

**Personnel Document on  
Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards  
for  
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual  
Review of Faculty and Professional Staff  
Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences  
University of Arkansas**

This document governs Fulbright College procedures in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to and evaluation of faculty and in the selection and evaluation of non-classified staff, effective January 1, 1999. It has been approved by the Fulbright College faculty, the Dean of Fulbright College, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These College policies are supplemented by policies of the departments in the College and are required to be consistent with the policies of the University, as set forth in three campus policy statements, those on (1) University Professorships, (2) Distinguished Professorships, and (3) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion and Tenure and a Board of Trustees policy, 405.1. In case of conflict, the Board Policy, the campus policy, the College policy, and the department policy will have authority, in that order. Copies of the campus and board policy documents are published annually in the Faculty Handbook, but revisions occur regularly and care should be taken to consult the current document. A copy of the current Faculty Review Checklist is also printed in the Faculty Handbook.

Signed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bernard L. Madison, Dean

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel D. Bennett  
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

\_\_\_\_\_  
John A. White, Chancellor

\_\_\_\_\_  
B. Alan Sugg, President

Rev. copy 12/98

# **FULBRIGHT COLLEGE GUIDELINES ON INITIAL APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF FACULTY AND APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences seeks excellence in its faculty and staff appointments and programs in accordance with the accepted standards of the larger scholarly community of which it is part. The College accepts an obligation to provide benchmarks for quality in scholarship and education in the University and in the State, and it seeks to enhance the national and international reputation of the University through its programs of teaching, research, and service. Faculty and staff members of the College are expected to perform according to the standards accepted by their respective disciplines or professions and in accordance with the commonly accepted professional and ethical practices of the larger academic community.

Faculty and staff performances are evaluated each year by the departments in the College, and recommendations for promotion and tenure originate in the departments and are reviewed by the College. College policies on faculty service are designed to recognize and reward meritorious performances by reappointments, salary raises, promotion, and granting of tenure. Needs of the programs, departments, College, and University, and how those needs are being met by faculty and staff performances, will be primary considerations in personnel decisions. Reappointments and tenure decisions will consider a faculty member's demonstrated willingness to work productively with colleagues in developing and maintaining programs. Attainment of tenure requires a high standard of performance in both research (or creative or artistic endeavors) and teaching and a clear indication that such a performance level will be maintained over a career as a faculty member here.

All decisions in selection, retention, promotion, and termination of faculty that are not based on financial exigency or change of departmental programs shall be made solely on the basis of professional merit, quality of contribution to the University, and the competent and regular performance of assigned duties. Judgments may not be based on attributes of the candidate that are irrelevant to professional performance, such as race, color, religion, gender, sexual preference, national origin, handicap, or veteran's status.

## **2. RESPONSIBILITIES**

The principal responsibility for implementing these guidelines and formulating departmental recommendations rests with the department chairs and the Dean of the College. However, each department's procedures must provide a means for expression of tenured and tenure-track faculty opinions and advice to the chair on personnel decisions concerning annual performance reviews and recommendations for initial appointments, reappointments, tenure, promotion, and emeritus status. In addition, each department shall provide a faculty committee (or committees) to consider appeals by faculty members of personnel decisions made by the chair. Committees that consider appeals of a

chair's decision shall be selected by a process independent of the chair.

Making faculty work assignments is a specific duty of the department chair. Faculty who feel that they have been unfairly dealt with may appeal directly to the Dean. The department chair is also responsible for monitoring and overseeing post-tenure review processes.

The faculty of each department of the College shall elect a peer review committee composed of departmental tenured or tenure-track faculty to review each faculty member's performance; this evaluation must be included in the annual review materials considered by the chair. In the case of post-tenure review, the peer review committee must be composed of tenured faculty only. Recommendations for promotion or tenure from a department faculty should be formulated by tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Although the advice and counsel of temporary faculty members are welcomed, they should not directly influence matters that affect the long-range future of department or College programs.

