# CHAPTER THREE: EVALUATION

## FINAL VOTING DRAFT, April 19, 2019

# Contents

3

## Section 3.0 Purpose

The purpose of this Chapter is to delineate a process and guiding principles for evaluating faculty members. UNI's Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System is designed to recognize and reward faculty excellence throughout the evolution of one's career, while protecting academic freedom, due process, tenure, and shared governance, according to the foundational 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.[1] Faculty evaluation also creates a process and standards for supporting ongoing faculty development and improvement. Department heads, in consultation with Professional Assessment Committees (PACs), have primary responsibility for evaluating faculty performance in terms of teaching or librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. This chapter establishes university level guiding principles and standards, as well as processes to evaluate faculty members across their careers. Specific departmental standards and criteria (Subdivision 3.1f Departmental Standards and Criteria Document) and procedures for reviewing faculty (Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document) must be compatible with those provisions in this chapter.

## Section 3.1 General Guiding Principles for Evaluation

### Subdivision 3.1a Dimensions of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated along three dimensions: teaching or librarianship[2], scholarship[3], and service. Specific definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service are included in Chapter 4 (Faculty Portfolios). Scholarship includes research and creative activities. Evaluators should acknowledge that faculty work may be relevant to more than one area (e.g., it could be evaluated as multiple areas of teaching, scholarship, and service).

### Subdivision 3.1b Teaching or Librarianship

Faculty members' primary role is to provide high quality instruction to students. Excellence in teaching is evaluated first and foremost. Faculty members whose primary role is librarianship are principally involved in the creation and provision of information, resources, and services that advance critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching or librarianship effectiveness has been made can serious consideration be given to an evaluation of scholarship and service.

---

[1] https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure
[2] Hereafter, "teaching" includes "teaching or librarianship" as appropriate.
3 Hereafter "Scholarship" refers to research, creative activity, and other forms of academic scholarly activity.

UNI expects faculty to foster critical thinking and knowledge in the content area of study, as well as to tailor course content or librarianship to the course level, curricular needs, and program learning goals and outcomes for the disciplines pursued by UNI's student body. Faculty teaching should evolve over time as faculty members continue to refine and develop their teaching skills or librarianship across their careers and to update and refine their curriculum. UNI encourages faculty to consider new pedagogical or librarianship approaches when appropriate for their discipline. Teaching should be informed by the scholarship of teaching and learning or discipline-based pedagogy.

## Subdivision 3.1c Scholarship[3]

UNI faculty engage in the collective endeavor of creating knowledge or art, enhancing civic life, and influencing communities through research, creative activities, and other forms of scholarship, as assigned in their Portfolio (see Chapter 4 for Faculty Portfolio definitions). Scholarship is a valuable and meaningful part of faculty life. Scholarship is assessed through peer-review, which attests to the quality and meaningful impact, significance and relevance of the work. UNI recognizes the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application (see Chapter 4 for definitions) as legitimate and important forms of scholarship. UNI recognizes all forms of peer review for tenured faculty (see Subdivision 3.7c and Subdivision 3.7d). In addition to traditional peer review (Subdivision 3.7c), departments may include other forms of peer review for probationary faculty in their **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document**.

## Subdivision 3.1d Service

Service is recognized as an essential component of UNI's overall Portfolio for all tenured, probationary, term, and renewable term faculty[4] members. Service obligations are to be shared and fulfilled equitably by faculty members according to their assigned Portfolios (see Chapter 4 for Faculty Portfolio definitions). Faculty members contribute to shared governance and civic life through service to their department, college, university, profession, and community. Faculty are expected to actively and productively participate in service and make substantial and constructive contributions to service. Service to the community should make use of faculty member's professional or disciplinary expertise.

## Subdivision 3.1e Weighting of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

The specific weighting of teaching, scholarship, and service shall be according to the faculty member's most recently assigned Portfolio (see Chapter 4 for faculty portfolio definitions). It is recognized that faculty may have varied degrees of accomplishment in the three areas.

---

[3]

[4] Some temporary faculty may have service obligations, as specified in their letter of offer.

## Subdivision 3.1f Departmental Standards and Criteria Document

All probationary and tenured faculty, PACs, and department heads are expected to collaborate together to create clear, consistent departmental standards and criteria for the purposes of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Departments should consult with adjuncts, term, and renewable term faculty regarding standards for their performance. Meetings shall be co-chaired by the department head and PAC chair. All criteria are to be reviewed annually in the spring semester by all departmental faculty members and department heads and submitted to the dean for approval. This document will be titled **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** and must be approved by the dean [in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)] and designee from the Provost's office and then distributed to the faculty of each department.

### Paragraph 3.1f.1 Document Components

The Departmental Standards and Criteria Document includes the specific operationalization of criteria for evaluating faculty performance. Departments shall specify criteria for: (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, and (c) Needs Improvement for annual review and continuation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews by rank and portfolio. All criteria must be consistent with the University Guiding Standards (Section 3.11). The document shall also specify any materials to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in addition to the required components in scholarship and service. Finally, the document must specify discovery scholarship expectations for probationary faculty and which if any integration or application scholarship is to be recognized for promotion and tenure. (Tenured faculty may pursue all three forms of scholarship. See Chapter 4.)

### Paragraph 3.1f.2 Template

A template for departments to use in developing their own Departmental Standards and Criteria Document is located in Appendix A.

### Paragraph 3.1f.3 Facilitating Departmental Collaboration

Departments, including department heads and all full-time faculty members, that need assistance in facilitating departmental collaboration to develop departmental standards and criteria for evaluation should seek assistance from their dean, the Associate Provost for Faculty, CRC, or Faculty Handbook Committee.

### Paragraph 3.1f.4 Failure to Approve Departmental Standards and Criteria

If the dean, Provost, or designee from the Provost's office rejects the department's document, they shall provide clear direction and feedback for revising the document to meet the **University Guiding Standards** (Section 3.11) and other general university policies and procedures**.**

### Paragraph 3.1f.5 Failure to Develop Departmental Standards and Criteria Document

When departments fail to create an approved **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document**, the dean shall call a meeting of the CRC to assist in resolving the issue.

If resolution cannot be achieved, representatives of the department, CRC, and the dean shall meet to develop an action plan to assist the department in finalizing an acceptable Standards and Criteria Document. In the meantime, the **University Guiding Standards Document** shall serve as the Department's standards and criteria.

### Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document

PACs must create a PAC procedures document, titled **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures,** that specifies additional procedures to those documented in this Handbook. These procedures define how the PAC organizes, functions, schedules and completes its work. PACs utilize their individual department's **Department Standards and Criteria Document** as their guiding resource for faculty evaluation (see Subdivision 3.1f). Any such procedures must be consistent with this Handbook and be reviewed annually by the department head, dean (in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)), and the Provost or designee. The procedures are then distributed to the faculty of each department. The Professional Assessment Committee Procedures must adhere to the timeline and calendar specified below (see Table 3.2 and Section 3.12 Calendar).

### Paragraph 3.1g.1 Template

A template for PACs to utilize in developing their own **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures** is located in Appendix B.

### Paragraph 3.1g.2 Failure to Develop Professional Assessment Committee Procedures

PAC procedures which contradict this Handbook, university policy or procedure, or law shall follow the same process outlined in Paragraph 3.1f.5.

## Table 3.2 Evaluation and Process Schedule by Faculty Rank: Summary

| RANK | BY STUDENTS | BY DEPARTMENT HEAD | | | BY PAC | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Student Assessments | Annual Review[5] | Review for Promotion or Tenure, as applicable | Post-Tenure Review | Yearly Retention and Continuance Review | Review for Promotion or Tenure, as applicable | Post-Tenure Review |
| **Adjunct Instructor (below 50% appointment)** | Every class, every semester | If the Department Head chooses, or by request of the adjunct | NA | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the adjunct | NA | NA |
| **Adjunct Instructor (50% or more appointment)** | Every class, every semester | During 1st year, 6th semester, 12th semester; or sooner if adjunct requests it[6] or needs improvement | Yes, if applying in the 12th cumulative semester or beyond (50% or more appt.) | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the adjunct | Yes, in 12th cumulative semester or beyond (50% or more appt.) | NA |
| **Associate Adjunct Instructor (12 cumulative semesters of 50% or more appt.)** | Every class, every semester | 18th semester, 24th semester, or sooner if adjunct requests it or needs improvement | Yes, if applying in the 12th cumulative semester since promotion or beyond (50% or more appt.) | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the adjunct | Yes, after 24th cumulative semester (50% or more appt.) | NA |

---

[5] Includes merit designations

[6] Teaching portfolio evaluation materials compiled according to evaluation schedule

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Senior Adjunct Instructor (12 cumulative semesters of 50% or more (appt.)** | Every class, every semester | Every 6 semesters, or sooner if adjunct requests it or needs improvement | Yes | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the adjunct | NA | NA |
| **Term Instructor (1-4 years & appt. ends)** | Every class, every semester | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Renewable Term Instructor (2-year Renewable Term)** | Every class, every semester [7] | Yes | Yes | NA | Yes; extensive in year 3 | Yes, every 6 years | NA |
| **Associate Instructor (2-year Renewable Term)** | Every class in the fall | Yes | Yes | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the instructor | Yes, every 6 years | NA |
| **Senior Instructor (2-year Renewable Term)** | Every class in the fall[5] | Yes | NA | NA | If the PAC chooses to conduct a yearly review, or by request of the instructor | NA | NA |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Probationary Faculty of any rank (tenure track)** | Every class, every semester | Yes, extensive in year 3 | Yes | NA | Yes; extensive in year 3 | Yes | NA |

---

[7] Student assessments may be administered more frequently if a faculty member "needs improvement" in the area of teaching. Faculty may also request informational student assessments or additional assessments for their evaluation file. See Subdivision 3.6

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Tenured Faculty of any rank** | Every class in the fall [5] | Yes | Yes | Summary evaluation in year 6; Full review if 3 "needs improvement" decisions during annual reviews | No, or by request of the faculty member | Yes | Yes, full review if requested by faculty member or if 3 "needs improvement" decisions during annual reviews |

## Section 3.2 Roles

### Subdivision 3.2a Faculty Member Being Evaluated

The faculty member being assessed shall adhere to the procedures, guidelines, and timetable contained in this handbook, and any pertinent Professional Assessment Committee Procedures. When seeking promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the department head and PAC chair by April 30, prior to the fall evaluation when teaching, scholarship and service contributions or portfolios will be reviewed. The faculty member is responsible for submitting evidence and supporting materials to document excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service (see Sections 3.4 - 3.8). These materials should reflect the assigned Portfolio (see Chapter 4).

#### Paragraph 3.2a1 Assembling Evaluation File Materials to Forward for Review

In preparing for promotion, tenure, or comprehensive review for post-tenure review, faculty members collaborate with the department head and secretary to assemble their evaluation file into a box/binders to be sent to the dean's office. The university will provide the box. Faculty boxes should be well organized.

### Subdivision 3.2b Professional Assessment Committee (PAC)

Each academic department shall have a Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) for the assessment and evaluation of renewable term, probationary, and tenured faculty (see Section 3.14 Review by PAC). The PAC is charged with conducting an independent review of faculty performance in the areas of

teaching, scholarship, and service using the [Departmental Standards and Criteria](). The PAC review serves as a recommendation to the Department Head.

