

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Personnel Document
On Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards
for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,
Annual and Post-tenure Review,
Promotion and Tenure

University of Arkansas
School of Social Work

This document governs the School in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty effective as of the date of the president's approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the School of Social Work, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure, (2) Guidelines on University and Distinguished Professors Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the UA web site <https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook>.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

APPROVALS	
<u>Kimberly Stauss</u> Chair	<u>02-01-2021</u> Date
<u>T. Shields</u> Dean	<u>2-9-21</u> Date
_____ Provost	_____ Date
_____ Chancellor	_____ Date
_____ President	_____ Date

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Mission Statement

The mission of the School of Social Work is to improve the lives of vulnerable persons, families, groups, organizations and communities, especially those in economic risk. We achieve this mission by using evidence-based practices to educate social work leaders/practitioners; emphasizing critical thinking and self-awareness; facilitating collaborative relationships in the community; and conducting original research.

I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service

Academic Policy Series 1405.11 (APS 1405.11. I.B.) defines the structure and responsibilities of the following unit levels committees: The Unit Peer Review Committee, The Unit Tenured Faculty, The Unit Promoted Faculty, and The Unit Personnel Committee.

The School of Social Work adopts **Section I of APS 1405.11**. The School elects to have two committees: the Personnel Committee and the Unit Peer Review Committee. The Personnel Committee will review the promotion and tenure, 3rd year review packets, and the multi-year appointments and will make a recommendation to the Chair/Director. The Unit Peer Review Committee will review all the full-time faculty annual review documents and will make a recommendation to the Chair/Director. The Unit Review Committee will also perform other functions as defined in the **APS 1405.11. including section B.11**.

Personnel Committees

During the academic years when a TT faculty is considered for promotion and/or tenure or their 3rd year review, three tenured faculty at the associate rank or above will be elected by the T/TT faculty. The tenured faculty with the most votes will serve as the chair of this committee. During the academic years when a NTT is considered for promotion, multi-year appointment, including a 3rd year review, if the School has at least two NTT faculty eligible, two clinical faculty at the rank of associate professor or above will also be elected by the NTT faculty to serve on this committee. The Personnel Committee members will be elected only if a TT or NTT is going up for promotion and/or tenure, or 3rd year review, or if a NTT faculty applies for a multi-year appointment. All voting members of the faculty are defined in APS 1405.11. The elected members of the Personnel Committee will serve a one-year term but they can serve successive terms.

Unit Peer Review Committee

For the annual review and evaluation process, a Unit Peer Review Committee will be elected every year. This committee will be composed of two tenured or tenure-track faculty (one of these has to be tenured), and one NTT faculty. The elected tenured faculty member will serve as the chair of this committee. If two tenured faculty members are elected the person with the most votes will serve as chair. Tenure-track and non-tenure-track assistant professors must have served three years at the School to be eligible to serve on the peer review committee. The elected faculty will serve a one-year term. They can serve successive terms. The School adopts APS 1405.11.III. C.2. to define eligible voting faculty.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

The general responsibilities of the Unit Peer Review Committee include making recommendations to the chair/director regarding annual reviews of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and all full-time non-tenure track faculty.

B. Personnel File

The School of Social Work personnel files reside in a locked file cabinet in the Chair/Director's office. While the School of Social Work has custody of these files, a faculty member may gain access to their file by submitting a written request to the Chair/Director. This file in the department serves as the official employment record.

II. Initial Appointment

APS 1405.11. II. defines Criteria for Initial Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor, Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor, and Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure. The School adopts the following documents regarding initial and successive appointments for non-tenure track faculty: APS 1405.11. II. D., APS 1405.11. III.A.2. and III. A.3., APS 1405.111, and the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

A. Initial Appointment at Various Ranks

The School of Social Work adopts the following evaluative criteria for initial appointment.

1. Lecturer: Must have either an MSW or Ph.D. in related field. School of Social Work part-time faculty members are expected to display a history of or promise for active personal and professional development, excellence in teaching and service, and collegiality.