At the College level, the elected College Personnel Committee<sup>1</sup> will serve to advise the Dean on personnel decisions, including appeals of decisions at either the department level or the College level. Only tenured faculty will be eligible to serve on the College Personnel Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fulbright College Personnel Committee consists of five faculty members, one from each of the College's three groups of departments and two at large. Each member serves a term of two years. The committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Dean on personnel matters. (Source: "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Organization." 1970.)

### **3. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENTS**

Departments are required to have approved "Standards, Criteria, and Procedures for Initial Appointment, Evaluation, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" documents containing:

1. Standards for initial appointment of faculty in all ranks used in the department, including visiting, research, adjunct, and emeritus ranks;
2. Criteria and procedures for an annual review and evaluation of the work and status of each faculty member;
3. Criteria/standards for reappointment;
4. Criteria and procedures for promotion; and
5. Criteria and procedures for the granting of tenure.

Recommendations on initial appointments will be forwarded to the College by the department chairs. Department procedures for formulating such recommendations will provide for participation by tenured and tenure-track faculty members or a committee of these faculty members charged with that responsibility.

Each new faculty member must receive copies of items 2, 3, 4, and 5 above no later than 30 days after the effective date of the initial appointment. No later than 30 days after the beginning of each

appointment year (either fiscal or academic), each faculty member must receive written notification of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, instruments, and assignments for the current year as outlined in the above four items and the current Faculty Handbook.

A program of active scholarship is considered essential for effective and inspired teaching, and each faculty member on appointment in the College is expected to engage in a program of personal scholarship or creative or artistic endeavors and to be active in professional activities of his/her academic discipline. Such programs are assumed for all faculty appointees, particularly in those faculty ranks described below, even if the principal responsibilities may be teaching or service.

Each department document must contain the criteria and standards for initial appointment, tenure, and promotion to the regular ranks used in that department. These ranks include Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Department documents may also include criteria and standards for appointments to the positions of University Professor and Distinguished Professor, provided that the criteria and standards are consistent with those stated below. The ranks of Lecturer and Instructor are used in some departments. The following are general descriptions of uses of various faculty and professional staff titles, ranks, and positions. Department documents may add to these descriptions, but if they do not, then these describe how the titles are used within departments.

**Lecturer** – Appointments are temporary, usually for one semester or one year, and may be full time or part time. Normally, appointees will hold a master’s degree or equivalent. Evidence of potential for excellence in teaching is required, as the duty of appointees is primarily teaching.

**Instructor** – Appointments are temporary, usually for one semester or one year, and may be full time or part time. A master’s degree or equivalent is required, and study beyond the master’s level is desired. Evidence of potential for excellence in teaching is required, as is evidence of continuing professional and scholarly interest in the academic discipline of the appointment.

**Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor** – These ranks are used for temporary appointments for one semester or one year of persons who meet the general criteria and standards for appointment to the corresponding professorial rank without the prefix of “Visiting.” Appointments at these ranks are to be used to enrich the learning and research environment through temporary appointments of scholar-teachers who normally have permanent employment elsewhere.

**Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor** – These ranks are used to appoint for specified periods, usually one semester or one year, persons who meet and normally exceed the criteria and standards in research/creativity for appointment at the corresponding professorial rank without the prefix “Research.” Appointments at these ranks are to be used principally to further the research mission of the University.

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor** – These ranks are used to establish official association of a teacher-scholar-artist with a department in the College to accomplish some specific purpose for a specified time. Appointments must be renewed annually and are usually without salary. An appointment to an adjunct title requires meeting the criteria and standards for appointment to the rank without the prefix “Adjunct.”

**Emeritus ranks** – Emeritus ranks are conferred by the Board of Trustees according to Board policies. Recommendations for appointments to emeritus ranks originate with departmental faculties, and a positive recommendation requires meritorious service at the rank and at lower faculty ranks for an appropriate number of years, as specified by Board policies.

**Post-Doctoral Appointees** – These appointees are usually made in one of the visiting or research professorial ranks described above or in the professional staff position of Research Associate (see below). The purpose of post-doctoral appointments is for training of the appointee beyond the doctorate degree and for furthering the research and teaching missions of the University.