### Paragraph 3.2b.1 PAC Membership

The PAC shall consist of all tenured members of the department. All tenured faculty members are expected to serve on the PAC, unless released by the department head in consultation with the PAC Chair (including for [Section 3.3 Conflicts of Interest]()). The department head or designated administrators (such as director) shall not be a member of the PAC. Any faculty member who is a candidate for promotion/post-tenure review shall be excluded from committee deliberation of their candidacy. A PAC must include a minimum of three committee members. If membership drops below three department faculty members, the PAC shall seek outside membership from tenured faculty members from another academic department. They may consult with the department head or dean and must inform them of the final membership. PACs may choose to invite faculty members from another department to serve on the PAC to review a specific case when additional expertise is necessary or if the PAC lacks the necessary membership to make an informed decision. Faculty on phased retirement may choose to serve on the department PAC and continue to fulfill PAC membership and/or chair responsibilities.

### SubParagraph 3.2b.1a Renewable Term Associate Instructors and Senior Instructors

Renewable Term faculty who have been promoted to Associate Instructors or Senior Instructors may serve on the PAC for the purposes of reviewing faculty of a lower rank in their faculty employment classification (see [Paragraph 3.17d.2 Other Responsibilities]()).

### Paragraph 3.2b.2 PAC Chair

The position of the PAC chair is a rotating term position of one or two years among members of the PAC committee. The PAC chair position may be renewed once consecutively. Some departments may choose to use a system of co-chairs who are elected and serve on alternating terms. The department's PAC procedures must detail the leadership requirements of PAC chairs and associated duties. The PAC chair/co-chairs ensure that the department has developed the **"Departmental Standards and Criteria Document"** ([Subdivision 3.1f]()) and **"Professional Assessment Committee Procedures"**([Subdivision 3.14d]()) that are compatible with University Guiding Standards ([Section 3.11 University Guiding Standards]()), the Faculty Handbook, and university

policies and procedures. The PAC chair/co-chair shall not be a faculty member who is being assessed for promotion by PAC in that year.

### Paragraph 3.2b.3 PAC Chair Responsibilities

The duties of the chairperson/s shall be to preside at PAC meetings and to be the official spokesperson for PAC in performing its designated responsibilities in an orderly and timely fashion to meet deadlines as described in Section 3.12 Calendar. PAC chairs also serve as members of the College Review Committee (see Subdivision 3.2d.). PAC chairs provide a copy of PAC procedures to the department head and dean for review.

### Paragraph 3.2b.4 PAC Responsibilities

PACs shall review renewable term Instructors and probationary faculty each year. They also review faculty for recommendations of retention, termination, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. The evaluation and process schedule for PAC reviews is summarized in Table 3.2. Section 3.14 Review by PAC provides specific procedures for conducting PAC reviews.

## Subdivision 3.2c Department Head

In collaboration with the PAC chair, the department head ensures that the department has developed the **"Departmental Standards and Criteria Document"** (Subdivision 3.1f) that are compatible with University Guiding Standards (Section 3.11 ), the Faculty Handbook, and university policies and procedures. The department head conducts an annual review (Section 3.13) of all probationary, tenured, term, and renewable term faculty. Heads review adjunct faculty with appointments of 50% or more during their first year, every sixth semester, and when seeking promotion. Heads may choose to review adjunct faculty with appointments below 50%.

The department head provides a recommendation to the dean. Department heads will provide specific written rationale when an evaluative decision is contrary to the PACs' recommendations. See Table 3.2 and Section 3.12 Calendar for a timeline of activities related to the department head's annual review of faculty.

### Paragraph 3.2c.1 Responsibilities

The department head ensures that an electronic copy of all official documents utilized in the evaluation process is accessible to all faculty members. These documents include the **"Faculty Handbook,"** **"Departmental Standards and Criteria Document"** (Subdivision 3.1f) and **"Professional Assessment Committee Procedures"**(Subdivision

). In the spring semester, the department head will distribute a communication requesting nominations or self-nominations for promotion and/or tenure to be received by April 15 for the next academic year. The department head is responsible for assuring that the material in the evaluation file be made available to the PAC during regular business hours and that all materials remain in the office or alternative assigned location.

## Subdivision 3.2d College Review Committee (CRC)

The department head and one PAC chair from each department shall serve on a College Review Committee (CRC), chaired by the dean. The CRC is responsible for facilitating collaboration across faculty and administration regarding evaluation processes and standards around the college. The CRC ensures quality, consistency, equity, and compatibility of department standards and criteria and PAC procedures with University Guiding Standards, the Faculty Handbook, university policies and procedures, and applicable accreditation requirements. The CRC does not review individual faculty materials for the purposes of tenure and promotion. The CRC is to meet a minimum of one time per year, preferably in spring, to review all official documents utilized in the evaluation process, including any changes proposed by department faculty members, PACs or administrators.

## Subdivision 3.2e Deans

Each dean will conduct an independent review of probationary faculty, renewable term faculty, faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, and faculty undergoing the post-tenure review by examining the Faculty Evaluation File (Subdivision 3.4b). Each dean provides a recommendation to the provost. Deans will provide specific written rationale when an evaluative decision is contrary to either the department head or the PACs' recommendations.

Typically, the Dean provides a final decision for 1st, 2nd, 4th, or 5th year Probationary, Renewable Term, and Adjunct faculty review, unless there is an action case for termination. In cases where the decision of the dean varies from the recommendation of the department head or PAC, the dean will consult with the Provost and provide a written rationale to the department head and PAC.

## Subdivision 3.2f Provost

The Provost, in consultation with the deans and associate provosts, conducts an independent review of probationary faculty (third-year, termination, or promotion/tenure), renewable term faculty (promotion only), faculty undergoing post-tenure review (if it leads to improvement), and faculty recommended for termination. The Provost shall provide in the spring prior a written list of selected materials from the Evaluation File for the Deans' Council and Provost to review.

The Provost may request additional materials as needed within the full Faculty Evaluation File.

Typically, the Provost does not participate in 1st, 2nd, 4th, or 5th year probationary faculty reviews, unless there is an action case for termination. The Provost does not participate in evaluations of Term, Renewable Term, or adjunct faculty members, except in the case of a Renewable Term faculty member's promotion decision. The Provost will provide specific written rationale to the dean, department head and PAC when an evaluative decision for promotion, tenure or post-tenure review is contrary to the dean's recommendation.

### Subdivision 3.2g Board of Regents

The Board of Regents/State of Iowa is responsible for the final approval for tenure and/or promotion decisions.

### Section 3.3 Conflicts of Interest

Faculty members shall be treated and evaluated on individual merit, and such evaluation shall be free of conflicts of interest that compromise these principles by the real or perceived possibility of preferential treatment based on family or personal relationships. While it is not possible to define all potential conflicts of interests, examples include individuals connected to the evaluatee by blood or adoption, by a current or former marriage or domestic partnership, by a romantic, sexual or other consensual relationship that may give the appearance of favoritism, or where the faculty members were adverse parties in an internal complaint, grievance, or legal action. Where a potential conflict of interest may exist, the evaluating faculty member must notify their dean of the potential conflict and may choose to recuse themself from the PAC review.  If the faculty member chooses not to recuse themself from the evaluation, their dean, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty, will determine whether a conflict of interest exists. If it is determined that a conflict of interest exists, the evaluating faculty member will not be permitted to evaluate the other faculty member.

### Section 3.4 Evaluation Files[8]

An evaluation file (including boxes or binders for action cases) shall be maintained for each tenured, probationary, term, renewable term and adjunct (temporary) faculty member. The evaluation file serves to annually and cumulatively document a faculty member's productivity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as applicable and according to an individual's portfolio. The departmental Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) will use the evaluation file to carry out its assessment of faculty. No separate or duplicated

---

[8] There are no separate "PAC Files."

evaluation (or "PAC") file will be created or maintained for the purposes of evaluation.

## Subdivision 3.4a Evaluation File Access

The Evaluation File shall be located and secured in the assigned departmental office or in a protected electronic faculty portal with controlled access. Faculty may add materials to their own files with the approval of the department head. Bulky materials, which are still considered part of the Evaluation File, may be located physically outside the file proper, provided a record of the material is included within the file. Department or University offices have the option of maintaining select documentation by providing protected and proper storage or databases for approved access for reviews in electronic format. PAC members may have access to the evaluation files during evaluation time periods.

## Subdivision 3.4b Evaluation File (including portfolios) Contents

The following materials shall be included in all departmental Evaluation Files. Additional categories of materials may be created as needed in specific departments upon agreement of the PAC and department head, and documented in the PAC Procedures.

### Paragraph 3.4b.1 Formal Letters and Documents[9]

A. Probationary Summary Cover Sheet
B. Letter of Offer
C. Position Description (or job requisition)
D. Updated annual Curriculum Vitae (FAR)
E. Faculty Narrative Letter (see Section 3.10)--(FAR)
F. Annual Faculty Activity Reports (FAR)
G. MOUs Related to Course Reassignments and Differentiated Portfolios
H. Approval notification(s) documented on Cover Sheet that the **Faculty Request to Suspend the Probationary Tenure/Promotion Clock** or **Faculty Request to Extend the Probationary Period for a Seventh Year**. (See Forms Repository.) These files shall not include confidential information.
I. Department Head Evaluation Letters
J. PAC Evaluation Letters, including PAC Minority Reports
K. External Letters (if available or required)
L. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Letters
M. Professional Development Assignment Letters

---

[9] Departments are free to create their own organizational system for the contents within the evaluation file.

### Paragraph 3.4b.2 Evidence of Teaching or Librarianship

A. Statement of Teaching or Librarianship Philosophy (FAR)
B. Syllabi (see Subdivision 3.5f)
C. Teaching or Librarianship Artifacts
D. Student Assessment Results (see Subdivision 3.5d)
E. Teaching or Librarianship Awards or Nominations received
F. Other evidence of teaching or librarianship effectiveness

### Paragraph 3.4b.3 Evidence of Scholarship

A. Research Agenda (may be optional or required as per Departmental Standards and Criteria Document)
B. Peer-Reviewed Publications/Products
C. Documentation related to Peer Review
D. Papers/Products Under Review
E. Papers/Products in Progress
F. Creative Activities, including but not limited to performances, compositions, exhibits, and installations
G. Scholarly Awards or Nominations received
H. Other Evidence of Scholarship

### Paragraph 3.4b.4 Evidence of Service

A. Documentation of Service Activity: departmental, college, university
B. Documentation of Service to the Profession
C. Documentation of Community Service
D. Service Awards or Nominations received
E. Other Evidence of Service Activity

### Paragraph 3.4b.5 Supplemental and Other Materials

A. Supplemental Files
B. Miscellaneous
C. Outdated Files (e.g. old CVs, old drafts, etc.)

### Subdivision 3.4c Evaluation File Material Removal

A faculty member may request in writing removal of any item in the file. The written request shall also contain a rationale for the requested removal. If the dean and the provost or designee agree, the item shall be removed from the evaluation file. If the dean and the provost deny the request for removal, they will notify the faculty member in writing within thirty (30) days from the date of the written request including reasons for the denial. For purposes of this section, days shall mean class days during the regular academic year.

### Subdivision 3.4d Response to File Material

Faculty members may write responses to materials in the evaluation file, which shall be attached to related materials and become part of the file.

### Subdivision 3.4e Faculty Member Review

Each faculty member shall have the right to review the contents of her/his evaluation file (including boxes/binders) during regular business hours, or at such other time as mutually agreed upon with the department head. The faculty member may scan (at no charge) or copy (at their expense) their file upon request.

