



**The University of Memphis**

**College of Education**

**Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology  
and Research**

**Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures**

**2015**

---

## Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research

### *Policies, Standards, and Procedures for Annual Review, Mid-Tenure Review, Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, and Promotion to Professor*

2015

#### **Introduction**

The professional activities of the faculty of the Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research support and advance the principal missions of the department.

These are:

1. To produce and disseminate research based knowledge. Such knowledge encompasses original research focusing on new empirical facts, ideas, and theories; scholarship that synthesizes and integrates; the application of knowledge and methods to problems, especially in but not restricted to the public domain; and scholarship that leads to improved teaching and advising.
2. To provide high quality teaching, advising, and supervision to students enrolled in department programs.
3. To provide high quality professional service in the particular area of expertise; respective disciplines within the department or college; relevant cognate fields; to appropriate professional organizations; and to various communities from the local to the global.

The Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research faculty present a great variety of profiles as a function of the roles they play in different contexts and the constituencies they address. To fulfill the functions expected, we deliberately cultivate complementary knowledge, skills, and dispositions across our diverse faculty. Teaching, research, and service contributions, therefore, may vary dramatically among faculty within the unit, yet be considered similarly meritorious. Among untenured and tenured professors alike, some may exhibit a profile that prioritizes basic and/or applied research over teaching and service. Others may balance efforts relatively evenly across the three categories. All faculty are expected to produce scholarly accomplishments, teach and advise students, and provide professional service; the quantity expected in each area will differ according to the nature and extent of other responsibilities.

Accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service are the principal bases for the allocation of rewards to department faculty, and collegiality is considered within each of these three domains.

#### **Definitions**

**Scholarship.** Scholarship is a discipline-based or multi-disciplinary activity that advances the fund of knowledge and learning through production of new ideas and understanding. In the course of advancing scholarship, faculty members demonstrate their scholarly contributions as per the guidelines of the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, through products that are

appropriate to the discipline and published or presented in a **peer-reviewed forum**. The principal objectives in the evaluation of research work (as broadly conceived) are to determine the quality and quantity of research activity, its significance, and the extent of its dissemination. ***It should be emphasized that quality is more important than quantity.*** Scholarship includes the following four subcategories. Individual faculty members are not expected to contribute in all subcategories. There is some overlap in the meaning of the subcategories, and a particular scholarly contribution may fall under more than one subcategory.

**Inquiry:** The scholarship of inquiry involves rigorous investigation aimed at the discovery of new knowledge within one's own discipline or area of study. In many ways, inquiry serves as the basis for other forms of scholarship. Evidence of activity in this area includes peer-reviewed:

- Scholarly publications
- Funded research
- Presentations at professional meetings

**Integration:** The scholarship of integration makes meaningful connections between previously unrelated topics, facts, or observations. Activity in this area should result in peer-reviewed presentations or publications. Examples are:

- Cross-disciplinary synthesis
- The conceptualization of an integrative framework within a discipline that results in a peer-reviewed publication or presentation

**Teaching:** The scholarship of teaching focuses on transforming and extending knowledge about pedagogy in one's discipline. Innovative contributions to teaching, insofar as they are published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum, would also constitute scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of teaching is not equivalent to teaching. Classroom teaching and staying current in one's field are not relevant criteria for evaluating faculty on the scholarship of teaching. Examples include:

- Writing an appropriate textbook or educational article in one's discipline
- Presentations at professional meetings on innovative approaches to teaching in one's discipline

**Engaged scholarship:** Per the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, Engaged Scholarship now subsumes the scholarship of application. It adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to the solution of practical problems or to collaborative problem-solving with urban, regional, state, national and/or global communities, and results in a peer-reviewed journal article or book. Engaged scholarship conceptualizes "community groups" as all those outside of academe and requires shared authority at all stages of the research process from defining the research problem, choosing theoretical and methodological approaches, conducting the research, developing the final product(s), to participating in peer evaluation. Innovative contributions to scholarship, insofar as they are published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum would also constitute

engaged scholarship. Engaged scholarship could include activities of the following kind, when such activities result in products open to peer review:

- The development of content-based seminars and workshops
- The provision of technical assistance
- The evaluation of public and private sector institutions, and policies

**The forms of scholarly accomplishments appropriate for evaluation of any of the four types of scholarship** include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Major accomplishments** include original products pertaining to the scholarship of inquiry, integration, teaching, or engagement (i.e., engaged scholarship) that have been externally reviewed and are at the national/international level of recognition:

- Refereed national or international journal article or monograph. Quality of the journal in the discipline is considered via examination of evidence such as impact factor, rejection rate, and sponsorship of the journal by a major professional organization. Publications in top-tier journals in one's area are considered an especial mark of quality.
- Written or edited book from a major publishing company (first editions take precedence over revised editions)
- Chapter in edited book (major publishing company)
- PI or co-PI on competitive research grant (external funded)

**Secondary accomplishments** include original products pertaining to the scholarship of inquiry, integration, teaching, or engagement (i.e., engaged scholarship) that have been externally reviewed and are at least at the regional level of recognition:

- Refereed professional society (national or international) paper presentation
- Invited presentation at a professional society conference (national or international) with a paper
- Refereed regional journal article or monograph
- Competitive research grant proposal (for external funding)
- Invited journal article

#### **Other accomplishments**

- Refereed paper presentation or invited presentation for a regional society conference
- Authorship of professional manual, guides, videotape, cassette tapes, or computer software
- U of M faculty research grant
- Unpublished manuscript (either in progress or under review)

**Teaching.** Teaching encompasses classroom instruction, testing, grading, course development, and mentoring students in academic projects including dissertations. Teaching is central to the

purposes and objectives of The University of Memphis, and it should be evaluated, rewarded, and encouraged. The evaluation of teaching should be adaptable to differences among disciplines and should be both formative (to improve teaching skills) and summative (to judge teaching skills.) Since the evaluation of teaching is primarily a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence should be employed to increase the validity of the evaluation. One source of evidence will be student evaluations, to be obtained for all classes in all program areas for all semesters, including summer sessions. The student evaluation instrument should include a standardized questionnaire with a substantial narrative portion. Sections may be added to address the special nature of the disciplines and the mode of instruction in different classes. Since mentoring students at all levels is an important aspect of teaching activities, it should be taken into account in faculty evaluations. Creative and effective use of innovative teaching methods and curricular innovations should be encouraged and constructively evaluated.