**Graduate Teaching Assistant** – Appointments of Graduate Teaching Assistants are made to graduate students enrolled in College programs. Appointees are expected to be full-time graduate students and are usually appointed for 50% of full time with duties of teaching under the supervision of faculty members, assisting faculty members with teaching, or tutoring.

**Graduate Research Assistant** – Appointments of Graduate Research Assistants are made to graduate students enrolled in College programs. Appointees are expected to be full-time graduate students and are usually appointed for 50% of full time with duties of research under the supervision of faculty members or assisting faculty members with research.

### **Positions of University Professor and Distinguished Professor**

To be appointed to a position as University Professor or Distinguished Professor in Fulbright College, a candidate must satisfy the following criteria. Departments may add to these criteria.

**University Professor** – Appointees must have achieved sustained excellent performances in teaching, research (or creative or artistic endeavors), and professional, public, and University service. Normally candidates for University Professor will have achieved such performances at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

**Distinguished Professor** – Appointees must have gained national or international recognition in their academic disciplines for extraordinary accomplishments in teaching and research (or creative or artistic endeavors).

### **Professional Staff Titles**

**Research Associate** – Appointees as Research Associates are expected to conduct independent research or direct development in conjunction with faculty or student research projects. Normally, graduate degrees in the discipline of the research projects are required in addition to significant experience in research and development.

**Research Assistant** – Appointees as Research Assistants are expected to assist faculty members and graduate students in the conducting of research or to perform duties that directly support research projects. Normally, a master's degree is required in addition to some experience in the duty areas of the appointment.

**Assistant Dean** – Assistant Deans are appointed to assist in administration of the College in the areas of budget management, academic programs coordination and support, personnel management and evaluation, externally sponsored programs management, and student affairs. Baccalaureate degrees

are required and graduate degree holders are preferred in addition to experience in the relevant duty areas.

#### 4. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS, REAPPOINTMENTS, AND SALARY INCREASES

The chair is responsible for initiating and conducting the evaluation of each faculty member in his or her department and for initiating the process of deciding whether to recommend reappointment of each non-tenured but tenure-track faculty member. However, the chair’s recommendation regarding reappointment is to be made only after consultation with the appropriate department faculty and with the faculty member involved.

When it becomes necessary to recommend non-reappointment of a tenure-track but non-tenured faculty member, the procedures and deadlines described by Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1 must be followed in every detail. The department chair recommends non-reappointment by a letter to the Dean with a copy to the candidate. Assuming agreement, the Dean sends a letter of non-reappointment to the candidate with copies to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the department chair.

All appointed non-tenured faculty in continuing positions should be notified of reappointment recommendations on a schedule that conforms to that of Board Policy 405.1 However, for temporary faculty members who are appointed for terms of a year or less, the letters of appointment will serve as notification by specifying the terms and responsibilities of the appointments and stating that the contracts do not extend beyond the end of the appointment period. (Such a statement does not preclude future appointments.) When such letters are sent by a department chair, a copy should be sent to the Dean.

*Summary of Deadlines for Recommendations on Reappointment of Non-Tenured, Non-Temporary Faculty Members*

<b>Year of Service</b>	<b>Letter to Dean</b>	<b>Letter to Faculty Member</b>
First Year	Two weeks prior to notifying faculty member	90 days in advance of date employment ceases
Second Year	Two weeks prior to notifying faculty member	180 days in advance of date employment ceases
Third or later year	Two weeks prior to notifying faculty member	One year in advance of date employment ceases

#### **B. Pre-Tenure Reviews**

During the period that a faculty member spends in a non-tenured, tenure-track position, a thorough review of the faculty member’s professional career will be conducted at least every third year. The

purpose of the review will be to assess the candidate's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure, and to provide him or her with advice and analysis resulting from the review. The results of pre-tenure reviews and subsequent response in faculty performances will be very important in future deliberations on reappointments and awarding tenure.