### Subdivision 3.4f Professional Assessment Committee Access

When a faculty member is assessed by a departmental Professional Assessment Committee (PAC), members of the committee or subcommittee shall have the right to review the contents of the faculty member's evaluation file on request to the department head. Reviews shall occur during regular business hours in the departmental office or in a location specified, or at such other time as mutually agreed upon with the department head. The PAC chairperson is permitted to take the file to a regularly scheduled PAC meeting. Files removed from the departmental office shall be signed out and back in and returned by the end of the normal business day.

### Subdivision 3.4g Materials Removal Upon the End of Employment at UNI

Faculty may request the return of their original materials, such as books, upon the end of their employment by making a written request to the department head within 30 days of the conclusion of their employment. Removal of original materials from the evaluation file must be documented by the department and summarized in writing to the faculty member and memorialized in the file.

### Subdivision 3.4h Maintaining Copies

Faculty are encouraged to maintain copies of their evaluation file materials for their own records.

### Section 3.5 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Teaching

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member's teaching performance. Faculty members shall document their teaching performance through required and optional artifacts placed in their evaluation file, as specified below, or FAR. Artifacts include but are not limited to syllabi, sample assignments, sample lectures, in-class activities, sample exams, or sample

17

projects. Documents shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified.

## Subdivision 3.5a Required versus Optional Teaching Components

The **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** must include all of the required components, as delineated below, for the evaluation of teaching. Optional components may also be included. Departments shall consider any additional optional components that a faculty member chooses to include in the teaching portfolio, that is part of the evaluation file, as evidence of teaching performance.

## Subdivision 3.5b Required Component: Annual Goals

All faculty shall develop annual goals, in consultation with the department head, for teaching (see Subdivision 3.7b for annual goals pertaining to scholarship, and Subdivision 3.8b for goals about service). Annual goals should be succinct and substantive, and documented in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The annual goals are discussed between the faculty member and the department head each fall for the purposes of discussing the faculty member's portfolio and professional development, as well as allocation of resources (Subdivision 3.13f Annual Meeting with Department Head). The faculty member may request the PAC chair to participate in the meeting. Faculty should reflect annually on achieving these goals, feedback from teaching observations (see Subdivision 3.5c), student assessments (see Subdivision 3.5d), and faculty development efforts (if pursued). Faculty members should respond to accomplishments or concerns outlined in annual reviews and student assessments.

## Subdivision 3.5c Required Component: Observations for Probationary Faculty, Renewable Term Faculty and Action Cases

Department heads and PACs (according to their PAC Procedures) shall conduct annual teaching observations of probationary and renewable term faculty, and for action cases (e.g., when faculty members are applying for tenure and/or promotion or undergoing comprehensive post-tenure review). Results must be summarized in the annual Department Head review and PAC review.

PACs may opt to conduct some peer teaching observations in the spring semester in advance of their reviews of faculty for the following fall semester, according to PAC procedures and for cases in which certain courses are only taught by faculty in the spring semester. Department heads may observe throughout the academic year.

### Paragraph 3.5c.1 Observation Training

Individuals engaging in peer observation are recommended to be trained in conducting and reporting effective peer observation by PAC members

18

or through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) before doing so.

### Paragraph 3.5c.2 Observations by Pedagogy Experts

Additional trained observers with expertise in a variety of pedagogies are available through Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to assess pedagogy and facilitate faculty development in teaching. Faculty members may optionally solicit observations by a CETL expert in pedagogy for a summary report to be included in their evaluation file or for informational purposes only. Pedagogy observers cannot review disciplinary content or knowledge. Observations by pedagogy experts shall not be used in place of observations by faculty with disciplinary expertise.

### Paragraph 3.5c.3 Observations of Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education Courses

Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education courses shall be observed by department heads and PAC members through becoming a guest in the class or reviewing available course organizational and delivery practices, as well as instructional materials. Department heads or PACs may also request copies of documents or recorded lectures utilized in teaching the courses.

### Paragraph 3.5c.4 Forms for Peer Observation

Departments may develop forms for documenting peer observation.

## Subdivision 3.5d Required Component: Student Assessments

Student assessments are one tool for faculty to use for a self-assessment of their teaching performance, and shall be used **formatively** to improve teaching and student learning. Student assessments best measure students' perceptions of the clarity of delivery of material and content, classroom logistics and organization (e.g., timeliness of the professor), course organization, effectiveness of communication, professor availability, or the professor's influence on students. Student assessments do not typically measure effectively the appropriateness of course objectives, knowledge of the discipline, or suitability of assessment procedures. Student assessments may not be reliable if the response rate is too low. In keeping with the University Standards and Guidelines (see Table 3.11a), faculty shall reflect on the feedback provided by students and how they can improve their teaching and student learning in their annual goals (see subdivision 3.5.b) located within their FAR in order to meet or exceed expectations.

### Paragraph 3.5d.1 Frequency and Access

Frequency of administration of student assessments varies by faculty rank (see Table 3.2 for a summary of the review schedule by faculty rank) and teaching performance. A summary of the results of student assessments of a faculty member shall be transmitted to the faculty member within ten (10) working days after the date grades are required to be submitted each semester. Results are to be placed in the Evaluation File, unless designated as Informational Only assessments.

### Subparagraph 3.5d.1a Probationary Faculty, Adjunct Instructors (including Associate and Senior), Term Instructors (1-4 years), and Instructors (renewable term)

Student assessments shall be administered in every class every semester for probationary faculty, Instructors (renewable term and term), and Adjunct Instructors.

### Subparagraph 3.5d.1b Tenured Faculty, Associate Instructors (renewable term) and Senior Instructors (renewable term)

Student assessments shall be administered in every class in the fall for tenured faculty, Associate Instructors (renewable term) and Senior Instructors (renewable term), Associate Adjunct Instructors, and Senior Adjunct Instructors, not counting years on leave or non-teaching assignments.

Additional student assessments shall be required in every class in the spring semester for faculty who have received a designation of Needs Improvement in the area of teaching in the previous annual review or for whom an improvement plan pertaining to teaching has been created.

Tenured faculty, Associate Instructors (renewable term), and Senior Instructors (renewable term) may also request informational student assessments or have them placed in their evaluation file for the spring semester. The University shall process informational assessments but no record of the results shall be kept in the evaluation file or utilized in the review process. These same faculty may request spring student assessments to be included in their evaluation file at their own discretion. However, the decision as to whether the assessment is evaluatory or informational must be made at the beginning of the semester and is non-revocable.

### Paragraph 3.5d.2 Faculty Reflection on Teaching

Faculty shall provide a **Faculty Reflection** on student assessments and their teaching in their annual goals within the Faculty Activity Report (FAR)

- (see Subdivision 3.5b). This reflection shall connect student assessments to the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy or specific aspects of teaching, ==and it shall document specific actions taken to improve teaching in response to feedback from assessments.== Faculty reflection may also contextualize student assessments, for example, by connecting them to the level of the course (e.g., lower- versus upper-division/level), curricular needs being met by the course (e.g., general education students versus majors only), rigor of the course, and other relevant factors. Faculty may also reflect on other aspects of their teaching in this part of the FAR. ==Faculty shall complete the Faculty Reflection to Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in teaching.==

For third-year probationary, all promotions, tenure, or post-tenure review cases, faculty will reflect cumulatively on all years since their last review by preparing a **Faculty Narrative** (see Section 3.10). ==Faculty shall complete the Faculty Narrative to Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in teaching.==

### Paragraph 3.5d.3 Interpretation

Department heads and PACs should focus their evaluation of student assessments on the faculty member's meaningful and documented use of the assessments for the purpose of improvement in teaching and learning over time. PACs, departments heads, and deans shall interpret results of student assessments in the context of the response rate, other data sources (e.g., course artifacts, faculty observations), and the self-reflection document ==which must demonstrate the way in which teaching and student learning has been improved as a result of the feedback from the assessments.== The faculty member has the opportunity to consider and analyze the student assessments through their annual goals.

### Paragraph 3.5d.4 Bias

Student comments regarding a faculty member's status in a protected class shall not be used to evaluate faculty.

## Subdivision 3.5e Required Component: Teaching Philosophy

All faculty members shall develop a succinct statement of their teaching philosophy, not to exceed two pages single spaced in a minimum of 11-point font. The teaching philosophy, located within the FAR, should be updated periodically if the faculty member's philosophy changes across time.

## Subdivision 3.5f Required Component: Syllabi

Faculty shall submit syllabi with learning outcomes for all classes they are teaching at the beginning of each semester to their department head or

designee. Learning outcomes should be connected to the learning goals of the program (e.g., General Education, Major, etc.). Learning outcomes for multiple sections of the same course should be consistent and included in each syllabus; additional outcomes for a particular section can be added. ==Learning outcomes for undergraduate courses shall differ from the graduate outcomes, which include a higher level of learning (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy) or a more advanced engagement with the content.== The syllabi should state the faculty member's office hours. See Appendix C. Syllabi.

### Subdivision 3.5g Optional Component: Professional Development

Faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development activities (e.g., CETL Faculty Teaching Certificate Program, CETL Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID), Teaching Mentorship, Discipline-based Training/Conferences, etc.) to enhance their teaching and curriculum development. Professional development activities are to be documented in the FAR.

### Subdivision 3.5h Optional Component: Other Evidence

Departments may wish to develop additional forms of evidence to document teaching evaluation or additional methods of evaluating teaching performance. These additional forms of evidence should be described in the Department Standards and Criteria document. Departments shall consider any additional optional components that a faculty member chooses to document in the FAR or teaching portfolio (part of the Evaluation File) as evidence of teaching performance.

## Section 3.6 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Librarianship

Librarianship effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a library faculty member's overall performance. Library faculty shall document their librarianship accomplishments in their evaluation file, consisting of required and optional artifacts. Librarianship portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified .

## Section 3.7 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Scholarship/ Creative Activity

Scholarship is reviewed for its quality and meaningful impact. Definitions of scholarship appear in Chapter 4 of this Handbook. Peer review is the process for validating the quality and meaningful impact of scholarship by disciplinary peers. Scholarship effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member's overall performance.

### Subdivision 3.7a Required Components: Portfolio, FAR and Vitae

Faculty shall document their scholarship accomplishments through required and optional artifacts placed in their evaluation file or Faculty Activity Report (FAR). Artifacts include but are not limited to creative works, published articles or books, scholarly projects in progress or in press, recordings, videos, compositions, or other projects. Departments may choose to evaluate additional dimensions of scholarship. Those criteria shall be documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f ) for faculty evaluation. Artifacts are succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified.

Probationary faculty contribute to scholarship (see expectations related to scholarship and specific to types of review in the University Guiding Standards). Some renewable term and term faculty may have scholarship included in their portfolio when described in their letter of offer or through assignment by the department head. Scholarship portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled.

### Subdivision 3.7b Required Component: Annual Goals

Faculty shall develop annual goals, in consultation with their department head, for scholarship (see Subdivision 3.5b for annual goals about teaching and Subdivision 3.8b for goals about service). Annual goals should be succinct and substantive, and documented in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The annual goals are discussed between the faculty member and the department head each fall (Subdivision 3.13f Annual Meeting with Department Head). Faculty should reflect annually on achieving these goals. Faculty members should respond to accomplishments or concerns outlined in annual reviews and student assessments.

### Subdivision 3.7c Definition of Traditional Peer Review

Traditional peer review of scholarship involves the review of a specific work, article, or project by colleagues, often anonymous, with expertise in the utilized methodologies and/or content area, resulting in public dissemination of work. In the case of creative work, peer review includes review by jury or equivalent professional organization or disciplinary experts.