**The areas appropriate for the evaluation of teaching** include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Student evaluations for each course each semester
- Writing instructional or pedagogical textbooks
- Designing new courses
- Restructuring existing courses
- Innovative teaching techniques
- Position papers written about teaching, learning, and other creative approaches to the teaching function
- Course syllabi
- Courses taught, with the number and level of students (this includes directed readings, practicum, supervised research, special problems, etc.)
- Course reading lists
- Workshops attended or other professional development designed to improve teaching effectiveness
- Ability to motivate students
- Peer review of teaching or content analysis of materials used in courses
- Faculty comments regarding interpretation of grade distributions relative to the particular course

**Service.** Service is undertaking activities in the department, college and university, in the profession, or in the community that support the mission of the university. These functions may overlap in some instances. All faculty members will perform basic citizenship activities with the department, college, or university. Some faculty may accept more extensive citizenship functions such as a leadership role in the Faculty Senate. Effective and substantial citizenship service should be rewarded. Faculty members are encouraged to perform outreach and professional service in addition to basic citizenship activities, and such service should be rewarded. Service to the profession is manifested by involvement in and service to regional, national, or international professional associations and organizations. Outreach refers primarily to sharing professional expertise with parties outside the university but, under very rare circumstances, may include non-professionally related activities outside the university. Outreach should directly support the goals and mission of the university.

**The forms of service appropriate for evaluation** include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Department, college, and university**

- Serving on department, college, or university committees and task forces
- Serving on the Faculty Senate
- Advising student organizations
- Advising students
- Conducting staff/faculty inservices
- Serving as guest lecturer
- U of M liaison to other universities
- Judging academic competitions

**Professional service:**

- Professional society memberships
- Professional society offices
- Reviewer for professional conferences
- Conference committees or society committees
- Serving as journal editor, editorial board member, and/or reviewer
- Textbook reviews
- Book review published in professional journal
- Speeches, workshops, and invited presentations at professional meetings (non-refereed talks, not-refereed papers)
- Guest lecturing on other campuses

**Outreach service:**

- Speeches, workshops, and invited presentations for schools/community
- School/community/government projects, boards, committees, or offices

**Collegiality**

The Tennessee Board of Regents defines collegiality as “Demonstrated willingness and ability to work effectively with colleagues to support the mission of the institution and the common goals both of the institution and academic organizational unit.”

Although evidence relating to collegiality will be most evident in the category of service, collegiality (or the lack of it) can also affect performance in research and teaching. Collegiality is not separate; collegiality enhances performance in each of these areas. Because the department values teamwork, evidence of collegiality plays a role in faculty evaluation. Given TBR and college guidelines and taking into account the unique mission and demands of the department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research, considerations of collegiality should be made under each of the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

**The areas appropriate for the evaluation of collegiality** include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Teaching:**

- Developing joint or interdisciplinary courses
- Working with colleagues to develop curricula or course sequences
- Serving on dissertation or thesis committees outside the department
- Mentoring or providing assistance or training to improve others' teaching
- Holding regular office hours or being available for consultation with students
- Being responsive to suggestions for improved teaching based on annual evaluation

**Research:**

- Collaboration on research projects
- Organization of or participation in research groups, lecture series, etc.
- Research and publishing with students
- Interdisciplinary research
- Reviewing and critiquing colleagues' or students' papers and grants
- Willingness to assist others with their research

**Service:**

- Attending and participating responsibly in faculty meetings, on committees, assignments, and other university service activities
- Discharging assignments and responsibilities in an expedient manner
- Providing assistance on informal, "behind the scenes" tasks
- Respectful collaboration with colleagues (e.g., engaging in problem-solving) when dealing with professional concerns or problems

**Process and Criteria for Evaluation**

**Annual Review**

**Evaluation by Chairs.** The Tennessee Board of Regents requires that department chairs evaluate the faculty in their departments annually and that the results of these evaluations be used as a basis for decisions relating to tenure, promotion, recommendations for salary increases and other personnel actions, including decisions regarding renewal of tenure-track appointments.

The annual review process is conducted in the spring semester and consists of two parts: (1) a review of the faculty member's accomplishments during the prior calendar year, using the previously agreed upon plan of activities for that year as the basis of the review, and (2) establishing a plan of activities for the next year, or for a longer period when appropriate. The review will consider the faculty member's performance in all areas that further the mission of the

university, including teaching and advising, research and other scholarly or creative activity, public and university service.

Any review of a faculty member's professional performance should be conducted with the full knowledge of the faculty member, should allow the faculty member to be informed of the findings prior to the transmittal of the conclusions of the review, and should allow the faculty member to verify that the review has been based on full and complete information.

### **Faculty Planning**

During the spring semester, all faculty members submit a current curriculum vitae, a narrative of their accomplishments during the past year (i.e., faculty activity report), and their plans for the upcoming year to their department chair (or other appropriate head of their academic unit if there is no department chair). The University's standard faculty evaluation instrument and planning document are available in the Office of the Provost or may be accessed on-line at <http://academics.memphis.edu/provost/mainindex.html>. The chair receives copies of student evaluations for each course that the faculty member has taught during the evaluation period and may also obtain peer input as discussed herein. Both the faculty member and the chair should obtain and include appropriate, similar information from any other relevant department(s) whenever the faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary activities. Generally, the faculty member's accomplishments over only the prior calendar year are considered in the annual review, although a two or three year period of activities may be considered when appropriate.

The department chair reviews the material and then prepares a narrative and an evaluation in a Faculty Evaluation and Planning Report. The chair provides an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance by assigning one of the following five performance categories: (a) exceptional performance, (b) very good performance, (c) good performance, (d) improvement needed, and (e) failure to meet responsibilities. The chair must provide written specifics for ratings of "improvement needed" and "failure to meet responsibilities." The chair's overall rating should take into account a balance of all the faculty member's activities.

The department chair uses the annual review process as the primary mechanism for evaluating faculty, for giving specific feedback to faculty on their performance, and for making recommendations on how to improve performance consistent with the department's and/or academic unit's goals in areas of teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service. It is recommended that each department and school refer to the tenure and promotion guidelines as a guide to expectations for continued faculty performance. Faculty planning, both short and long term, begins in the spring during the annual review process. This is a joint endeavor carried out by the faculty member and chair, with results acceptable to both; the plan will take into account academic freedom and the departmental or academic unit's mission. Faculty have the option of revising their plan throughout the year as the balance of their responsibilities dictate. Informal meetings between the chair and each faculty member may be necessary to finalize the planning report. The chair's signature on the planning report indicates the appropriateness of the faculty member's plan.

### **Curriculum Vitae**



The University of Memphis uses an on-line data form for development of faculty curricula vitae [<https://itweb2.memphis.edu/fcv/login/php>]. Faculty members must submit updated vitae information each spring as part of their annual evaluation, and are encouraged to update these vitae throughout the year. Faculty and administrative staff may access CVs in "view only" mode.

### **Student Evaluations**

Student evaluations are required for every section of every course, including summer sessions, taught by University of Memphis faculty members, all full-time and part-time instructors, and graduate teaching assistants. Faculty members must include student evaluation results with applications for tenure and promotion. The Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness rating system (SETE) is an electronic process. Information about SETE forms, and monitoring capabilities can be found on the provost web site at [<http://academics.memphis.edu/Provost>] and on each faculty member's portal - SETE channel.