### **C. Annual Review of Faculty and Salary Increases**

#### Evaluation System Guidelines

##### *1. General*

a. Salary increases shall be considered annually for each faculty member; such increases shall be considered without regard to discipline, department, or program. Salary increases are to be based on individual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, scholarship (including research and creative or artistic endeavors), and service. Normally, the weighting of a faculty member's evaluations will be 40% teaching, 40% research/creativity, and 20% service. Weightings different from these require justification by departmental or college assignments, recommendation by the department, and approval by the Dean.

b. Department chairs shall submit recommendations and supporting statements to be used for determining salary increases for each person according to guidelines supplied by the Dean and developed in consultation with the College Personnel Committee. Such recommendations should be suitable for conversion to salary increases.

##### *2. Departmental*

a. The annual faculty résumé update is required of each faculty member. This résumé update serves as a standard source of information to the department, the chair, and the Dean in developing their recommendations.

b. Department chairs have the responsibility for making salary increase recommendations to the Dean. These should include any advisory recommendations made by the departmental peer review committee.

c. Each department peer review committee (see Section II) shall provide a peer review of each faculty member's performance. That evaluation shall be included in the chair's annual review of all faculty.

d. Faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research and scholarly activity (or artistic accomplishment and performance), and service/administration should be rated on a common scale for the College and reported as part of the recommendation.

e. The ratings in the separate areas of teaching, research, and service are to be combined, along with any special considerations, to form an overall recommendation, using a common combined scale for the College.

f. Since faculty performance cannot adequately be expressed by any single or multiple set of ratings, the recommendations from the department chair shall include statements supporting the recommendations. The supporting statements should be concise but contain sufficient information to facilitate an assessment of the ratings by the Dean.

g. Campus policies require that students be afforded the opportunity to evaluate each class and that a summary of student perceptions be incorporated into the evaluation of faculty performances. These summaries are to be part of the materials considered by the chairs in annual reviews.

h. Candidates may supply any materials they choose but in the format prescribed.

### *3. Evaluation Areas: Teaching, Research, and Service*

In each of the evaluation areas of teaching, research, and service, the qualitative evaluation of the College faculty members will be based on high national standards of excellence. Teaching, research, and service are lifelong pursuits that are difficult to compartmentalize into twelve-month periods. While evaluations should emphasize the performance during the previous year, past patterns of performance and, for new faculty, estimates of future promise should also be considered.

Each department shall develop guidelines that indicate specific performance criteria for each range of scores in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. These guidelines will be reviewed at the College level to promote uniformly high standards and equitable application across the College.

#### **a. Teaching**

Qualitative Evaluation 0 to 10

The quality of teaching is the primary consideration for merit ratings in teaching. Teaching activities include classroom and laboratory assignments; supervision of graduate theses, honors projects, senior theses, and independent study projects or courses; advising of students; supervision of interns; presentation of workshops; and other pedagogical efforts.

0 to below 3: Unsatisfactory performance (see section V.E.). A rating of zero will be given when no material on teaching is presented for review. A rating of zero may also be given to faculty who refuse to participate in the evaluation of their teaching; for derelict performance, including such things as not holding class; or for refusing a reasonable teaching assignment. Ratings of under 3 may indicate such things as exceptionally low student evaluations or substantial and continued written student complaints.

3 and above: Scores awarded for acceptable performance.

4 - 7: Scores in this range reflect average and above average performance.

8 - 10: Scores in this range are reserved for excellence as evidenced by teaching awards; student success in honors, theses, awards, or publications; outside evaluations by educational bodies; or other criteria developed by the department.

Departments are encouraged to delineate special considerations, such as teaching a course for the first time, difficulty of course content, and grade distributions.

#### **b. Research (or Creative or Scholarly Activity, or Artistic Accomplishment)**

The quality of research performed, or of creative or artistic activity, is the primary consideration for the merit rating in research. Department guidelines concerning quality should fit within the following general guidelines:

Ratings from 0 to 10 should indicate progressively increasing evidence of recognition for research or creative endeavors. Such evidence includes awards and prizes; publication of results; invitations to lecture, exhibit, or perform; and competitive grant support of work.