2. Instructor: Must have either an MSW or Ph.D. in related field. School of Social Work faculty members are expected to display a history of or promise for active personal and professional development, excellence in teaching and service, collegiality, and have potential to engage in personal and/or collaborative scholarship, and/or creative activity and to promote and contribute to the profession's development.

3. Assistant Professor: To be appointed to a TT position, the faculty member must have a Ph.D. in Social Work or a related field. To be appointed to a NTT position, the faculty member must have an MSW or Ph.D. in a related field. School of Social Work faculty members are expected to display a history of or promise for active personal and professional development, excellence in teaching and service, collegiality, and have potential to engage in personal and/or collaborative scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and to promote and contribute to the profession's development.

4. Associate Professor: To be appointed to a TT position, the faculty member must have a Ph.D. in Social Work or a related field. To be appointed to a NTT position, the faculty member must have an MSW or Ph.D. in a related field. School of Social Work faculty members are expected to display a history of active personal and professional development, excellence in teaching and service, collegiality, and history of engaging in personal and/or collaborative

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and to promote and contribute to the profession's development.

5. Professor: To be appointed to a TT position, the faculty member must have a Ph.D. in Social Work or a related field. To be appointed to a NTT position, the faculty member must have an MSW or Ph.D. in a related field. School of Social Work faculty members are expected to display a history of active personal and professional development, excellence in teaching and service, collegiality, and history of engaging in personal and/or collaborative scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and to promote and contribute to the profession's development.

B. Workload Assignments

The School adopts **Section III. A of APS 1405.11**. The standard workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is, 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% academic service. The standard workload for non-tenure-track teaching faculty at assistant or higher rank is 80% teaching, and 20% service. The standard workload for non-tenure-track teaching faculty at instructor rank is 80% teaching and 20% service. To fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interests of the department, the chair/director may modify a faculty member's workload assignment and workload percentages (Academic Policy Series 1405.11. Section III.B.3.). The workload assignment might be revised, for example, due to externally funded research or administrative obligations. Adjustments to the typical workload may be requested by faculty, but are determined by the chair/director based on the best interests of the department.

III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer Review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review

A. Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenured-Track faculty.

The School adopts Section III. A of APS 1405.11.

B. Annual Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

The School adopts Section III. B of APS 1405.11. Also, Section III.C of 1405.11 stipulates that annual review process for full-time non-tenure track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty.

1. All faculty members are evaluated annually using the Fulbright College Annual Resume Update and Annual Evaluation forms and the "Evaluative Criteria" of the School described below. Each Social Work faculty member is evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of a) teaching, b) research or scholarly activities, and c) service. The Unit Peer Review Committee reviews these documents and makes its recommendation to the Chair/Director. The Chair/Director may forward a different recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by the Committee recommendation.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Each year, the Unit Peer Review Committee will designate a date in January that faculty will be required to turn in annual review materials. The specific date in January will be determined by the Unit Peer Review Committee based on the timeframe needed for the Chair/Director to review and provide the Annual Review Documents to Fulbright College. Each faculty member is to submit a review packet which includes an annual faculty resumé update, a self-evaluation and evidence supporting the evaluation rating. Peer evaluations of these materials will be made by the School's Unit Peer Review Committee using the criteria set forth in the School of Social Work and Fulbright College's Personnel Documents. The packet, along with the recommendations by the Unit Peer Review Committee, will be used by the Chair/Director to determine merit ratings in the areas of teaching, research and/or scholarly activities and service.

Prior to the completion of the annual evaluation (including any recommendations based on the evaluation) in any year, the Director/Chair shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. Tenured faculty and non-tenure-track faculty members at the rank of associate professor or above receiving a satisfactory evaluation may waive this required meeting. Tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty at the assistant professor rank are required to meet with the Chair/Director.

Per APS 1405.11. III. B 12. the Chair/Director must provide the draft of the intended evaluation and recommendations to the faculty member prior to submitting it to the dean. The faculty member shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response before the Chair/Director prepares their final recommendation.