### **Peer Input**

Department chairs are encouraged to seek peer input regarding faculty members as a part of the evaluation process. The form of such input may vary from discussions between the chair and the faculty member to formal committees. Examples of successful peer input in various departments include: formal input from a representative group of faculty either appointed by the chair or selected by the faculty; formal input from a rotating group of tenured faculty; formal input from the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (which is composed of all full-time, tenured department faculty holding the rank of at least Associate Professor with the exception of the department chair) and discussions between the chair and each faculty member in the department. In all of these models, documentation should be reviewed by peers. When a formal committee is used, its makeup should reflect the department's diversity and be as widely inclusive as possible; its membership should rotate among faculty members through the use of staggered terms. Although the majority of the committee members should be tenured, untenured faculty may also serve as members. When part of the annual review process, internal peer review committees within departments may also participate in planning with individual faculty members, evaluate faculty's annual performance, and provide evaluations to department chairs.

### **Faculty Evaluation and Planning Report**

The basis for annual review is faculty planning. Faculty planning, both short and long term, should begin in the spring during the annual review process. This is a joint endeavor carried out by the faculty member and the department chair, and takes into account the departmental mission and needs and academic freedom. As noted, The University of Memphis standard faculty evaluation instrument and planning document are available in the Office of the Provost or may be accessed on-line at <http://academics.memphis.edu/provost/mainindex.html>. Annual planning and report/evaluation should also be part of a cumulative process that culminates in a tenure and promotion file for untenured faculty and a promotion file for those who will be candidates for Professor. Thus, the consultation between the faculty member and the department chair during the annual review should be focused on assisting the faculty member in planning his or her personal distribution of effort among teaching, scholarship, and service in order to help fulfill the

department's mission and goals and also to maximize the likelihood of promotion. However, planning need not be for specific activities or outcomes but for broad objectives and allocation of time. The chair's signature on the planning form indicates the appropriateness of the faculty member's plan. After the chair has completed and signed the annual Faculty Evaluation and Planning Report, he or she will transmit the form to the faculty member. The faculty member is given an opportunity to read, sign, and/or offer a written response to the document. The chair also may respond in writing to the written comments of the faculty member, and a copy of all such attachments will be included with the evaluation documents when forwarded to the dean of the college for review and when placed in the faculty members' personnel file maintained by the Office of Academic Personnel Services. A faculty member's failure to sign the annual Faculty Evaluation and Planning Report will not invalidate the results of the evaluation, but faculty members are encouraged to include comments and/or responses to the evaluation whenever the faculty member disagrees with the results of the evaluation.

*Per the University of Memphis Faculty Handbook, the evaluation system must be designed to ensure that both formative and summative information is provided to determine which individuals should participate in appropriate faculty development program(s). If it is determined that faculty development is needed, opportunities to address the need for improvement will be provided. Failure either to participate in a recommended program or to otherwise attain a required level of performance or credential may justify appropriate administrative action (Tennessee Board of Regents memorandum dated January 8, 1992).*

### **Role of Evaluation in Renewal of Tenure-Track Appointments and Tenure and Promotion Decisions**

Evaluations may be considered in determining whether to renew a faculty member's tenure track appointment. **The department chair may use the annual evaluation and review process as an opportunity to counsel tenure-track faculty during their probationary period. The mid-tenure review, discussed below, provides an additional opportunity for counseling tenure-track faculty regarding any areas of concern and becomes a part of the faculty member's application for tenure.**

Because a faculty member's annual evaluations and mid-tenure review are a core part of the materials considered for the faculty member's tenure and promotion review, copies of these evaluations and review should be retained and included in the tenure and promotion file of all tenure-track faculty.

Evaluation of a faculty member's performance constitutes only one aspect of the final recommendation on tenure or promotion. In addition to evaluation, the administrative assessment of need, enrollment trends, financial resources, rank distribution, and other such matters will also be considered at the university level in the recommendation to grant tenure and/or promotion.

Faculty should keep materials in a file containing evidence of contributions and accomplishments so that the necessary work to develop a dossier for third-year review and tenure and promotion reviews can be expedited.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to document activities and accomplishments over the previous year when preparing the annual report and submitting it to the department chair. Materials prepared for the annual review should include not only a listing of activities and accomplishments but supportive materials (e.g., publications) as well. Subsequent sections describe required and optional materials to be included. Generally, as noted, the faculty member's accomplishments over only the prior calendar year are considered in the annual review, although a two or three year period of activities may be considered when appropriate.

The department chair will respond to each annual report with a narrative evaluation as well as a rating of scholarship, teaching, and service, and then overall performance. Collegiality as previously defined will be considered by the chair when evaluating each component of a faculty member's work. This evaluation is based on the initial planning record in each performance area, areas of emphasis of the faculty member, and specific accomplishments over the year. However, the initial plan is not to be considered a rigid contract. Unforeseen circumstances and opportunities may arise that result in activities, outcomes, or products that differ from those in the original plan. It is this summary of work that is evaluated. The overall rating is not necessarily an average of the performance in the three areas, but should be a holistic evaluation with explicit reference to the relative contribution of each of the three areas. It is important and a matter of fairness that untenured faculty receive clear and consistent communication relative to their annual reports as to their progress towards tenure. The faculty member will review the chair's evaluation and sign the evaluation form if there is agreement with the evaluation. If any faculty member feels that he or she has been treated unfairly, or that his or her evaluation was done in an arbitrary fashion, or that the evaluation process was improper, a review by the Dean may be requested.

In years when there are available funds to support merit increases, an overall rating of very good or exceptional would qualify a faculty member to be considered for a merit increase. If no merit increases have been available over preceding years, or if a faculty member's salary is not commensurate with his or her multi-year performance and/or department salary norms, a faculty member's accomplishments over a multi-year context should be considered.

**Evidence of Quality of Scholarship.** As specified by the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, normally only peer-reviewed items should qualify as scholarly contributions. Multiple-authored publications, grants, technical reports, papers, etc. should be accompanied by an attribution statement or other information stating the role and degree of effort on the part of the candidate in each publication. This can be presented in a candidate's narrative on research and scholarship and/or by assigning a weight factor in the citation to represent his/her level of participation. When possible, information about the review process, journal acceptance rates, citation rates, and impact factors should be included. If this information is not available, the candidate should describe the journal. This is to provide the T & P Committees, department chair, and dean a clear and definitive picture of the scholarly work of the author. Faculty materials submitted for the annual evaluation of scholarly accomplishments must include:

- Copies of all published articles and letters of acceptance for articles in press
- With sponsored research, a letter of notification of support from the sponsoring agency
- A list of presentations and awards

**Evaluation categories for annual review of scholarship.** The following five descriptive categories should be used as a guide to evaluate the annual scholarly accomplishments of faculty members. However, the chair and the faculty member should consider the general pattern of scholarship, the quality of the product, the time assigned, tenure status, and rank. Comparisons should be made not relative to the entire department but to those similarly situated. It should be emphasized that quality of scholarship is more important than quantity.