0 to below 3: Unsatisfactory performance (see section V.E.). A rating of zero will be given when no evidence of research or artistic/creative achievement is presented for review. A rating of 0 may be given when no evidence of research/creative achievement exists or when a faculty member refuses to submit such evidence; or for breaches of professional ethics, such as plagiarism or falsifying research. A rating of under 3 indicates substandard research typified by few if any attempts to participate in research activity.

3 and above: Scores awarded for acceptable performance.

4 - 7: Ratings of 4 to 7 require publication of research results in books or peer-reviewed journals, or artistic creativity widely known in the region, or evidence of significant progress on major projects. Award of competitive external funds, invited participation in workshops or professional meetings, or in-person presentations that are screened or selected will be considered as positive evaluations of work in progress.

8 - 10: Ratings of 8 to 10 require evidence of national recognition for excellence indicated by a track record of publication in well-known, national or international journals or in books that are favorably recognized (e.g., published by well-known, respected publishing houses and/or reviewed and deemed highly significant after publication); invitations to participate in national or international meetings, exhibitions, or performances; and a record of sustained competitive funding (where relevant).

Department guidelines should address the issues of journal quality, publishing house quality, quality of performance or exhibition sites, and competitive nature of funding sources.

### **c. Service**

#### **Qualitative Evaluation 0 to 10**

Evaluation of service is an assessment of the quality of academically related efforts devoted to department, College, and University activities; professional societies and organizations; local, state, national, or international governing or advisory boards and committees; and similar not-for-profit contributions of a community, educational, or professional nature.

0 to below 3: Unsatisfactory performance (see section V.E.). A rating of 0 will be given when no evidence of service is presented for review. A rating of 0 may be given when no evidence of service exists or when a faculty member refuses to submit such evidence or to carry out assigned duties. A rating of under 3 indicates an unwillingness to serve.

3 and above: Scores awarded for acceptable performance.

4 - 7: Ratings of 4 to 7 are to be awarded for steady average and above average performance.

8 - 10: Ratings of 8 to 10 are to be awarded for excellent performance.

Variables for the evaluation of service shall include quality of performance, evidence of positive evaluation by peers for service activities (e.g., election to national office, service on review panels or editorial boards), awards, or other signs of recognition and contribution.

#### *4. Completing Evaluation of Faculty*

A form will be provided by the College for reporting the numerical evaluations of faculty members in each of the categories of teaching, research/creativity, and service. Each performance rating must be accomplished by an expository statement in support of the numerical assessment. Prior to submitting the forms to the College, the department must provide for a meeting between the chair and each faculty member to discuss the evaluation and to identify faculty development needs and problems in performances of the faculty member. The dates of such meetings and any unresolved disagreements should be recorded on the forms or in accompanying materials to be sent forward with the forms. A record of such meetings, including faculty development needs and problems in performances, must be made and kept as a part of the faculty member's personnel record. Appeals of the chair's evaluations are to be considered first by a designated department committee. If unresolved at the department level, the appeal can be made to the Dean but must be made within ten working days after the deadline for submission of the forms to the College. Recommendations for salary adjustments other than merit raises should be made separately and individually to the Dean by the department chair.

#### *5. Department Faculty Committee Evaluation*

When a department faculty committee formulates recommendations for faculty evaluations, the recommendations of the committee should be incorporated into the recommendations from the chair unless there is a serious unresolved difference of opinion between the chair and the committee. In those cases where the chair and the committee may have reached two very different conclusions concerning a particular faculty member's performance, two reports may be submitted.

### **5. PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Each faculty member who wants to be considered for promotion and/or tenure should submit materials according to the University's Faculty Review Checklist, following the format exactly. Since the Faculty Review Checklist must be used when nominations are submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, each chair shall ask that the original submissions follow this form. A complete résumé is also required at the College level. Though redundant in many respects, a résumé is considered essential by the Personnel Committee in evaluating candidates. Candidates may supply any materials they choose but in the format prescribed.

When a department chair is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean shall appoint a faculty member outside the department to chair the proceedings and serve all roles designated for the "department chair" in what follows. Otherwise, the procedures will be the same as for any faculty member.