Reappointment/Non-Reappointment

Per APS 1405.11. III. B. 11., the Chair/Director makes a recommendation regarding reappointment (including non-reappointment) of each tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty member. This recommendation is made only after considering the written report of the unit committee conducting the annual peer review and the vote of the tenured faculty.

2. Evaluative Criteria

Not every potential circumstance can be anticipated or included in these ratings recommendations for research/creative activity, teaching and service; in all categories the guidelines are not to be considered inclusive. Cases should include documentation highlighting the importance of the work. The goal is to maintain high standards of faculty performance, while allowing flexibility in the annual evaluation process. Potential scores are: 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5 or 3.0. Please follow guidelines below when assigning point values to the areas of Service, Teaching and Research. Faculty are also evaluated on their overall performance.

Service

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Exceeds Expectations (3)

Indicates excellence in service to include “meets expectations fully” and leadership role in or exceptional service that distinguishes the faculty member from colleagues; exceptional/meaningful service/ contributions to the School, college, university or the profession; or to an international/national/ regional/state organization, or through significant/exceptional public service. Examples may include a combination of the following: chairing of an ad-hoc committee; election to national or statewide office (ex. AR NASW) office; recognition by and contribution to the university and its mission as a land-grant institution; numerous community service contributions at the local, state, national and/or international level; chairing a search committee; chairing national committees; and/or winning a national service award or a University or College service award.

Meets Expectations Fully (2)

Indicates strong service to the School, college, university and/or academy. Service at this level includes a combination of the following: participation on required number of committees; and some community service contributions at the local, state, national and/or international level. Additional examples may include reviewing for peer reviewed journals or funding agencies.

Minimally Meets Expectations (1)

Indicates minimal or inadequate service at the School level. Limited, but acceptable service at the college, university, community or the profession level.

Does Not Meet Expectations (0)

Indicates little or no evidence of meaningful service is presented, little or no evidence of service exists or a faculty member refuses to submit such evidence or to carry out assigned duties or demonstrates an unwillingness to serve; little or no to the School, college, university, community or the profession.

Teaching

Exceeds Expectations (3)

Indicates excellence as evidenced by at least one of the following: teaching excellence evidenced by teaching awards; high student evaluations in all courses (4.0-5.0 on all 6 core items); induction into the UA Teaching Academy; and making substantive and innovative contributions to teaching over and above what is normally expected. Must also include at least two of the following examples of teaching excellence: engaging in scholarship pertaining to MSLC; demonstration of outstanding student success; teaching above and beyond the required teaching load; supervising several independent studies; chairing at least one honors and graduate thesis or dissertations committee; serving as a committee member on several honors and graduate theses or dissertations; receipt of research or creative awards to students taught or mentored by faculty presenting evidence in this category; student success as evidenced by student awards; service to the Teaching Academy; receipt of grant for curriculum development and/or curriculum design.

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Meets Expectations Fully (2)

Indicates strong performance. Proficient teaching performance as evidenced by good student evaluations for all courses (3.0 and higher on all 6 core items); syllabi reflect required components and clearly link competencies and practice behaviors to assignments; and syllabi contain weights for course assignments. Must also include at least two of the following examples of teaching performance: developing a new course; supervising an independent study; excellent student success as evidenced by co-authorship on peer-reviewed publications; participating on undergraduate honors or graduate student thesis or dissertation committee; receives nominations of the faculty member for teaching awards, prizes, or honors; nominations for honors, research or creative awards to students taught or mentored by the faculty presenting evidence in this category; substantial development of curriculum; providing evidence of updating content and technology of courses; and/or evidence of meeting advising responsibilities; and engages in teaching-related professional development.

Minimally Meets Expectations (1)

Indicates minimal performance: a faculty member who completes assigned teaching responsibilities, but does not meet criteria for a rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” typically will be rated as “Minimally Meets Expectations”. Must include at least two of the following examples of teaching performance: below average teaching performance as evidenced by fair student evaluations in all courses (2.0-2.99 on all 6 core items); advising is limited to designated advising times only; available to students only during prescribed office hours; teaching activity that is irregular and is not part of continuous output; limited curriculum development and updating courses and skills; and little participation in honors or graduate theses, or dissertation committees.