- **Exceptional:** Exceptional performance in scholarly accomplishments over the preceding year would consist of a very high level of scholarship evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments with supporting evidence indicating a high quality of work. One example of this combination might be four or more articles published in national or international peer-reviewed journals of high quality, with at least one of these articles first authored, a refereed paper presentation at a national conference, a manuscript under review in a journal of high quality, and other evidence of accomplishments. In assigning a rating of exceptional, quality and influence of the article, and other accomplishments, should be considered. Fewer than four articles may constitute exceptional scholarship when one or more articles has been published in top national or international journals (as evidenced by the journal acceptance or rejection rate, citation rate, impact factor, and other relevant data), or is widely cited or read, or when a major external grant is funded. Publication of an authored or edited book will reduce the expectation for articles.
- **Very Good:** Very good performance in scholarly accomplishments over the preceding year would consist of a high level of scholarship evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments with supporting evidence indicating a high quality of work. One example of this combination might be three or more scholarly articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals, with a combination of secondary or other accomplishments such as a refereed paper presentation, evidence of work in progress (e.g., other manuscripts submitted for publication), or publication of ancillary works such as discipline-relevant encyclopedia entries. Fewer than three articles may constitute very good scholarship when one or more articles have been published in top national or international journals (as evidenced by the journal acceptance or rejection rate, citation rate, impact factor, and other relevant data) or are widely cited or read, or when a major external grant is submitted or funded. Publication of an authored or edited book will reduce the expectation for articles.
- **Good:** Good performance in scholarship over the preceding year would consist of a solid level of scholarship evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments with supporting evidence indicating good quality of work. One example of this combination might be at least two articles in national or international peer-reviewed journals, and a combination of other accomplishments such as one or more peer-reviewed national presentations, submission of one or more additional professional articles, or publishing of ancillary works. Fewer than two articles may constitute good scholarship when one or more articles have been published in top national or international journals (as evidenced by the journal acceptance or rejection rate, citation rate, impact factor, and other relevant data) or are widely cited or read, or when a major external grant is submitted or funded. Publication of an authored or edited book will reduce the expectation for articles.

- **Needs Improvement:** Needs Improvement in scholarship over the preceding year would consist of an inadequate level of scholarship as reflected in a low quantity and/or quality of major, secondary, and other accomplishments. Examples of this combination might include consistently publishing one peer-reviewed article per year in lower tier journals (as evidenced by journal rejection rate, citation rate, and impact factor), or failure to publish scholarly articles combined with evidence of efforts toward scholarship, such as submission of peer-reviewed articles, peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, and/or publication of ancillary works. In assigning a rating of “needs improvement,” the faculty member’s multi-year performance should typically be considered. For example, a faculty member who typically averaged 2 or more publications per year would not be assigned a rating of “needs improvement” on the basis of a year in which he or she published only one article.
- **Failure to Meet Responsibilities:** Failure to meet responsibilities over the preceding year would consist of persistent negligence in scholarship. One example of this might be failing to publish and submit articles, and failure to conduct research, for more than one year despite feedback from the department chair.

**Evidence of Quality of Teaching.** The evaluation of a faculty member's teaching will not be made solely on the basis of materials provided by the faculty member. The chairperson may use a variety of sources (e.g., classroom observations) for evaluation purposes. Mentoring is also an important component of teaching. Evidence of mentoring may include unsolicited comments from students, research and publishing with students, conference presentations by students, documentation of progress made by advisees, documentation of timely responses to student requests for help or information, student awards, and other relevant materials.

**Evaluation categories for annual review of teaching.** The following five descriptive categories should be used as a guide to evaluate the teaching of faculty members. It is expected that relatively few faculty would receive a rating of exceptional and that a rating of failure to meet responsibilities would be given only in circumstances in which the faculty member has demonstrated little or no receptiveness to or improvement from feedback. Interpretation of student course evaluations should consider the nature of the course (e.g., a required course versus an elective course).

- **Exceptional:** Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by having excellent ratings for the type of course on the approved evaluation form, consistently positive student remarks on the evaluation form, and supportive evidence demonstrating both excellence and commitment to teaching.
- **Very Good:** Good performance in teaching is manifested by above average ratings for the type of course on the approved evaluation form and positive student remarks.
- **Good:** Satisfactory performance in teaching is evidenced through average evaluations for the type of course on the approved evaluation form and few negative remarks by students.
- **Improvement Needed:** “Improvement needed” performance in teaching is manifested by below average evaluations for the type of course on the approved evaluation form and consistent negative remarks by students.

- **Failure to Meet Responsibilities:** Failure to meet responsibilities is evinced by gross negligence in performance of duties. Examples of such behavior include but are not limited to failure to attend classes and meet with advisees, consistent presentation of erroneous material in classes, and failure to implement feedback from the departmental chair regarding improvement of teaching performance.

**Evidence of Quality of Service.** The quality of service is demonstrated by evidence of activities undertaken in the department, college and university, in the profession, or in the community that support the mission of the university. These functions may overlap in some instances. Service to the University includes basic or extensive citizenship activities with the department, college, or university. Service to the profession is manifested by involvement in and service to regional, national, or international professional associations and organizations. Outreach refers primarily to sharing professional expertise with parties outside the university but, under very rare circumstances, may include non-professionally related activities outside the university. Outreach should directly support the goals and mission of the university. Categories of service are as follows:

**Evaluation categories for annual review of service.** The following five descriptive categories should be used as a guide to evaluate the annual service accomplishments of faculty members. However, the chair and the faculty member should consider the general pattern and quality of service, the time assigned, tenure status, and rank. Comparisons should be made not relative to the entire department but to those similarly situated. It should be emphasized that quality of service is more important than quantity.

- **Exceptional:** Exceptional Service consists of unusual breadth or depth of high-quality service. This could be demonstrated by a single instance of noteworthy service (e.g., chairing a national committee or organization or an important university or community task force or committee, or reviewing 10 or more articles for professional journals), or a combination of activities such as taking leadership positions at the department, college, university, community, or professional level; serving as an editor, editorial board member, or reviewer for professional journals; spearheading or implementing discipline-relevant projects that aid the university, community, or profession; service to regional, national, or international professional associations and organizations; or extensive and noteworthy outreach.
- **Very Good:** Very good service exceeds the normal expected level. It typically will be similar to service characterized as exceptional, but somewhat less extensive, or it may involve fewer activities or activities requiring less time.
- **Good:** A good level of service is evidenced by some combination of moderate participation at the departmental, college, or university level, a moderate level of outreach, and/or a moderate level of professional service involvement.
- **Needs Improvement:** Needs improvement would be reflected in a considerably below average level of quantity or quality of service in the preceding year. This may be evidenced by a failure to serve the department, college, university, or professional community, and a failure to conduct outreach.
- **Failure to Meet Responsibilities.** Failure to meet responsibilities consists of gross negligence or persistent neglect of service despite feedback from the department chair in

previous annual evaluations. This may be demonstrated by failure to support or participate in department, college, university, professional, and community activities.