### Subdivision 3.7d Additional Forms of Peer Review for Tenured Faculty

The university acknowledges that additional forms of peer review of a specific work, article, or project are available for all tenured faculty and for probationary faculty when deemed appropriate by the department as specified in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document**. When peer review by disciplinary experts is intrinsic to the process of disseminating scholarship or receiving substantial public recognition for scholarly achievement, the university

accepts that peer review process as validating the appropriate quality and meaningful impact of the scholarship. Examples include but are not limited to receiving a major external grant that underwent peer review, editor-reviewed trade press, being invited by colleagues to present scholarship as an expert at a prestigious professional conference or performance/exhibit, or winning an award for achievement in scholarship from colleagues. Faculty members must document the peer-review process in their evaluation file, including external confirmation (e.g., copy of the peer-review process as printed on the organization's website, reviewer comments, or a letter from the editor inviting a contribution to a book because of one's expertise).

Some high-quality and meaningful scholarship within the tenured faculty member's discipline may not have a peer-review process intrinsic to its dissemination or recognition (see Section 4.5 Scholarship for Tenured Faculty). In order to recognize these additional forms of scholarship for the purposes of annual review, post-tenure review, or promotion, departments shall develop a peer-review process to assess that scholarship is making use of the faculty member's disciplinary expertise, is of acceptable quality, and has a meaningful impact. Additionally, departments may choose to include integration or application scholarship for probationary faculty in their **Departmental Standards and Criteria Documents** (see Chapter Section 4.4 Scholarship/Creative Activity for Probationary Faculty). Such a process must be documented in the Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document in writing and include all of the following elements:

A. Faculty engaged in scholarship without an intrinsic peer-review process must submit a request for approval to their department head and PAC chair in writing for consideration of their work for evaluation purposes. The request must document the faculty member's contribution to the product, as well as the work's scope, quality, and impact.

B. Faculty members shall provide a list, according to applicable PAC procedures, of disciplinary experts who can assess the scope, quality, and impact of the work.

C. The department head and the PAC chair shall select disciplinary expert(s), according to applicable PAC procedures, to assess the work's scope, quality, and impact,

D. Additionally, departments or faculty members may solicit constituencies outside of the academic discipline to assess the work's scope, quality, or impact. For example, a faculty member may solicit a letter from a community organization attesting to the influence of a curriculum the faculty member

developed, or a department head may solicit feedback from a nonprofit director about the benefits of a program review performed by a faculty member.

### Subdivision 3.7e Additional Methods

Departments may develop additional methods for assessing the quality or meaningful impact of a particular piece of scholarship. Any such methods must be in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria** document. Departments may not create review methods which preference one type of scholarship over another for tenured faculty (see Chapter 4).

### Subdivision 3.7f Peer Review of Scholarship Portfolios for Action Cases

Colleges or departments may require peer review of a faculty member's entire scholarship portfolio for the purposes of tenure or promotion. Specific criteria shall be documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f) and specific procedures should be documented in the **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g).

## Section 3.8 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Service

Service effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member's contributions or accomplishments. The definition of service appears in Chapter 4 of this handbook.

### Subdivision 3.8a Required Components: Portfolio, FAR and Vitae

Faculty shall document their service accomplishments in a portfolio located in the evaluation file, and in departmental required documentation in their FAR (see 3.52) and vita. This documentation should be according to the faculty member's role (including any leadership role), level of participation, and meaningful contributions. Service activities, including those completed at the university, for the profession, or community, should all be similarly documented.

Probationary, renewable term, and term faculty contribute to service at levels appropriate for their appointments (see expectations related to service and specific to types of review in the University Guiding Standards). Service portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled.

### Subdivision 3.8b Required Component: Annual Goals

Faculty shall develop annual goals, in consultation with their department head, for service (see Subdivision 3.5b for annual goals about teaching and Subdivision 3.7b for goals about scholarship). Annual goals should be succinct

and substantive, and documented in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The annual goals are discussed between the faculty member and the department head each fall (Subdivision 3.13f Annual Meeting with Department Head). Faculty should reflect annually on achieving these goals. Faculty members should respond to accomplishments or concerns outlined in annual reviews and student assessments.

### Subdivision 3.8c Additional Methods

Departments may develop additional methods for assessing the quality or meaningful impact of service activity. Any such methods must be in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

## Section 3.9 Oral Communication

Please see the Board of Regents policy 3.21 English Language Proficiency (Oral Communication Competence), as per Iowa Code 262.9(24).

## Section 3.10 Faculty Narrative for Promotion/Tenure Cases or Third-Year Reviews

Faculty are required to submit a **Faculty Narrative** document in their evaluation file on or before October 15 when seeking promotion and/or tenure, and during the year three probationary review period. The narrative should be no more than five pages in length, single spaced in no smaller than 11-point font. The narrative shall address teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service in the following ways. The section on teaching shall include (a) a reflection on teaching/librarianship, (b) improvements made across time and in response to student assessments and peer observations, and (c) future directions. The section on scholarship shall include (a) a bibliographic listing of peer-reviewed work for the period under review, separated by types of publications and presentations, (b) reflection on the quality and quantity of scholarly work, and (c) future directions. The section on service shall include (a) a bulleted list of service activities for the period under review, broken out by type of activity (e.g., international, national, regional, state, local, university, college, department, community, etc.), (b) reflection on the quality and quantity of service activities and contributions, and (c) future directions.

Faculty shall complete their **Faculty Reflection** within the FAR (see Paragraph 3.5.d.2) and the **Faculty Narrative** document (if applicable) to Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in Teaching.

## Section 3.11 University Guiding Standards for Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship, and Service

**University Guiding Standards** provide broad, guiding standards to departments for evaluating faculty performance annually and cumulatively for promotion,

tenure, or post-tenure review. The **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f) should specify criteria for faculty performance regarding particular operationalization of the **University Guiding Standards**, including expected products/contributions/measures of productivity, their extent (e.g., how many), their frequency, and other important dimensions, for Annual Review, Tenure and/or Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. The **Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation** must be consistent with the **University Guiding Standards** and methods for measuring as documented in Chapter 3 of this Handbook.

Tables 3.11a, 3.11b, 3.11c, and 3.11d below document University Guiding Standards which Meet Expectations, Exceed Expectations, and Need Improvement for each area of faculty performance (teaching, scholarship, service, and librarianship) by faculty rank and portfolio. Although there may be disciplinary differences which render some expectations more or less important or moot in a particular circumstance documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation**, the "Meets Expectations" rows document comprehensive standards, all of which should generally apply to faculty. The "Exceeds Expectations" and "Needs Improvement" rows offer examples and are therefore inclusive but not exhaustive.

## Table 3.11a University Guiding Standards: Teaching

| Rating | • **Probationary Faculty,**<br>• **Term,**<br>• **Renewable Term Instructors, or**<br>• **Adjunct Instructors** | • **Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with a Standard Portfolio,**<br>• **Associate Instructors,**<br>• **Senior Instructors,**<br>• **Associate Adjunct Instructors, or**<br>• **Senior Adjunct Instructors** | **Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Teaching Portfolio** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expect-ations**[10] | Teaching reflects rich **content knowledge** of the discipline.<br><br>Teaching fosters **critical thinking.** | Teaching reflects rich **content knowledge** of the discipline.<br><br>Teaching fosters **critical thinking.** | Teaching reflects rich **content knowledge** of the discipline.<br><br>Teaching fosters **critical thinking.** |

---

[10] Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.

| Meets Expect-Ations Cont. | **Communicates and provides feedback** related to instruction to students in a timely manner. | **Communicates and provides feedback** related to instruction to students in a timely manner. | **Communicates and provides feedback** related to instruction to students in a timely manner. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Instructional design and delivery** contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes. | **Instructional design and delivery** contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes. | **Instructional design and delivery** contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes. |
| | Course **syllabi** provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, evaluation methods and course-level student learning outcomes. | Course **syllabi** provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, and evaluation methods, and course-level student learning outcomes. | Course **syllabi** provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, and evaluation methods, and course-level student learning outcomes. |
| | Assignments and/or activities used for **assessing student work** (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes. | Assignments and/or activities used for **assessing student work** (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes. | Assignments and/or activities used for **assessing student work** (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes. |
| | Active and meaningful participation in **faculty development** regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops). | Active and meaningful participation in **faculty development** regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops). | Active and meaningful participation in **faculty development**, which contributes substantially to teaching practices (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops). |
| | Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on teaching which inform teaching practice.[11] | Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on teaching which inform teaching practice.[2] | Sustained **self-assessment and reflection** on teaching inform teaching practice and improved teaching and learning.[2] |

---

[11]  See Paragraph 3.6d.2 Faculty Reflection for details.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expectations** Cont. | | | Innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning.<br><br>**Leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.<br><br>Sustained engagement with the **scholarship** of teaching and learning or best practices. |
| **Exceeds Expect-ations**[12] | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.<br><br>Substantial **innovation** in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning<br><br>**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.<br><br>Contributes to the knowledge or practice of **pedagogy** within the field or university.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum. | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.<br><br>Substantial **innovation** in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning<br><br>**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.<br><br>Contributes to the knowledge or practice of **pedagogy** within the field or university.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum. | Extensive **leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.<br><br>Receives peer recognition for substantial **innovation** in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum.<br><br>**Widespread adoption** of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field. |

---

29

|  | **Widespread adoption** of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field. | **Widespread adoption** of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field. |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improve-ment**[13] | Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.<br><br>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.<br><br>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.<br><br>No or inadequate syllabi.<br><br>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices. | Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.<br><br>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.<br><br>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.<br><br>No or inadequate syllabi.<br><br>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.<br><br>Does not participate in faculty development or provide constructive contributions around teaching or learning.<br><br>Does not demonstrate any leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning. | Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.<br><br>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.<br><br>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.<br><br>No or inadequate syllabi.<br><br>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.<br><br>Does not demonstrate leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning.<br><br>No innovation or experimentation in teaching practices.<br><br>Does not engage with the scholarship of teaching and learning or best |

---

[13] This list provides examples of performance which needs improvement. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

| | practices. |
|---|---|

## Table 3.11b University Guiding Standards: Scholarship

| | Probationary Faculty | Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with Standard Portfolio | Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Teaching Portfolio |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expect-ations[14]** | Reflects a rich **knowledge** of one's field.<br><br>Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative **rigor**.<br><br>Demonstrates intellectual or creative **independence.**<br><br>Demonstrates **regular** and **sustained** productivity, which has undergone traditional peer review[15] (and/or other forms of peer review as appropriate to the field).<br><br>Makes a meaningful **contribution** or impact through discovery (and/or integration or application as appropriate to the field).<br><br>Expectations align with workload, including differentiated portfolios (e.g., course | Reflects a rich **knowledge** of one's field.<br><br>Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative **rigor**.<br><br>Demonstrates **regular** or **sustained** productivity, which will lead to peer review as defined in Section 3.8.<br><br>Makes a meaningful **contribution** or impact through discovery, integration, or application.<br><br>Expectations align with workload, including differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments or reduced service expectations for specialization in research/ scholarship/creative activity). | **Stays abreast of developments** within one's field.<br><br>Uses scholarship by self or others to **inform teaching**.<br><br>Engages in some scholarship/creativity activity by: producing scholarship/creative activity of any type, participating in conferences/productions/ performances, using expertise in service, engaging in scholarship-oriented faculty development, submitting grants, or other activity appropriate to one's field. |