Does Not Meet Expectations (0)

The rating of does not meet expectations is given when the faculty teaching performance is not deemed adequate based on a combination of two of the following: poor teaching performance as evidenced by student evaluations (≤ 2.0 on all 6 core items); the faculty member fails to produce an annual resume update; syllabi do not reflect required components or clearly link competencies and practice behaviors to assignments; routinely not holding classes; refusing a reasonable teaching assignment; documented failure to direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member serves as thesis or dissertation chair; does not post regular office hours on office door and/or does not hold scheduled office hours. It may also indicate such things as teaching misconduct and/or failure to treat students with professionalism and respect. Refusal to order texts by the deadline, participate in the student evaluation process or submit grades according to stated deadlines will result in an automatic rating of “does not meet expectations” in teaching; absenteeism for reasons other than health or approved professional obligations; failure to arrange for appropriate substitute when valid absence is required; and/or consistent pattern of students being unable to contact professor.

Research/Scholarship

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Exceeds Expectations (3)

Indicates excellence in research and scholarship. To receive a rating of “3” faculty must (a) have at least one published or in-press article in peer-reviewed journal, (b) received external grant funds, **AND** (c) demonstrated at least one of the following: scholarship pertaining to MSLC (ie. presentations, participation on a MSLC research group, evaluation or conceptual article, or use as a framework for an article); an in-press or in-print publication in peer-reviewed journals; publication of a book or a new textbook from an academic or university press or another reputable publisher; national research awards; PI or Co-PI on externally funded contract or grant; and/or invited presentations as a speaker or subject matter expert for national or international meetings, before Congressional, federal agencies or a state legislative committee, or at highly acclaimed symposia.

Meets Expectations Fully (2)

Indicates strong performance in research and scholarship. Examples may include a combination of the following: presenting a paper at a national or international conference; acceptance or request for revise and resubmit of a manuscript submitted to a peer-reviewed journal; publication of an edited volume; competitive external or internal funding as Co-I or Consultant; award of a book contract from an academic or university press; revised textbook published with a reputable publisher; publication of an encyclopedia entry; any regional research award; and/or a substantial time commitment to editorial work on a scholarly journal.

Minimally Meets Expectations (1)

Indicates marginal research and scholarship performance and is warranted when clear evidence of research or other scholarly activity is present, but when such activity has not resulted in the publication of original research or external funding awards; or determination of research or creative activity that, although in progress, is irregular and is not part of continuous output. Examples may include any one of the following: evidence of progress on a major project (e.g., data collection or analysis, preparation of a manuscript for submission to a journal or publishing house, preparation of a funding proposal); presentation of a paper at a regional conference; publication of a book review or; submission of technical reports; or participation in research workshops or professional training.

Does Not Meet Expectations (0)

Indicates unsatisfactory research or scholarship; the faculty member is generally inactive and/or fails to produce an annual resume update. Examples may include: breaches of professional research ethics, such as plagiarism or falsifying research; very little or no evidence of research presented at professional meetings; no submission of manuscripts, research reports, grant proposals for review; or no organized research activity.

C. Peer Review Process for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

The School Adopts procedures for the Peer Unit Review Committee described in APS 1405.11. III. C.

D. Third Year Review

The School adopts APS 1405.11 Section III. D. and Section V. of the College Personnel Document, which stipulates that third-year reviews should be conducted by Chairs after input from the faculty of the School of Social Work. The Chair will include the third-year review in the candidate's file and will provide a copy to the candidate and to the dean.

IV. Promotion for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above

The School adopts the criteria and processes stated in APS 1405.11, III. A. 1., APS 1405.11, III.B., and the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

V. Tenure

The procedures for granting of tenure are the same as the procedures for promotion. The School adopts criteria for awarding tenure, procedures for granting tenure, and procedures for suspending probationary period, and mandatory sixth year review as defined in APS 1405.11. V and in the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track, Tenured, and Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The School adopts the procedures and processes stated in APS 1405.11 Section VI and Section VII.