### **Mid-Tenure Review (Third-Year Review)**

The third-year review is a major midterm evaluation of untenured faculty in tenure-track positions and is conducted at the end of the faculty member's third year of appointment. The purpose of the review is to provide the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, the chair, the dean, and the faculty member with information about the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure. This evaluation typically takes place near the end of the faculty member's third year and is conducted by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the department chair. Each faculty member is responsible for presenting documentation (a dossier) of contributions and accomplishments according to departmental or academic unit, college, and university guidelines. These materials are reviewed by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, by the chair, and by the dean, and are subsequently forwarded to the Office for Faculty Administrative Services for inclusion in the faculty member's permanent file. During this process, the committee chair and department chair should provide the candidate with information about his or her progress toward application for tenure.

Although this review is required of all untenured tenure-track faculty, exceptions could be made as needed for those faculty who come into the university with years of credit toward tenure. The department chair will initiate the third-year review process for eligible faculty by appointing a Departmental Third-Year Review Committee Chair during the spring semester. After receiving the recommendations of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, the department chair will make his/her own recommendations and forward both to the Dean of the College. The department chair will meet with the faculty member to share the recommendations made by the committee and the chair and to provide guidance in directing future work.

**Procedures.** The procedure for the mid-tenure review should be the same as that used by the department for tenure and promotion review. Deliberations and discussions of dossiers will take place in committee meetings. All discussions will be held in strict confidence. If additional information is required by the committee, the committee chair will inform the department chair of this and then request this information from the faculty candidate. Each candidate's accomplishments should be evaluated with respect to quality as well as quantity within the context of the candidate's roles and responsibilities. The dossier for the mid-tenure review should be the same as the dossier for tenure and promotion, with the exception of letters from external peer reviewers, which are not required for mid-tenure review. The format of The University of Memphis Tenure and Promotion dossier example should be used and should contain information documenting evidence of quality in scholarship, instruction, and outreach/service. The inclusion of non-essential documents is discouraged.

**Evaluation Criteria.** The evaluation criteria for the quality of a faculty member's mid-tenure accomplishments should be the same as those used for promotion to associate professor with tenure. However, the quantity of work produced by the faculty member for the mid-tenure

review is expected to be necessarily less than the quantity produced for tenure and promotion to associate professor. The evaluation criteria relate to the institution's traditional missions: instruction, scholarship, and outreach/service. The candidate should have also demonstrated a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and missions of the department, college, and university.

**Feedback.** The committee chair will prepare a written report based on the recommendation of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee members that is submitted to the department chair or equivalent. The report should specify the department's criteria and discuss, in particular, both the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarship, instruction, and outreach/service. The report should provide meaningful feedback and direction to the faculty member to assist in planning and organizing subsequent work activities. The department chair will then prepare a written report that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's accomplishments in instruction, scholarship, and outreach/service.

A copy of the two reports will be presented to the faculty member. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee chair, and the department chair or equivalent, will meet with the candidate to discuss the reports. The faculty member may write a brief statement in response to the discussions and reports obtained from the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the department chair. The purpose of this response is to allow the faculty member the opportunity to address any concerns or inaccuracies in the reports. The faculty member may also describe plans for addressing concerns raised during the mid-tenure review. In addition, the response ensures that all participants in the process understand the nature and context of the feedback, thereby minimizing miscommunication. The candidate's dossier, the recommendations made by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the department chair, and the candidate's response (if any) constitute the candidate's file. The department chair is responsible for forwarding the candidate's file to the dean.

## **Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

### **Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion**

**Tenure.** A faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or higher who has completed a five-year probationary period (unless otherwise prescribed in writing and approved by the dean and provost) must make application for tenure. Absent an exception approved by the dean, the provost, and the president, application for tenure must be submitted in the fall semester of the sixth year. Exceptions that may affect the length of the probationary period are addressed in the *Faculty Handbook* in the sections entitled "Credit for Prior Service," "Credit for Administrative Position or Transfer," "Extension of the Probationary Period," "Stopping the Clock," and "Leaves of Absence."

Candidates for tenure must meet eligibility requirements for promotion to associate professor or have already attained that rank. Stated another way, anyone recommended for tenure must also be recommended for promotion.



Tenure applications receive one of two responses: tenure is granted; or tenure is denied. Re-application for tenure is not possible and the seventh year, or other final year following application for tenure, will be terminal if tenure is denied. Per the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, faculty members who are not recommended for tenure and promotion will be given notice of non-renewal of the appointment. Upon receipt of notice of such non-renewal, the faculty member will be eligible for a one-year non-renewable appointment at the University.

Failure to submit an application for tenure in the academic year that precedes the end of the probationary period will result in non-renewal of the candidate's contract for the following year. Unlike unsuccessful applications for tenure, the candidate will not be accorded an automatic one-year contract if he/she fails to apply for tenure at the specified time.

Faculty holding temporary appointments are not eligible for tenure. Also, faculty may not be tenured in an administrative position. A faculty member will retain tenure in his/her former faculty position when appointed to an administrative position, and those otherwise eligible for tenure and who also hold an administrative position may earn tenure in the faculty position only.

**Promotion.** Faculty members may apply for promotion whenever they believe they meet the established criteria. Faculty members are advised, but not required, to confer with the department chair before submitting applications for promotion.

### **Departmental Review Process for Tenure and Promotion**

The department chair has the responsibility of initiating the promotion to Associate Professor with tenure for eligible faculty in the department, although a faculty member may submit his or her name to the chair. Faculty members must meet the minimum eligibility requirements for Associate Professor with tenure as delineated in the most recent *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*. At the beginning of each fall semester, faculty eligible for promotion should be notified by the chair and supplied with copies of the department, college and university guidelines and review forms for promotion and tenure, as well as deadlines for submitting dossiers for promotion. The names of faculty members to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will be forwarded to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee. After receiving the recommendations of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, the chair will make his/her own recommendation and forward both to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee.** The make-up and function of this committee, and the processes to be followed by this committee, are as follows:

1. This committee for assessment of candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be composed of all full-time, tenured department faculty holding the rank of at least Associate Professor with the exception of the department chair. The committee for assessment of candidates who are being considered for promotion to Professor will consist of all full-time, tenured department faculty holding the rank of

Professor with the exception of the department chair. The department adheres to the university rule of Single Participation: Departmental representatives to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee may vote at the departmental level, but cannot vote at the College level on candidates from their department. Spouses may not participate in committee discussions at any level.