[14] Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations.There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.
[15] Traditional peer review and other forms of peer review are defined in Section 3.8.

|  | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | reassignments or reduced service expectations for specialization in research/ scholarship/creative activity). | | |
| **Exceeds Expect- ations**[16] | **Substantial collaboration with students**, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).<br><br>Securing a major competitive **grant**.<br><br>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field.<br><br>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.<br><br>Receives substantial national peer or disciplinary **recognition** for scholarly/creative contribution. | **Substantial collaboration with students**, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).<br><br>Securing a major competitive **grant**.<br><br>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field, university, or community.<br><br>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.<br><br>Receives substantial national peer, disciplinary, or community **recognition** for scholarly/creative contribution. | Substantial scholarly/creative **collaboration with students**.<br><br>Demonstrates **regular** or **sustained** productivity, which has undergone peer review as defined in Section 3.8.<br><br>Receives peer, disciplinary, university, or community **recognition** for scholarly/creative contribution.<br><br>**Routine or sustained** scholarly or creative output. |
| **Needs Improve- ment**[17] | Peer review does not meet criteria.<br><br>Lacks rigor. | Peer review does not meet criteria.<br><br>Lacks rigor. | Does not  stay abreast of developments within one's field.<br><br>Found to have engaged in |

---

[16]This list provides examples of performance which exceeds expectations. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

[17]This list provides examples of performance which needs improvement. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No or too few peer-reviewed products.<br><br>Found to have engaged in research misconduct. Does not demonstrate any intellectual or creative independence.<br><br>Substandard quality. | No or too few peer-reviewed products.[18]<br><br>Found to have engaged in research misconduct.<br><br>Substandard quality. | research misconduct.<br><br>Teaching is not informed by scholarship.<br><br>No engagement with scholarship/creative activity. |

## Table 3.11c University Guiding Standards: Service

| | ● **Term Instructors, Renewable Term Instructors, or**<br>● **Adjunct**[19] **Instructors of Any Rank** | ● **Probationary Faculty,**<br>● **Associate Instructors,**<br>● **Senior Instructors** | **Tenured Faculty of Any Rank** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expect-ations**[20] | **Active participation** in service to the department, as specified in offer letter.<br><br>**Active participation** in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community, as specified in offer letter.<br><br>**Meaningful contributions** to processes or products of service.<br><br>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course | **Active participation** in service to the department. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.<br><br>**Active participation** in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.<br><br>**Meaningful contributions** to processes or products of service. | **Active participation** in service to the department.<br><br>**Active participation** in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community.<br><br>**Meaningful contributions** to processes or products of service.<br><br>Demonstrates **leadership** in service.<br><br>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios |

---

[18] All forms of peer review are available to tenured faculty. See Subdivisions 3.7c, 3.7d, and 3.7e.

[19] As specified in contract.

[20] Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances. Adjuncts do not do service outside of that specified in their offer letter.

33

|  |  | Service growth over the course of the probationary period for faculty with reduced service expectations at the beginning.<br><br>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments for service). | (e.g., course reassignments for service). |
|---|---|---|---|
| reassignments for service). |  |  |  |
| **Exceeds Expect-ations**[21] | Contributing service above or beyond that specified in offer letter.<br><br>Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community **recognition** for service.<br><br>Meaningful **participation** in program review and/or student outcome assessment. | Widespread service or **extensive service** in multiple areas (may include discipline or broader community).<br><br>Demonstrates substantial **leadership** in service.<br><br>Critical ==and constructive== **contributions** to major service projects.<br><br>Substantial **mentorship** of students or colleagues.<br><br>Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community **recognition** for service.<br><br>Meaningful **participation** in program review and/or student outcome assessment. | Sustained widespread service or **extensive service** in multiple areas.<br><br>Demonstrates substantial, sustained **leadership** in service.<br><br>Critical ==and constructive== **contributions** to major service projects.<br><br>Substantial **mentorship** of students or colleagues.<br><br>Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community **recognition** for service.<br><br>Meaningful **participation** in program review and/or student outcome assessment. |

---

[21]This list provides examples of performance which exceeds expectations. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

| | Weak or no constructive service as specified in offer letter. | Weak or no constructive participation or contributions in department, college, or university service.<br><br>Does not grow in service over time. | Weak or not broadly enough participation in service.<br><br>Participation is not active or does not contribute meaningfully.<br><br>Never or rarely demonstrates leadership. |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improve-ment**[22] | | | |

(Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

## Table 3.11d University Guiding Standards: Librarianship (for Library Faculty)

| | • **Probationary Faculty,**<br>• **Term,**<br>• **Renewable Term Instructors, or**<br>• **Adjunct Instructors** | • **Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with a Standard Portfolio,**<br>• **Associate Instructors,**<br>• **Senior Instructors, Associate Adjunct Instructors, or**<br>• **Senior Adjunct Instructors** | **Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Librarianship Portfolio** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expect-ations**[23] | Librarianship reflects rich **content knowledge** of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)<br><br>Librarianship fosters **information literacy, discovery, and/or access.**<br><br>**Creation and provision of information, resources, and services** advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and | Librarianship reflects rich **content knowledge** of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)<br><br>Librarianship fosters **information literacy, discovery, and/or access**.<br><br>**Creation and provision of information, resources, and services** advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and | Librarianship reflects rich **content knowledge** of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)<br><br>Librarianship fosters **information literacy, discovery, and/or access.**<br><br>**Creation and provision of information, resources, and services** advances critical thinking, scholarly |

[22]This list provides examples of performance which needs improvement. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

[23] Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Meets Expect-ations**[24] **Cont.** | learning in an evolving information landscape.<br><br>**Activities** contribute to university and library priorities and goals.<br><br>Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).<br><br>Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.<br><br>**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals. | learning in an evolving information landscape.<br><br>**Activities** contribute to university and library priorities and goals.<br><br>Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).<br><br>Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.<br><br>**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals. | research, and learning in an evolving information landscape.<br><br>**Activities** contribute to university and library priorities and goals.<br><br>Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., assisting others in staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).<br><br>Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.<br><br>**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.<br><br>**Innovation** in librarianship.<br><br>**Leadership** in librarianship or faculty development within the discipline.<br><br>Sustained engagement with the **scholarship** of |

[24] Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.

36

| | | | librarianship. |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Exceeds Expectations**[25] | Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which contributes substantially to the practice of librarianship.<br><br>Substantial **innovation** in areas information literacy, discovery, and/or access.<br><br>**Substantial leadership** in area of practice.<br><br>**Widespread adoption** of librarianship practices out in the field.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** in the practice of librarianship or contribution to the profession. | Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which contributes substantially to the practice of librarianship.<br><br>Substantial **innovation** in areas information literacy, discovery, and/or access.<br><br>**Substantial leadership** in area of practice.<br><br>**Widespread adoption** of librarianship practices out in the field.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** in the practice of librarianship or contribution to the profession. | Extensive **leadership** in area of practice.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for substantial **innovation** in areas information literacy, discovery, and/or access.<br><br>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary **recognition** for excellence in librarianship.<br><br>**Widespread adoption** of librarianship practices out in the field. |
| **Needs Improvement**[26] | Librarianship is weak.<br><br>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access<br><br>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services. | Librarianship is weak.<br><br>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access<br><br>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services. | Librarianship is weak.<br><br>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access<br><br>Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners |

[25]This list provides examples of performance which exceeds expectations. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

[26]This list provides examples of performance which needs improvement. At a minimum, departments must include any items from this list that are pertinent to their discipline as examples. Departments may also include additional standards.

| Needs Improvement Cont. | Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners | Weak or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners | No or superficial self-assessment or reflection. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No or superficial self-assessment or reflection. | No or superficial self-assessment or reflection. | Weak or no participation in faculty professional librarianship development. |
| | Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development. | Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development. | No faculty development around librarianship. |
| | | | No leadership around librarianship. |
| | | | No innovation. |
| | | | No engagement in the scholarship of librarianship. |

## Section 3.12 Calendar[27]

### SPRING SEMESTER

**By March 1 - Departments Complete Revisions of "*Departmental Standards and Criteria Document*" and "*Professional Assessment Committee Procedures*"**

Departments complete revisions of **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f) and **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures** (Subdivision 3.1g). Department PAC committees should also select PAC chair/co-chairs for the coming academic year.

**Between March 1-15 - Convene College Review Committee**

Deans convene the College Review Committee (CRC), which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of reviewing the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** and **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**. (See Subdivision 3.2d).

**April 15** - **Distribute Evaluation Standards**

---

[27] For all dates on timeline, if the date falls on a weekend, it shall be alternately on the first business day thereafter.

Department Heads will distribute the **Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation** and **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures** to all faculty members for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure, and post-tenure review, except that when no changes have been made, provision of these materials to a Faculty Member in a previous year shall be understood to comply with this Section. The evaluation standards and PAC procedures should be simultaneously distributed to members of the PAC, the dean, and provost or designee.

### April 30 - Request Consideration for Promotion/Promotion & Tenure; Notification of Post-Tenure Review

1. By this date, faculty must request consideration for seeking Promotion/Promotion & Tenure for the following academic year. Request for consideration may be made earlier, per department procedures. (See Section 3.15).

2. Department Heads notify tenured faculty who will complete post-tenure review in the following academic year. (See Section 3.16).

## FALL SEMESTER

### August-September - Department Heads Meet with Faculty

During the Fall semester, the department head shall have individual meetings with all faculty members eligible for annual review. The purpose of the meeting is developmental and formative, to review progress on the faculty member's previous year's goals, and discuss future short-term and long-term goals for the faculty member. (See Subdivision 3.13f).

### September 15 - Request for Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty submit request to PAC chair for a comprehensive review by the PAC. (See Subdivision 3.16g).

### By Sept. 25 - Review Department Standards and Criteria

1. **PAC chair/s** and **Department Head** shall meet with new PAC members, probationary faculty members, and any faculty members who have applied for promotion and/or tenure or will be participating in post-tenure review to review the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f) for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure, and post-tenure review.

2. Deans may convene the **College Review Committee** (CRC; Subdivision 3.2d), which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of orienting them regarding the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** and **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**. The

discussion may include reviewing the Faculty Handbook, departmental standards and criteria, PAC procedures, consistency across the college, and other forms of training or discussion.

**Oct. 15** - **Deadline for Submission of Assessment Materials**

Faculty members (renewable term, probationary, candidates for tenure and promotion, and candidates for post-tenure review) must submit materials, including the **Faculty Narrative** (when seeking promotion and/or tenure, and during the year three probationary review period; see Section 3.10), for their **evaluation file** no later than this date. Materials may be earlier, per department procedures. See Subdivision 3.4b Evaluation File (including portfolios) Contents for a list of all materials.

**Oct. 15 - Deadline for Initial Follow-up Report for Performance Improvement Plan following Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review**
    See Paragraph 3.16.f.3 Outcome 2.

**September-November** (as determined by department PACs) - **Peer Observations**

1. PAC conducts peer teaching observations (Subdivision 3.5c) of probationary faculty, renewable term Instructors, tenured faculty applying for promotion, and post-tenure review faculty. Also PAC meets to discuss and vote on cases.

2. PACs may opt to conduct some peer teaching observations in the spring semester in advance of their reviews of faculty for the following fall semester, in order to reduce PAC workload and for cases in which certain courses are only taught by faculty in the spring semester.

