biases may exist in student evaluations based on, but not limited to, sex,

race, sexual orientation, and content rigor, and that these biases are established in the academic literature.”

9. No Item Counts Twice. Some activities may qualify as two activities. Unit criteria should make clear that the candidate must present evidence under only one area of assessment.

A8.2 Process for Changing Criteria: Unit criteria are faculty-driven and specific to the discipline(s) represented within the unit. These documents are faculty-driven and are therefore approved primarily by faculty members within the unit and on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A. Drafting the College/School Unit Criteria

1. Tenured and Tenure-track faculty are responsible for developing Unit Criteria.
2. Units may use the Peer Review Committee or may establish a Unit Criteria Committee or other tactic for composing a draft of this document and submitting it to the department/unit for consideration.
3. Eligible faculty review, make recommendations, and approve a draft of the unit criteria at the departmental/unit level.

B. Chain of Approval

1. P&T committee
 - i. A departmental/unit representative submits this draft of Unit Criteria to the P&T Committee.
 - ii. The Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluates the proposed criteria to ensure they are consistent with the Faculty Manual and are sufficiently clear. The Promotion and Tenure committee approves the criteria and forwards them to the Provost for review.
 - iii. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee observe deficiencies in this draft, the proposal will be returned to the Unit with an explanation and suggested changes. The Chair of P&T works with unit representative on appropriate improvements.
 - iv. The Unit will revise its proposed criteria and resubmit them to the P& T Committee.
 - v. If the Unit and the P&T committee cannot reach an agreement, the Chair of the P&T Committee will convene a meeting with the Unit and selected members of the P&T Committee to resolve the issues. If there continues to be unresolved aspects of the Unit Criteria, the Provost will endeavor to resolve the differences.
2. Provost reviews and approves or returns to the Unit for additional changes.
3. Once approved, the Unit Criteria will be Published on the P&T Website by the Faculty Governance Webmaster.

C. Implementation and Review

- a. The approved Unit Criteria become effective immediately. For details on choosing which unit criteria to follow, see Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion in Chapter 5.
- b. Unit criteria should be reviewed every 3-5 years), or when: the unit mission has changed, there are problems with/confusion about the criteria, or unit faculty wish to modify them.

A8.3 Faculty Review Form—Classroom Faculty

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Faculty Member: | Academic Unit: |
| Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure () | Date: |

Notes: Definitions of terms below. Additional pages may be attached.

1. Teaching effectiveness. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of teaching effectiveness.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

| RELEVANT SIGNATURES | DATE |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Unit Administrator | |
| Chair, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Dean | |
| Provost | |
| Candidate | |

A8.4 Faculty Review Form – Library Faculty

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Faculty Member: | Academic Unit: |
| Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure () | Date: |

Notes: Definitions of terms on reverse. Additional pages may be attached.

2. Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of effectiveness.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | Highly Effective | Effective | Less than effective | Ineffective |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|

Comments:

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

SIGNATURES:

| RELEVANT SIGNATURES | DATE |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Unit Administrator | |
| Chair, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Member, Peer Review Committee | |
| Dean | |
| Provost | |
| Candidate | |