2. The first meeting of this committee will be called each fall by the department chair, who will conduct the election of the chair of the committee. Subsequent meetings will be called by the committee chair. When all dossiers are complete, the committee chair will notify committee members that they are ready for review and set the date for the first committee deliberations.
3. Committee members will review candidates' dossiers by requesting them from the department chair or secretary. Dossiers may not be removed from the department.
4. Discussions of candidate's dossiers will take place in committee meetings. All discussions will be held in strict confidence. If additional information is required by the committee, the committee chair will first inform the department chair of this, and then request the information from the candidate.
5. Discussions should be objective and should adhere to the consideration of the established criteria. Each candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service should be evaluated with respect to the quality of accomplishments, not merely the quantity, and within the context of the candidate's role and responsibilities. Per the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, reviewers at every level will utilize dossier materials **and** professional observations in making their recommendations. Professional observations may be included in the documentation that is prepared for submission to the department chair.
6. Voting will be by secret ballot. Three-fourths of the committee membership constitutes a quorum and absent members may vote by proxy. The results of the voting together with a short narrative conveying the major recommendations and reasons for these recommendations will be given to the chair of the department. These recommendations should reflect the full scope of discussions that took place in the committee meetings, and should also contain the rationale for the recommendation that is consistent with the vote of the committee.

### **Election of Departmental Representatives to the COE Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The CEPR Department will elect one representative to the COE Tenure and Promotion Committee for a two year term that begins in the fall semester and ends at the conclusion of the full summer session. This member must be a tenured full professor or associate professor holding current full graduate faculty status. In addition, a second member will be elected for a one-year term during the 2008-2009 academic year, and again every three years (this one-year position rotates among COE departments). The candidate with the highest number of votes will serve as the elected representative. If for any reason an elected representative cannot finish his/her term, the department chair will conduct a special election to select an alternate from the remaining eligible faculty.

## **Department Chair**

The department chair will evaluate the candidate's file, make further recommendations, and then, in cases involving promotion only, meet with the candidate to transmit the recommendations which the committee and the chair have made and the reasons for these recommendations. When the chair meets with the candidate being considered for tenure or tenure and promotion, he/she should, per the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, restrict his/her conversation to the recommendations that have been made, but should not, at this time, address the reasons for the recommendations. In promotional situations, the chair is free to discuss his/her recommendations. Application for promotion may be withdrawn at this point.

The major share of the responsibility for appraising a candidate is the responsibility of the department chair and the department committee. The appraisal must be a thorough evaluation of scholarship, teaching, service, and other relevant criteria, supported by substantial evidence.

If a department chair is being considered for promotion or tenure, the recommendation of the department committee will be transmitted directly to the college dean.

## **Dossier for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Each candidate must present a dossier of materials in support of promotion prepared according to the format mandated in the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, illustrated below, as well as appropriate supporting materials such as documented evidence of quality in scholarship, teaching, and service listed above under Annual Review. Supporting materials must include copies of all publications and summary student evaluations of courses. The inclusion of non-essential documents is discouraged.

**Format of the Dossier.** Candidates should provide a Dossier arranged in the following manner. All candidates prepare dossiers for review in consultation with the Department Chair. Candidates who are not certain what to include in their dossiers or how to organize the material should seek help from their chairs and colleagues, particularly those who have served on tenure and promotion committees. Great care should be taken in the preparation of the dossier. Nothing may be added to or removed from a candidate's dossier after it has been evaluated by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee. The candidate should assemble his/her materials in a three-ring notebook that is organized in the following manner:

- Documents and materials in candidate's dossiers are to be placed in four loose leaf binders. The first binder contains materials to be forwarded to the provost after the department and COE recommendations are concluded. The COE dean will provide the department and the candidate with an information sheet describing the required materials, which must include the results of the external review and pre-tenure third year review. The components of this binder are listed in Chapter 4 of the *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*, available online at [http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB\\_Chapter4.htm#Review%20Process%20for%20Tenure%20and%20Promotion](http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2007FHB_Chapter4.htm#Review%20Process%20for%20Tenure%20and%20Promotion). Additional guides and forms

pertinent to this binder are available on the Provost's website, <http://academics.memphis.edu/provost/>.

- The second binder will contain the candidate's evidence of successful teaching, including SETE summaries, syllabi, and any other evaluative materials required by departments.
- The third binder contains evidence of the candidate's scholarly activities. Copies of all publications, papers and reports must be included. Only publications that are in print or in press (i.e., fully accepted, with a letter documenting full acceptance) should be considered publications. Articles or chapters that are under review or revision, regardless of how many times they have been revised (e.g., third revision), are not publications and should be listed separately as works in progress. Additionally, technical reports, book chapters, and other products should not be listed under refereed journal articles. Multi-authored publications must be accompanied by an attribution statement or other information (including the appropriate COE scholarship attribution form, available on-line at [insert website link when available]) stating the role and degree of effort on the part of the candidate in each publication. When possible, information about the review process, journal acceptance rates, citation rates, and impact factors should be submitted attached to the publication. If this information is not available, the candidate should describe the journal. Information concerning extra-mural grants and awards should contain information about whether they were competitive, amount of award, and the role played by the candidate in the proposal stage and in grant administration. External evaluations by grantees may be included, if available.
- The fourth binder will contain information the candidate submits showing evidence of service to department, college, university, profession, and various communities. Activities thought to be "engaged scholarship/research" under the university or department definitions may be placed in this binder and so labeled.

Supporting materials for tenure and promotion applications forwarded by the deans are to be assembled in notebooks with covers that are labeled with the name of the applicant, department and college. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion must meet department, college, and university criteria in effect at the time of the application.

### **External Peer Review**

Both tenure and promotion to associate professor and professor require external peer review of a candidate's record of scholarly activity by qualified peers who are not affiliated with the University of Memphis. The purpose of external peer reviews is solely to provide an informed, objective evaluation of the quality of the candidate's scholarship and research. It is expected that the external reviewers will be selected from peer or comparable institutions with national reputations in the faculty member's discipline. Though not an absolute requirement, it is also expected that faculty of superior rank will review faculty of lower rank. For example, full professors should review applicants for promotion to professor. These reviewers should be recognized scholars in the candidate's area of research and should not be former mentors, professors, or close colleagues. Every effort should be made to eliminate biases for or against the candidate.

Such reviews place a burden on the usually busy schedules of the evaluators. In order to obtain external reviews in a timely manner, the process of developing the lists of external reviewers, as described below, should be initiated during the spring semester preceding the fall tenure and promotion process.

Letters from external peer reviews evaluating the candidate's scholarly record must be solicited by the department chair and included with the candidate's dossier before it is forwarded to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the college committee. In addition to a letter, external reviewers should provide a curriculum vitae that documents their professional accomplishments. Letters from at least six external reviewers should be requested; three from a list provided by the candidate and three selected by the chair in consultation with the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The candidate shall develop a list, normally four to eight names, of recommended peer reviewers from outside the University. In addition, the chairs of the department and the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee will develop a list of outside peer reviewers. The chairs must select at least one of the names suggested by the candidate. The department is solely responsible for supplementing the candidate's list with additional reviewers. The dossier should contain at least four external reviews. If it is not possible to obtain four reviews, the reasons must be documented at the departmental level. For each reviewer, there should be an accompanying brief paragraph identifying her/his credentials and a statement regarding the nature of the relationship to the candidate (if any). The external reviewers are expected to provide informed, objective evaluations rather than testimonials. Therefore, no external reviewer can be a past mentor or collaborator of the candidate. The external reviewers for candidates seeking the rank of professor should be professors themselves.