3. Department heads may observe at this time, as well as other times during the academic year.

**Dec. 15 - PAC Reports** (see Subdivision 3.14k)

PACs distribute their report to the probationary faculty member, faculty candidate for promotion and tenure, renewable term Instructor, or faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review by December 15. PACs also submit their reports to the department head, dean, and evaluation file no later than December 15. (See Table 3.2 for a summary of which faculty PAC review).

**SPRING SEMESTER**

**Mid-January - Dean's Retreat (optional)**

College-level dean's retreat with department heads to review all promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure review cases within the college.

### Feb. 1 - Head's Evaluation of Faculty Members

Department heads distribute their report to the probationary faculty member, faculty candidate for promotion and tenure, renewable term Instructor, or faculty member under consideration for post-tenure review by February 1. Department heads submit their reports to the dean by Feb. 1 (See Subdivision 3.13l).

### After Feb. 1 - Heads Meet with Faculty Members (optional)

Department heads and probationary faculty may meet a second time in the spring semester. (See Subdivision 3.13f).

### Mid-February Provost's Retreat

Provost retreat with all deans to review all promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure review cases in the university.

### February - Withdrawal from Consideration for Promotion to Professor

Faculty who request consideration for promotion to Professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair, department head, dean, and provost before the provost's decision. (See Paragraph 3.15a.4).

### Mar. 1 - Provost Letters

All probationary faculty, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure, renewable term faculty, and faculty under consideration for post-tenure review, shall receive official written evaluation of their work from the provost.

### March 15 - Performance Improvement Planning after Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

Any Performance Improvement Plans for faculty who have undergone comprehensive post-tenure review are due. (See Paragraph 3.16.f.3 Outcome 2: Needs Improvement).

### April 15 - Deadline for Submission of Faculty Activity Report

Date by which all faculty members [temporary (adjunct), term, renewable term, probationary, and tenured faculty] submit materials for the Annual Review, including completing the **Faculty Activity Report (FAR)**, and reporting on the previous academic year activities from April 1 of the previous year through March 31 of the current year.

### June 25 - Department Head Annual Review Letters

1. Department heads will provide written annual evaluation of term, renewable term, probationary, and tenured faculty members based on materials submitted in the FAR and for the purposes of merit pay. The letters shall be transmitted concurrently to the dean and the faculty member. (See Subdivision 3.13m Awarding of Annual Merit).

2. **Human Resource Services** will also provide notice to all non-temporary faculty members of their salary statement for the following academic year.

## Section 3.13 Annual Review for Faculty by Department Head

### Subdivision 3.13a Purpose

Annual review provides an annual assessment of faculty performance, feedback for faculty reflection, an opportunity for faculty to access professional development resources, and the allocation of merit pay. Annual reviews are also used for continuation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review purposes.

### Subdivision 3.13b Eligibility for Annual Reviews

Department heads shall evaluate annually the teaching, scholarship, and service of all probationary (fall and spring), tenured (spring; or fall and spring for action cases), term (spring), and renewable term faculty (fall and spring), according to their designated workload or contract. Department heads shall review Adjunct Instructors with an appointment of 50% or more during the first year and every sixth semester thereafter, or sooner if the faculty member's performance is found to Need Improvement. Department heads may review Adjunct Instructors with appointments below 50% at their discretion. Adjunct faculty members may request an annual review by the department head at other times.

### Subdivision 3.13c Conflicts of Interest

Department heads who have a conflict of interest should follow University Policy 4.03 Conflicts of Interest in Employment (Nepotism).

### Subdivision 3.13d Timeline and Process Schedule for Annual Review by Faculty Rank: Summary

The annual review process follows the timelines and process schedule in Table 3.2 Evaluation and Process Schedule by Faculty Rank: Summary and Section 3.12 Calendar.

### Subdivision 3.13e Standards and Criteria for Annual Review

University Guiding Standards are found in Section 3.11. Specific criteria for annual review are documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (see Subdivision 3.1f).

### Subdivision 3.13f Annual Meeting with Department Head

During the fall semester, the department head shall have individual meetings with all faculty members. The purpose of each meeting is developmental and

formative. The discussion should review progress on the faculty member's previous year's goals and discuss future short-term and long-term goals. Department heads and probationary faculty may meet a second time in the spring semester.

## Subdivision 3.13g Outcomes of Annual Review for All Faculty

Department heads shall assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

## Subdivision 3.13h Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty

### Paragraph 3.13h.1 Continued Probation

Department Heads shall recommend Continued Probation (probationary faculty) or retention (renewable term faculty) only if the faculty member Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in each area of job performance (teaching and scholarship, service) required by portfolio and rank. The Department Head shall state the strengths of faculty performance and any recommendations for improvement.

### Paragraph 3.13h.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties

Department Heads shall recommend Continued Probation With Difficulties if the probationary faculty member Needs Improvement in one or more of the areas under review. The department head, in consultation with the dean, shall provide specific actions to be taken and outcomes to be completed in the next year to address the deficiencies. The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to create a plan for improving performance. The department head and faculty will consult the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for teaching, scholarship, and service improvement plans.

### Paragraph 3.13h.3 Termination

Seriously deficient performance is sufficient cause for a recommendation to terminate a faculty member's probationary or renewable term appointment. (Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1, Subdivision 2.42 & Subdivision 2.45). In making such a recommendation, department heads must explain why the performance warrants termination. If termination is approved, probationary or renewable term faculty members shall remain employed by the university for a period of one academic year, performing duties assigned by the department head and dean.

43

### Subdivision 3.13i Third-Year Review for Probationary Faculty

Department heads provide a comprehensive review of probationary faculty member's performance to date in year three in order to assess cumulative accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service in relation to Departmental Standards and Criteria.

### Subdivision 3.13j Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure

For promotion and/or tenure cases, department heads shall recommend (a) Promotion, (b) Promotion Denied, (c) Tenure, (d) Tenure Denied, or (e) Termination, as appropriate for the case. Department heads shall provide a substantive rationale for their decisions in the evaluation letter.

### Subdivision 3.13k Outcomes for Review of Tenured Faculty

Department heads shall assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

### Subdivision 3.13l Evaluation Letters

Evaluation letters provide faculty with feedback and decision outcomes. An evaluation letter shall include a summary of the assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to the faculty member's appointment and designated portfolio. Letters should not typically exceed a maximum of three pages, single spaced in minimum 11-pt font. Assessments of teaching shall include a summary of teaching observations and student assessments, as well as a narrative describing the improvements made in teaching and librarianship over time. Assessments of scholarship shall be both qualitative and quantitative but shall not include a narrative describing each scholarly work. Assessments of service activities shall address both the quality and quantity of service. Each letter shall include the relevant outcomes specified in Subdivisions 3.13g (outcomes for all), 3.13h (retention/continuance), 3.13j (promotion or tenure), and 3.13k (for tenured faculty). Letters shall also specify the annual merit designations for each area of performance, according to Subdivision 3.13m. The letters shall be transmitted concurrently to the dean and faculty member and shall be placed in the evaluation file.

### Subdivision 3.13m Awarding of Annual Merit

First, promotion raises (Section 9.2 Promotions) shall be dispersed from the merit and promotions pool (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement) to individual faculty members. Second, the remaining merit pool shall be allocated to each college according to the number of merit-eligible faculty FTE (not a percentage of

Merit pay is added to the faculty member's base pay. A letter with the following year's salary, designating the increase to base pay and merit award amount (if applicable), shall be distributed to faculty by Human Resource Services.

### Paragraph 3.13m.1 Eligibility for Merit

When not specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, all tenured, probationary, renewable term, and term faculty are eligible for merit pay.

### Paragraph 3.13m.2 Merit Formula

The department head shall calculate a total merit score for each faculty member based on their portfolio and performance as measured by the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f). Department heads shall assign full points up to a maximum of 4 points for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service). Then, they multiply each designation by the percentage for that area (teaching, scholarship, service) of the faculty member's official portfolio assignment (standard, extended teaching, or approved modified portfolio) as designated in this handbook. The department head will add the score for each area to determine the Faculty Member's Merit Score.

**Merit Calculation Summary**:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Exceeds Expectations= | 4 | | the percentage |
| Meets Expectations= | 1, 2, or 3 | x | for each area |
| Needs Improvement= | 0 | | of official portfolio |

Faculty Member's Merit Score = (Teaching rating x teaching portfolio percentage) + (Scholarship rating x Scholarship portfolio percentage) + (Service rating x Service portfolio percentage)[28]

---

[28] When a faculty member does not have an area as a part of their workload designation, remove it from the equation altogether.

Examples:

45

Only faculty who receive a 1 or above in each area will receive merit pay in a given year. (Faculty members who receive a 0 in any area will receive an overall 0 for their Faculty Member Merit Score and are therefore ineligible for merit.) <mark>The total amount allocated for merit pay is divided by the total number of points for all faculty (ranging from 0 to 4 for each faculty member) within each college. For the calculation of the merit pool of available funds, those who will receive no merit (a "0" merit score) are excluded from the total number of faculty in each college merit pool for that year.</mark> The quotient is how much each point is worth. For each faculty merit award, multiply each point worth times number of points awarded. The total merit funds disbursed cannot exceed the amount allotted for merit in a given year.

## Section 3.14 Review by PAC

### Subdivision 3.14a Purpose

The Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) conducts independent reviews of faculty performance. PAC reviews include recommendations regarding continuation/retention, promotion, tenure, post-tenure (during a Comprehensive Review), and performance improvement plans. The procedures for the evaluation process shall be detailed in the departmental **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document** ([Subdivision 3.1g](#)). Standards and criteria for evaluating faculty performance are documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** ([Subdivision 3.1f](#)) and the **University Guiding Standards** ([Section 3.11](#)).

---

The equation for a faculty member on a standard portfolio with designations at a high level of meeting expectations for teaching and service, and exceeds expectations for scholarship:
(3 x .6 ) (for teaching) + (4 x .25) (for scholarship) + (3 x .15) (for service) = 3.25

For a faculty member on a standard portfolio exceeding expectations for teaching and meeting expectations at mid-level for scholarship and service:
(4 x .6 ) (for teaching) + (2 x .25) (for scholarship) + (2 x .15) (for service) = 3.2

For a faculty member who has a course reassignment to do service and performs at a high level of meeting expectations:
(3 x .40) + (3 x .25) + (3 x .35) = 3.0

For a term faculty member who meets expectations at a high level in teaching (80%) and performs service at mid-level of meeting expectations (20% of the time):
(3 x . 80) + (2 x .20 ) = 2.8

<mark>For a faculty member with a standard portfolio but does not fulfill service responsibilities:
(2 x .6 ) (for teaching) + (2 x .25) (for scholarship) + (0 x .15) (for service) = 0</mark>

46

**Subdivision 3.14b Schedule for Review of Probationary, Renewable Term and Adjunct Faculty Members**

The evaluation schedule is summarized in Table 3.2. PACs shall provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews for all tenure and/or promotion cases of probationary, **adjunct (with 50% or more appointments)**, or renewable term faculty members.

Additionally, PACs shall evaluate the performance of all **probationary** faculty yearly. PACs also provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews of probationary faculty in year three.

PACs also shall review **adjunct** instructors of any rank or appointment at the faculty member's request, or at the discretion of the PAC as documented in the **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g).