#### *A. Extramural Evaluation*

To complete the package of materials supporting a candidate's nomination for promotion or tenure, the department chair must solicit evaluation letters of the candidate's record from three distinguished scholars or artists from other institutions comparable to or better than the University of Arkansas, at least in the candidate's academic discipline.

Evaluators shall be chosen for their recognized expertise in the candidate's field and their ability to provide objective evaluations of the candidate's work. Evaluators should not be close current or former research associates or co-authors, former dissertation or postdoctoral research advisors, or former students or teachers of the candidate. If a recommended evaluator does not meet these criteria, a thorough description of the past associations of the evaluator and the candidate must be included with the evaluation and the special circumstances involved must be thoroughly justified.

The selection of the extramural evaluators is to be made by the department chair (and the department personnel committee, where utilized) in consultation with the Dean. The candidate may suggest names to be included or specifically excluded from a list of potential evaluators, but these are to be non-binding suggestions only.

The chair writes letters requesting the evaluation of all three choices. Sample letters for tenure decisions and promotions are provided as Attachments A and B, and it is suggested that these letters be sent out no later than early September. Should an alternate to either sample letter be used, the Dean's approval is required in advance. It is important that the evaluators be asked whether the person being reviewed would be promoted and/or tenured at the evaluator's home institution, or if more appropriate, at a major public research university. The letters are to be returned directly to the chair and never to the candidate. All returned letters must become part of the candidate's evaluation package and must be forwarded to the Dean's Office and subsequent levels of administration. The evaluators should receive with the chair's letter this statement of College procedure, the candidate's publications or other evidence of scholarly production, and a résumé.

Extramural letters of evaluation should remain confidential and should be disclosed only to people involved in the review process. Anyone who sees letters as part of the evaluation process should be informed that the letters are confidential. Confidentiality is essential for candid evaluations. To maximize confidentiality, chairs should exercise caution and avoid proliferation of copies of confidential material. However, it is College policy that each faculty member be provided access to his or her own personnel file upon written request and that evaluators be informed of this when the letters are solicited.

### ***B. Deadline for Faculty***

No later than September 15, the chair shall inform in writing each faculty member who is being considered for promotion or tenure that he or she is being considered. No later than October 1, any faculty member (whether so informed or not) may request in writing to the chair to be nominated for promotion that year; such a request shall be honored by the chair. In order to obtain essential outside evaluation, chairs should begin these discussions with individual faculty earlier than September 15.

### ***C. Department Guidelines***

Each department will implement the procedures specified in its "Standards, Criteria, and Procedures for Initial Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure" document. The department personnel committee, or another faculty component consulted by the chair, may write a letter to the Dean (transmitted through the department chair) which states its recommendation for each candidate with an explanation to the Dean. (It should be noted that University policies require that the Chair obtain "written advice of either an elected unit committee or another group selected pursuant to

procedures established by the faculty and chairperson.” The permissive language in the previous sentence, which is taken from the Faculty Handbook, allows any faculty component that is consulted by the chair to transmit a written analysis to be considered by the Dean, but the only written analysis required to be sent to the Dean is that from the Chair.) The explanation should provide an evaluation of the record that includes an analysis of the applicant’s total performance and rate of production in relation to the expected norms of the discipline. The chair will notify the candidate in writing of the chair’s recommendation and that of any faculty committee before forwarding the materials to the Dean’s Office. If either of the recommendations is not favorable, the chair must provide the reasons to the candidate. At this point, the candidate has the option of withdrawing from further consideration. If the materials are forwarded, they should consist of the following: the materials supplied by the candidate, the extramural evaluation letters with the referees’ credentials and copies of the chair’s letters to the referees, any faculty recommendation with justification, the chair’s recommendation with justification, any response to department recommendations that may be submitted by the candidate, department criteria and procedures used, records of annual evaluations since last promotion, records of pre-promotional or pre-tenure reviews with advice and analysis provided to the candidate, a complete résumé, and the forms required by the University.