All reviewers should receive the same materials for evaluation; if not, an explanation should be included. Peer reviewers who have agreed to write letters of evaluation should be sent the following: the candidate's curriculum vitae, a representative sample of the candidate's work, a letter from the department chair to the reviewer, including a request for a written response to the question: "How do you assess the quality of the scholarly and/or creative activity of the candidate;" a deadline for the written response; and a statement that the State of Tennessee has an Open Records Law and that the candidate has access to the outside peer evaluation document.

**Evaluation for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.** To be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, the candidate must have an established record of high-quality empirical scholarship in national or international peer-reviewed journals and must have begun to establish a national or international reputation for that scholarship. In general, the successful candidate would have 10-15 publications, most of which are empirical, in national peer-reviewed journals relevant to their field. The quality of scholarship will be evidenced by publications such as articles in scholarly peer-reviewed journals and well-received books, and will be judged by internal faculty assessments and statements from external peer referees. Although not an absolute requirement for tenure or promotion, publishing in top-tier peer-reviewed journals in one's area is considered an especial mark of quality. In general, the candidate will also be expected to clearly demonstrate and articulate one or more theoretically-based lines of inquiry, to utilize designs of sufficient sophistication to extend the research in this

area or these areas, and to demonstrate ability to conduct independent research (e.g., a substantial number of lead-author or first-author peer-reviewed publications). It is recognized that different products and types of research require different time investments, and this will be considered when evaluating the candidate's materials. For example, a meta-analysis, longitudinal study, or major theoretical paper typically would be considered time-consuming and substantive and would reduce the expectation for quantity of empirical publications. It is also expected that a faculty member promoted to Associate Professor with tenure has demonstrated adequate or better performance in teaching as described in the annual review criteria. A record of quality service to the department, college and/or university, professional associations, and appropriate communities is also expected. The candidate should have demonstrated collegiality and a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and missions of the department, college, and university.

### **Promotion to Professor**

**Eligibility for Promotion to Professor.** The department chair has the responsibility of initiating the promotion to Professor for eligible departmental faculty, although a faculty member may submit his or her name to the chair. Faculty members must meet the minimum eligibility requirements for Professor as delineated in the most recent *University of Memphis Faculty Handbook*. At the beginning of each fall semester, faculty going forward for promotion should be supplied with copies of the department, college, and university Tenure and Promotion Policies, review forms for promotion and tenure, and deadlines for submitting dossiers. The names of faculty members to be considered for promotion to Professor will be forwarded to the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee for Promotion to Professor. After receiving the recommendations of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee, the chair will make his/her own recommendation and forward both recommendations to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

**Dossier for Promotion to Professor.** Each candidate must present a dossier of materials in support of the promotion prepared according to format described above under Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, as well as appropriate supporting materials such as the documented evidence of quality in scholarship, teaching, and service listed under Annual Review above. Supporting materials should emphasize accomplishments since the last promotion, and the inclusion of non-essential documents is discouraged. The candidate, in close consultation with the department chair (or department member appointed by the chair), prepares the appropriate review forms and the dossier to be submitted.

**Evaluation for Promotion to Professor.** To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the candidate must have an established record of distinguished empirical scholarship that has resulted in national or international scholarly recognition. The scholarship will be evidenced by publications, either articles in scholarly peer-reviewed journals or well-received books. The quality of scholarship will be judged by internal faculty assessments and statements from external peer referees, who are to be selected utilizing the process described above under Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Although not an absolute requirement for promotion to professor, publishing in top-tier peer-reviewed journals in one's area is considered an especial mark of quality. In general, the faculty member will also be expected to have made

distinguished contributions to one or more theoretically-based lines of inquiry and to have utilized sophisticated research designs to extend the research in this area or these areas. A substantial number of lead-author or first-author peer-reviewed publications is also expected. It is recognized that different products and types of research require different time investments, and this will be considered when evaluating the candidate's materials. For example, a meta-analysis, longitudinal study, major theoretical paper, or major book typically would be considered time-consuming and substantive and would reduce the expectation for quantity of empirical publications. It is also expected that a faculty member promoted to Professor has demonstrated adequate or better performance in teaching as described in the annual review criteria. A record of quality service to the department, college and/or university, professional associations, and appropriate communities is also expected. The candidate should have demonstrated collegiality and a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and missions of the department, college, and university.

### **Clinical Professors**

**General Criteria for Appointment to Clinical Positions.** Both tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty are expected to exhibit high standards of professional performance, integrity, and collegiality and to further the goals of their department and college. In addition, a clinical faculty member must have an appropriate degree, or its equivalent in training and experience; a strong commitment to higher education and in particular to the mission of the University of Memphis, and a willingness to assume the responsibilities and obligations appropriate to a professional or faculty university employee. The following criteria are utilized for appointments in clinical professor positions:

1. Clinical Instructor: A faculty member with a minimum of a professional master's degree appropriate for the discipline, who possesses the potential for successful performance in clinical or service activity in a university environment.
2. Assistant Clinical Professor: A faculty member with a terminal degree in the discipline, who possesses the potential for successful performance in clinical or service activity in a university environment.
3. Associate Clinical Professor: A faculty member who has met the criteria for Assistant Clinical Professor and has consistently demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in clinical or service activity.
4. Clinical Professor: A faculty member who has demonstrated sustained excellence in clinical or service activity.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Non-Tenure Track Clinical and Research Faculty.** Clinical faculty appointments are non-tenure track positions that are renewed annually based on annual evaluations of performance in the activities delineated in the faculty member's contract. Clinical faculty members engage in clinical service duties such as training, supervision, and coordination; outreach and liaison work with community organizations; teaching; research mentoring; and scholarly activities as specified in their contracts. Generally, clinical faculty members are hired primarily to provide clinically-related service and teaching. Hence, a relatively high proportion of their time is spent on service and teaching, and a smaller proportion of their time is spent on research. Both evaluation and promotion criteria are based on this time allocation.

**Evaluation categories for annual review of service.** The following five descriptive categories should be used as a guide to evaluate the annual service accomplishments of clinical faculty members. However, the chair and the faculty member should consider the general pattern and quality of service, the time assigned, and rank. Comparisons should be made not relative to the entire department but to other clinical faculty members of similar rank. It should be emphasized that quality of service is more important than quantity.