PACs also shall evaluate the performance of all **renewable term** Instructors (not promoted to Associate) yearly. PACs provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews of renewable term Instructors in year three and when the faculty member is seeking promotion. PACs shall review renewable term Associate Instructors or Senior Instructors at the request of the faculty member, or at the discretion of the PAC, as document in the **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.**

**Subdivision 3.14c Schedule for Review of Tenured Faculty**

PACs provide a review of tenured faculty when (a) the faculty member is seeking promotion, (b) the faculty member has requested a comprehensive review by the PAC at any point during the post-tenure review period (see Subdivision 3.16g), or (c) the faculty member has received Needs Improvement designations in three annual reviews within the six-year review period by the department head (see Subdivision 3.16f).

**Subdivision 3.14d Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty by the Professional Assessment Committee**

The review may be conducted by the full membership of the PAC or by a subcommittee, as specified in the **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g).

**Paragraph 3.14d.1 PAC Deliberations**
PAC deliberations are to remain confidential and professional throughout the evaluation process. A PAC member may not disclose any information

47

related to votes or comments about a candidate to the candidate or others. Faculty should report violations to the PAC chair for resolution or to the Faculty Petition Committee in the case of a violation of university policy.

.

**Paragraph 3.14d.2 PAC Statement on Parliamentary Authority**

Where possible, the PAC will conduct its business consistent with the motion to consider informally. The parliamentary authority shall be the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order in all cases where they are not inconsistent with this structure of **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g) or other university policies.

**Paragraph 3.14d.3 PAC Voting**

PACs shall vote on recommendations of retention, tenure, promotion, termination, and post-tenure review. Votes shall be by secret ballot distributed to all PAC members.

**Paragraph 3.14d.4 Timeline for Review**

The PAC review process follows the timeline and process schedule summarized in Table 3.2  and Section 3.12 Calendar.

**Paragraph 3.14d.5 PAC Conflicts of Interest**

PAC members shall not review faculty with whom they have a conflict of interest pursuant to Section 3.3 Conflicts of Interest.

**Paragraph 3.14d.6 PAC Requesting Outside Members**

See Paragraph 3.2b.1 PAC Membership.

**Paragraph 3.14d.7 Procedures for Reviewing Files**

See Subdivision 3.4g Professional Assessment Committee Review.

**Paragraph 3.14d.8 Additional PAC Procedures**

PACs shall document any additional procedures according to Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.

**Subdivision 3.14e Standards and Criteria for Review**

University Guiding Standards are found in Section 3.11. Specific criteria for review are documented in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (see Subdivision 3.1f).

### Subdivision 3.14f Yearly Review by PAC for Faculty

A yearly PAC evaluation will be based on performance from October 15 of the preceding academic year (when evaluation files were due) to December in the current academic year.

For yearly reviews of probationary and renewable term faculty, PACs shall assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f). PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

### Subdivision 3.14g Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty

For probationary and renewable term faculty, PACs shall vote on and recommend (a) Continued Probation (probationary faculty) or Retention (renewable term faculty), (b) Continued Probation (probationary faculty) or Retention (renewable term faculty) with Difficulties, (c) Termination, or (d) Abstention. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC Report (Subdivision 3.14k).

#### Paragraph 3.14g.1 Continued Probation

PACs shall recommend Continued Probation or Retention if the faculty member Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in each area of job performance (teaching, scholarship, service) required by portfolio and rank. The PAC report shall state perceived strengths and any areas where improvement is needed.

#### Paragraph 3.14g.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties

PACs shall recommend Continued Probation or Retention with Difficulties if the faculty member Needs Improvement in one or more of the areas under review. The PAC shall recommend specific actions to be taken and outcomes to be completed in the next year to address the deficiencies.

#### Paragraph 3.14g.3 Termination

Seriously deficient performance is sufficient cause for a recommendation to terminate a faculty member's probationary appointment. (See Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1 Subdivision 2.45). In making such a recommendation, PACs must explain why the performance warrants termination. If termination is approved, probationary or renewable term faculty members shall remain employed by the university for a period of

one academic year, performing duties assigned by the department head and dean.

## Subdivision 3.14h Third-Year Review for Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty

PACs provide a comprehensive review of a probationary or renewable term faculty member's performance to date in year three. PACs also shall assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

## Subdivision 3.14i Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure Cases

For promotion and/or tenure cases, PACs provide a comprehensive review of performance to date or since the last promotion, as appropriate. PACs shall vote on and recommend (a) Promotion or (b) Promotion Denied and/or (c) Tenure or (d) Tenure Denied, or (e) Abstention, as appropriate for the case. PACs shall also assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the cumulative (not annual) criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f). PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

## Subdivision 3.14j Outcomes for Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

During a comprehensive post-tenure review, PACs shall vote on and assign a rating of (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

## Subdivision 3.14k PAC Reports

PACs shall submit recommendations through written reports to the department head by December 15 (see Section 3.12 Calendar). Such reports should reflect the PAC's comprehensive evaluation and collective judgments, as well as a report on the vote totals. For probationary or renewable term cases, see Subdivision 3.14f (yearly review) and Subdivision 3.14g (retention/continuance). For promotion and/or tenure cases, see Subdivision 3.14i. For post-tenure review cases, see Subdivision 3.14j.

PAC reports will include a summary of the assessment of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to the faculty member's designated portfolio. Letters should not typically exceed five pages, single space in a minimum of 11-pt font. Assessments of teaching/librarianship shall include a summary of teaching observations and student assessments, as well as a narrative describing the success of improvements made in teaching and learning over time. Assessments of scholarship shall be documented with an overall description in both qualitative and quantitative terms but not describing each scholarly work individually. Assessments of service activities shall address both the quality and quantity of service.

Either department head or PAC may call a meeting to discuss the majority report.

### Paragraph 3.14k.1 Minority Reports

Faculty members may also submit minority reports. A minority report must be submitted by December 15 (see Section 3.12 Calendar). PAC procedures (see Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document) should determine whether or not the submitted minority report will be signed by those PAC members creating the report.

### Subdivision 3.14l Meetings with the PAC

PACs may choose to meet with probationary faculty members and/or any additional faculty members scheduled to be promotion and/or tenure cases, to review the **Department Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f) for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure.

## Section 3.15 Promotion and/or Tenure of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

### Subdivision 3.15a Eligibility for Promotion and/or Tenure

Probationary faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or tenure. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate has a documented record of accomplishment in teaching, scholarship, and services. It is recognized that each candidate will have varied degrees of accomplishment in the three areas. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration by given to an evaluation of scholarship, and service. Individuals holding term, renewable term, temporary, non-academic, or other non-probationary appointments at the University are not eligible to be considered for tenure. Tenured Associate Professors are eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

### Paragraph 3.15a.1 Time in Rank

Probationary faculty are expected to undergo a review for tenure in year six of their tenure-track appointment, unless specified in their letter of offer. An Assistant Professor must complete at least six years of service in rank, including at least three years at the rank of Assistant Professor at UNI, before promotion to Associate Professor.

An Associate Professor completes at least six years in rank before promotion to Professor, unless specified in their letter of offer.

Under extenuating circumstances, a faculty member may request to: 1) suspend the probationary tenure/promotion clock or 2) extend the probationary period for a 7th year by completing a Request to Suspend the Probationary Tenure/Promotion Clock or Request to Extend the Probationary Period for a Seventh Year, both of which are located in the forms repository.[29]

### Paragraph 3.15a.2 Early Promotion or Tenure

Because sufficient time is necessary to demonstrate consistent levels of performance which Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, early consideration for tenure and promotion is rare. The awarding of tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor one year prior to the expiration of the sixth year of service may be justified in cases of exceptional performance. Exceptional performance includes cases in which the candidate clearly Meets Expectations in all areas and Exceeds Expectations in teaching plus one additional area of scholarship or service during three years of evaluations, not necessarily consecutively, in reviews by the PAC and department head. They must also Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations for the cumulative standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion to be eligible, as documented in the **Department Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

A faculty member may request through a letter early tenure or promotion to the department head no later than April 30.

### Paragraph 3.15a.3 Years Credit

Faculty may be awarded years of credit toward tenure and/or promotion upon hire. Years of credit, including specific accomplishments that count toward standards and criteria for tenure or promotion, must be documented in the faculty member's letter of offer or memorandum of understanding to be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

---

[29] https://java.access.uni.edu/FormsRepository/faces/formList.jspx#F

Probationary faculty retain the choice to use prior years of service or not, however, if they elect to not go up for tenure and/or promotion at the prescribed time using those years credit, they may not use prior service or accomplishments for those credited years in the future. In that case, only UNI years of service will count for a tenure and promotion bid.

### Paragraph 3.15a.4 Withdrawal from Consideration

Faculty who request consideration for promotion to Professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair, department head, dean, and provost before the provost's decision (see Section 3.12 Calendar).

### Subdivision 3.15b Materials Submission

Faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report (FAR), Faculty Narrative (Section 3.10), and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, according to Section 3.4.

### Subdivision 3.15c Timeline

Faculty shall submit a request to the department head by April 30 for consideration for promotion and/or tenure for the following academic year. Materials for the evaluation files for individuals seeking promotion and/or tenure are due on October 15. Faculty shall adhere to the timeline and process schedule in summarized in Table 3.2 and Section 3.12 Calendar.

### Subdivision 3.15d Standards and Criteria for Review

Standards and Criteria for tenure and/or promotion depend on the rank and portfolio of the faculty member. University-level standards are found in Section 3.11. Criteria for individual departments are found in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

### Subdivision 3.15e Promotion Salaries

Upon promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, faculty members shall receive salary increases to base pay as documented in Section 9.2.

## Section 3.16 Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

### Subdivision 3.16a Purpose

The source of the intellectual vitality of the University of Northern Iowa is the faculty. Individual faculty members, through the performance of their professional duties, create and nourish this vitality for the benefit of our students and the wider society. Tenured faculty members have an especially important role to play in sustaining and enhancing an academic environment in which free and rigorous inquiry can be pursued. Given their central role in serving our students and the

wider community, it is critically important for the tenured faculty to be provided a mechanism for periodic assessment and reflection.

Post-Tenure Review affords the opportunity for the professional performance of each tenured faculty member to be assessed longitudinally every six years. Self-reflection within departmental and university contexts presents the faculty member with a guidepost for further professional growth and re-tuning, for example, to better address current institutional priorities. In addition, these periodic assessments allow UNI to reward tenured faculty for consistently high-quality work. Finally, for those faculty members who are found to be deficient in one or more areas, there will be an opportunity to design and implement a performance improvement plan.

Ultimately, the goal of Post-Tenure Review is to assist tenured faculty to engage in a process of professional development over the length of their careers. Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of the tenure decision.

Academic freedom is paramount in order for faculty members to be fully effective as teachers and scholars. The post-tenure review process at the University of Northern Iowa is conducted according to this handbook and is guided by the "Minimum Standards for Good Practice if a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review is Established in the 1999 AAUP report *Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response*" and UNI's previous evaluation system.

### Subdivision 3.16b Relationship of Post-Tenure Review to Promotion to Professor

Post-tenure review and Promotion to Professor are independent processes; departments document their standards, which may be different, for each in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f). However, consideration for promotion to Professor takes the place of post-tenure review. A successful post-tenure review does not automatically qualify a faculty member for promotion to Professor. At the same time, a successful post-tenure review does not require meeting all the criteria necessary for promotion to Professor.

### Subdivision 3.16c Post-Tenure Review Clock

Faculty undergo post-tenure review every six years or after receiving three Needs Improvement designations during annual reviews within the six year review period, whichever comes first.