The letter submitted by the department chair should focus on the specifics of the applicant’s record, expand on items of special significance, and indicate those areas of less obvious importance. This also applies to any letter(s) submitted by department committees. The comments should include but not be limited to the following:

- a. The qualitative evaluation of teaching and its relationship to student or peer ratings;
- b. The expected rate of scholarly or artistic activity (e.g., publications, exhibits, or performances per year, grants) since hiring or last promotion;
- c. Notation and full explanation of scholarly or artistic activity;
- d. Descriptions of evidence for regional, national, and international distinction;
- e. Statement of expectations for outside funding in candidate’s discipline;
- f. Explanation of the contribution of the applicant to coauthored publications and presentations, and a statement of the professional nature and significance of the contributions;
- g. Where relevant, the role of the applicant in the department’s undergraduate and graduate programs and any limitations on participation due to circumstances in the discipline or department; and
- h. Discussion of publication or performance record to indicate the quality, the mechanism of review, and the acceptance by the field.

#### ***D. Dean’s Office Guidelines***

As a part of the procedure for a faculty member being considered for tenure, the Dean expects to visit one of the candidate’s classes at a mutually convenient time arranged through the chair of the department. Early in the fall semester, the chair should check with concerned faculty for suggested visiting times, and call the Dean’s Office to make the final arrangements. Normally the chair will plan to accompany the Dean to the class. This visit is symbolic of the importance the College attaches to effective teaching as a minimum requirement for tenure.

The complete materials must be in the Dean’s office by approximately November 1. (The exact deadline will be specified each year.) The Dean of Fulbright College submits the materials for promotion and tenure to the elected College Personnel Committee shortly after their receipt. The

College Personnel Committee will review the case for each candidate and make a recommendation with justification to the Dean. After conferring with the Personnel Committee, the Dean will inform the candidate of his recommendation before forwarding any materials to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If the candidate is not satisfied with the recommendation of the Dean, then he/she may appeal within ten working days of written notification by the Dean. The candidate may withdraw from further consideration by notifying the Dean in writing prior to the deadline for the Dean's recommendations to be in the Office of Academic Affairs. (The exact date will be specified each year.)

Prior to forwarding any recommendation and rationale or materials to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean must report his or her decision to the candidate and the chair of the candidate's department.

### ***E. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review***

When the annual review of a tenured faculty member results in an overall rating of less than 3 (unsatisfactory) in two consecutive annual reviews, or in three of five consecutive annual reviews, a professional development plan to improve that faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level must be developed.

At the beginning of the calendar year, faculty required to construct a professional development plan must complete this plan by July 1, for 12-month employees, or by August 15 for 9-month employees. During this period, faculty may also file grievances against the unsatisfactory rating, if desired.

The professional development plan is a process for improving the faculty member's performance in teaching and/or research/creative activities, and/or service over a period of three years (or fewer, if the faculty member requests it). The plan is to be developed by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair and the department peer review committee. The plan should contain clear indications of what satisfactory performance is and the methods by which those levels of performance will be obtained. The plan must also contain a list of resources that will be used and a statement of expected results. These resources could include, but are not limited to, Off-Campus Duty assignments, workshops on or off campus, or leaves of absence to obtain new skills. Development plans that in effect say no more than "I am going to work harder" will be rejected.

In some cases, a change in the weighting of the faculty member's evaluations may also be used to shift the emphasis in performance to the existing skills of the faculty member. In such cases, a clear change in the work assignment should be evident in the development plan. In addition, levels of performance higher than minimally satisfactory will be expected.

The development plan is to be submitted by the department chair to the Dean for approval. The Dean has the option of assigning "advisors" from departments outside that of the faculty member's to assist in executing the development plan.

Once the plan is initiated, the faculty member's annual review will be based on this plan as well as the annual merit evaluation ratings assigned by the chair and the panel of faculty overseeing the development plan. If the faculty member fails to demonstrate the required improvement at the

termination of the plan, the Dean may recommend a one-year terminal contract and dismissal for cause, following the dismissal process outlined in Board Policy 405.1 (as defined in Section IV.C of the policy).