- **Exceptional:** Exceptional Service consists of unusual breadth or depth of high-quality service. This could be demonstrated by a combination of excellence in performance of the service duties stipulated in the employment contract and by excellence in additional duties taken on by the faculty member (e.g., chairing a national committee or organization; leading a university task force; establishing relationships with multiple community organizations; taking multiple leadership positions at the department, college, university, community, or professional level; spearheading or implementing discipline-relevant projects that aid the university, community, or profession; or other service to regional, national, or international professional associations and organizations).
- **Very Good:** Very good service exceeds the normal expected level. It typically will be similar to service characterized as exceptional, but somewhat less extensive, or it may involve fewer activities or activities requiring less time.
- **Good:** A good level of service is evidenced by clearly meeting the service expectations delineated in the clinical faculty member's employment contract. Generally this would be demonstrated by a combination of service to the department, college, university, community, and profession.
- **Needs Improvement:** Needs improvement would be reflected in a considerably below average level of quantity or quality of service in the preceding year. This may be evidenced by a failure to carry out some duties stipulated in the employment contract.
- **Failure to Meet Responsibilities.** Failure to meet responsibilities consists of gross negligence or persistent neglect of service despite feedback from the department chair. This may be demonstrated by failure to carry out multiple duties stipulated in the employment contract or by poor quality of service as demonstrated by extensive and persistent negative feedback from organizations, faculty, or community members.

**Evaluation categories for annual review of teaching.** Clinical faculty are expected to maintain a standard teaching load, or the load stipulated in their contracts. Evaluation and promotion criteria for teaching performance of clinical faculty are identical to evaluation and promotion criteria for teaching performance of tenure-track professors, described above.

**Evaluation categories for annual review of scholarship.** Clinical faculty are expected to stay current in their discipline and to conduct a level of scholarship sufficient to maintain graduate faculty status and consistent with the percentage of planned effort stipulated in the Faculty Planning Form. The following five descriptive categories should be used as a guide. However, the chair and the faculty member should consider the general pattern of scholarship, the quality of the product, the time assigned, and rank. Comparisons should be made not relative to the entire department but to other clinical faculty. It should be emphasized that quality of scholarship is more important than quantity.



- **Exceptional:** Exceptional performance in scholarly accomplishments over the preceding year would consist of a very high level of scholarship evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments with supporting evidence indicating a high quality of work. Exceptional scholarship significantly exceeds the level of accomplishment stipulated in the yearly faculty plan.
- **Very Good:** Very good performance in scholarly accomplishments over the preceding year would consist of a high level of scholarship evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments with supporting evidence indicating a high quality of work. Very good scholarship exceeds the level of accomplishment stipulated in the yearly faculty plan.
- **Good:** Good performance in scholarship over the preceding year would consist of a solid level of scholarship sufficient to maintain graduate faculty status, evident through a combination of major, secondary, and other accomplishments. Good scholarship meets the level of accomplishment stipulated in the yearly faculty plan.
- **Needs Improvement:** Needs Improvement in scholarship over the preceding year would consist of an inadequate level of scholarship as reflected in a low quantity and/or quality of major, secondary, and other accomplishments. Needs Improvement indicates scholarship that fails to meet the level of accomplishment stipulated in the yearly faculty plan.
- **Failure to Meet Responsibilities:** Failure to meet responsibilities over the preceding year would consist of persistent negligence in scholarship that consistently fails to meet the level of accomplishment stipulated in the yearly faculty plan.

### **Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty appointments may be assigned the ranks of clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor. Full-time, non-tenure track clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion consideration according to the following schedule:

- After three years in the rank of clinical instructor and attainment of a terminal degree, the faculty member is eligible for promotion to clinical assistant professor;
- After five years in the rank of clinical assistant professor, the faculty member is eligible for promotion to clinical associate professor;
- After five years in the rank of clinical associate professor, the faculty member is eligible for promotion to clinical professor.

This promotion schedule may be shortened with the concurrence of the department and the dean of the College of Education

From time to time, clinical faculty may become eligible for tenure-track positions. In these cases, the faculty member may be given credit for time in rank as a clinical or research professor, or may be given credit for previous experience at other institutions.

Clinical and research faculty serving on non-tenure contracts will be evaluated for promotion based on success in their assigned responsibilities in service, teaching, and scholarship as depicted in their job description and yearly contract, and as evaluated by criteria enumerated

above, as well as by their collegiality. Application for promotion is initiated at the department level by the department chair and follows a review process identical to the review process of tenure-track faculty, delineated above. Promotional criteria for clinical faculty are as follows.

**Evaluation for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor.** To be recommended for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, the candidate must have an established record of high-quality clinical service that clearly meets the service expectations delineated in his or her employment contract. Additionally, the candidate must have at least adequate teaching ratings, and must have demonstrated a record of empirical scholarship that at minimum meets the criteria for maintaining graduate faculty status.

**Evaluation for Promotion to Clinical Professor.** To be recommended for promotion to Clinical Professor, the candidate must have demonstrated a sustained record of outstanding or distinguished service that goes beyond the criteria stipulated in his/her annual contract. In addition, the candidate must have established a record of empirical scholarship that has resulted in national or international scholarly recognition, as evidenced by peer-reviewed journal publications or well-received books. The quality of scholarship will be judged by internal faculty assessments and statements from external peer referees, who are to be selected utilizing the process described above under Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. It is also expected that a faculty member promoted to Professor has demonstrated adequate or better performance in teaching as described in the annual review criteria. The candidate should have demonstrated collegiality and a willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and missions of the department, college, and university.

### **Non-Renewal of Clinical Faculty Appointments**

Clinical faculty are subject to non-renewal of their appointments with appropriate notice. The non-renewal or non-reappointment of any faculty member on a clinical appointment does not necessarily carry an implication of unsatisfactory work or conduct. A faculty member whose clinical appointment is not renewed will be given an oral statement of the reason(s) and an opportunity for discussion with the president or the president's representative.

Clinical faculty whose annual appointments will not be renewed will be given written notice of non-renewal of their appointment contracts in conformance with the following schedule:

- Not later than April 1 of the first academic year of service if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment expires during an academic year, at least two months in advance of the expiration date.
- Not later than January 1 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment expires during the academic year, at least five months in advance of the expiration date.
- Not later than May 15 preceding the third or subsequent year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if the appointment expires during the academic year, at least twelve months in advance of the expiration date.

Notice of non-renewal becomes effective on personal delivery of the written notice to the faculty member, or on the date the notice is mailed to the faculty member's home address of record, whichever first occurs. Dates for notice of non-renewal are not affected by any credit for prior service. Failure to give timely notice of non-renewal of a contract will not result in a tenured appointment, but the faculty member will be eligible for an additional one year, nonrenewable appointment.

Faculty members on clinical appointments will not be terminated during the term of their appointments except for reasons that would be sufficient for the termination of tenured faculty. The same procedures for the termination of a tenured faculty member are followed to dismiss a clinical faculty member for cause prior to the expiration of the one-year term of the appointment.