### Subdivision 3.16d Post-Tenure Review Process

The annual review process is the foundation of post-tenure review. As described in Section 3.13, the department head conducts an annual review of the

performance of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Performance in each of the three areas will be judged to (a) Meets Expectations, (b) Exceeds Expectations, or (c) Needs Improvement, according to the faculty member's rank and portfolio. Standards and Criteria are documented in the **University Guiding Standards** (Section 3.11) and **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

## Subdivision 3.16e Summary Review

<mark>If a faculty member is found in their annual evaluations to Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for three or more years of reviews</mark> the post-tenure review shall be a brief summary evaluation called the **Summary Review**, which shall be conducted by the department head. The department head's report shall be submitted to the dean and faculty member, and placed in the evaluation file. The faculty member may submit a written response to the department head and the dean, which shall also be placed in the evaluation file.

### Paragraph 3.16e.1 Materials Required for Summary Review

(i) One- to two-page summary from the faculty member reflecting on accomplishments over the review period and outlining goals for the next review period;

(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;

(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;

(iv) Current Curriculum Vitae.

### Paragraph 3.16e.2 Department Head's Summary Review Report

The department head shall summarize the results of the annual reviews over the post-tenure review period <mark>and provide an overall (cumulative) rating of Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in teaching scholarship, and service</mark>. The head may note areas of strength or make recommendations for performance improvement. The head may also discuss professional development opportunities or workload adjustment per Chapter 4 of this Handbook.

## Subdivision 3.16f Comprehensive Review

If a faculty member receives a Needs Improvement designation in <u>one or more</u> review areas (teaching, scholarship, and service, according to one's portfolio) in <mark>three</mark> annual reviews <mark>(not necessarily consecutively or in the same review area) durin</mark>g the post-tenure review period, a Comprehensive Review shall be separately conducted by the departmental PAC and by the department head during the next academic year. The PAC's report (along with optional minority reports) shall be submitted to the faculty member, department head, and dean;

and the report will be placed in the evaluation file. The department head's report shall be sent to the faculty member and dean, and placed in the evaluation file. The faculty member may submit a written response to the PAC or department head and dean, which shall be placed in the evaluation file.

### Paragraph 3.16f.1 Materials Required for Comprehensive Review

(i) Two- to three- page summary from the faculty member reflecting on performance over the review period and indicating how deficiencies have been or will be addressed. Goals for the next review period should also be discussed;

(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;

(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;

(iv) Current Curriculum Vitae;

(iv) Additional materials consistent with departmental review policies, as documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

### Paragraph 3.16f.2 Outcome 1: Meets or Exceeds Expectations Comprehensive Review Result

If the department head and PAC give a rating of Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations in each of the areas of the faculty member's portfolio during a Comprehensive Review, the post-tenure cycle restarts.

### Paragraph 3.16.f.3 Outcome 2: Needs Improvement Comprehensive Review Result

If the department head or PAC gives a rating of Needs Improvement for one or more areas of faculty performance during the Comprehensive Review, the department head shall work with the faculty member to develop a **Performance Improvement Plan** in order to strengthen performance in future annual reviews. ~~The faculty member may request the presence of a representative, including their PAC chair or United Faculty, when meeting with the department head.~~ The Performance Improvement Plan is due by March 15. The faculty member may consult with the PAC chair to assist in the process. The Performance Improvement Plan shall be approved by the department head and dean and placed in the Evaluation File. If the faculty member and the department head cannot agree on an acceptable plan, the department head and PAC chair will create one that is approved by the dean. The plan shall be sent to the faculty member for final review before implementation. ~~The faculty member may appeal the decision. (Appeal procedures are located in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook. ).~~

The plan shall contain specific actions and measures to address the deficiencies found in the review. The department head and faculty member will consult the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for teaching, scholarship, and service improvement plans. An initial Follow-up Report of the results of the Performance Improvement Plan must be completed by October 15 of the following semester. In the spring, faculty members will update their progress in the FAR.

During the next two subsequent annual reviews, the department head shall use the Performance Improvement Plan and Follow-up Report as a basis for evaluation. Significant progress on all corrective elements of the plan will be expected by the second annual review.

### Paragraph 3.16f.4 Sanctions

In the event that recurring evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question the faculty member's ability to function in their position, then sanctions up to and including dismissal may be imposed. Any sanctions must be levied in accordance with university Policies and Procedures and the Faculty Handbook, including Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Faculty Handbook. The standard for dismissal remains that of just cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause for dismissal (however, such reviews may constitute evidence of such cause).

### Paragraph 3.16f.5 Appeals

Appeal procedures are located in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook.

## Subdivision 3.16g Requesting a Comprehensive Review

Faculty may request a Comprehensive Review by the PAC by submitting a letter with the request to the PAC chair by September 15 (see Section 3.12 Calendar).

## Subdivision 3.16h Reviews for Other Levels of Performance

If a faculty member's annual reviews exhibit deficiencies but not at a level for which a comprehensive review is mandatory, the head may request either a Summary Review or a Comprehensive Review for the scheduled post-tenure review.

### Subdivision 3.16i Special Circumstances

(i) A faculty member may petition to defer post-tenure review for good cause, including PDA, Fulbright assignments, extended FMLA, or leaves of absence approved by the Board. The faculty member must submit a written request to the department head as soon as practical. If a deferment is granted, it shall be for a period of one year.

(ii) A faculty member who plans to go up for promotion the following year may delay post-tenure review for a year. In the case that the faculty member does not ultimately go up for promotion, the faculty member will undergo post-tenure review that year.

(iii) A faculty member who will fully retire within one year after a post-tenure review is scheduled to occur may choose to forgo the review. An official retirement letter must be submitted in writing to Human Resource Services (HRS).

(iv) Faculty members on phased retirement shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review.

### Subdivision 3.16j Outstanding Performance Rewards

Full professors who have received outstanding performance reviews during post-tenure review shall receive a monetary award as documented in Section 9.2.

## Section 3.17 Review and Promotion of Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty

### Subdivision 3.17a Purpose

A central goal of the University of Northern Iowa is that all students be afforded a high-quality learning environment for the development of the knowledge and skills necessary for professional careers and productive citizenship. Thus, in carrying out the responsibilities set forth in their portfolio, adjunct and renewable term faculty members are expected to meet high professional standards. Further, the university also seeks to provide an equitable and inclusive governance structure to ensure full and fair participation in the university's affairs. This governance structure must include non-tenure-track faculty to the fullest level consistent with their workload but without the erosion of the rights and privileges of the tenure system. Given their important role in the life of the university, a system of ranked positions, similar to those available on the tenure track, exists for adjunct (with 50% or more appointments) and renewable term faculty.

### Subdivision 3.17b Appointment Types

Non-tenure track faculty hold one of three appointment types, including (i) Temporary Adjunct, (ii) Term (1-4 years), and (iii) Renewable Term (rolling

two-year contract). These appointment types are defined and explained in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 of the Faculty Handbook, respectively.

### Subdivision 3.17c Review of Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty

The evaluation schedule is summarized in Table 3.2. Both department heads and PACs review adjunct and renewable term faculty.

**Department heads** review **Adjunct Instructors** with an appointment of 50% or more during the first year and every sixth semester thereafter, or sooner if the faculty member's performance is found to Need Improvement (see Section 3.13 Annual Review for Faculty by Department Head) or when seeking promotion. Department heads may review Adjunct Instructors with appointments below 50% at their discretion.

**PACs** review **Adjunct** Instructors of any rank when seeking promotion or more frequently as documented in the **Professional Assessment Committee PAC Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g) (see Section 3.14 Review by PAC). PACs may review Adjunct Instructors with appointments below 50% at their discretion as documented in the PAC Procedures Document.

**Adjunct** faculty members may request an annual review by the **department head** or PAC at other times.

**Department heads** review **renewable term** Instructors of any rank annually (see Section 3.13).

**PACs** review **renewable term** Instructors (not promoted) yearly, with an extensive, multi-year review in year three and when seeking promotion. PACs may choose to conduct a yearly review of Associate Instructors or Senior Instructors as documented in the PAC Procedures Document (Subdivision 3.1g). Renewable term instructors may request a yearly review by the PAC at any time (Subdivision 3.14f Yearly Review by PAC for Faculty).

#### Paragraph 3.17c.1 Materials Submission

Adjunct (with 50% or more appointments) and renewable term faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report, Faculty Narrative, and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, as documented in their **Professional Assessment Committee PAC Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g) and Section 3.4 Evaluation Files.

#### Paragraph 3.17c.2 Timeline

Faculty shall adhere to the timeline and process schedule summarized in Table 3.2  and Section 3.12 Calendar. Materials for annual review and

promotion are due October 15th. The Faculty Activity Report and other evaluation materials for the evaluation files are due March 31.

### Paragraph 3.17c.3 Standards and Criteria for Review

Standards and Criteria depend on the rank and portfolio of the faculty member. **University Guiding Standards** are found in Section 3.11. Criteria for individual departments are found in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

### Subdivision 3.17d Promotion

**Adjunct** faculty (on 50% or more appointments each semester) are eligible to apply for promotion after twelve cumulative semesters in rank at or above that percentage of time. Adjunct Instructors may be promoted to Associate Adjunct Instructor and then Senior Adjunct Instructor.

**Renewable term** faculty are eligible for promotion after six years in rank. Renewable Term Instructors may be promoted to Associate Instructor and then Senior Instructor.

Eligible Adjunct and Renewable Term faculty members shall be promoted when they Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations in all areas of their assigned duties as documented in the **University Guiding Standards** (Section 3.11) and **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f). Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration by given to an evaluation of scholarship and service (if applicable). Faculty must also Meet Expectations or Exceed Expectations for the cumulative standards and criteria to be eligible for promotion, as documented in the **Department Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

Applying for promotion is a personal choice of the adjunct or renewable term instructor. There shall be no penalty for not applying for promotion when eligible.

### Paragraph 3.17d.1 Promotion Salaries

Faculty members who are promoted shall receive salary increases (see Chapter 9, Section 9.2).

### Paragraph 3.17d.2 Other Responsibilities

Associate Instructors and Senior Instructors may serve on the PAC for the purposes of review of faculty below their rank (see Paragraph 3.2b.1a).

## Section 3.18 Faculty/Administrators Eligible for Tenure Upon Hire

Well-established faculty or faculty-administrators may be eligible for tenure in a department in their area of expertise at the time of hire, as documented in an offer letter. Department heads must submit appropriate materials to the dean and PAC of the designated department for consideration. Department Heads and PACs shall follow regular procedures for promotion, including a vote regarding the conferral of the of tenure recommendation.

## Section 3.19 Appeals

An attempt should be made first to resolve the complaint informally through meetings between the faculty member, the faculty member's representative (see Subdivisions 11.61 and 12.71 Representation), department head, dean, Associate Provost for Faculty, and/or PAC chair if the PAC was involved in the review. A faculty member may file a grievance, according to Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook. A faculty member may file a petition, according to Chapter 11 of the Faculty Handbook.

## Section 3.20 Faculty Participation in Administrative Evaluation Procedures

Faculty will participate in department head evaluations according to a process recommended by an ad hoc joint faculty-administration committee appointed by the Provost and Faculty Leadership. The provisions are documented in the Department Head Handbook.

**APPENDIX A: Department Standards and Criteria document Template**


**Department Standards and Criteria Document**
**(Instructions for Development)**


This document identifies the process for the specific operationalization of criteria for evaluating faculty performance at the departmental level, to be documented according to Subdivision 3.1f Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. Departments may complete the attached templates by adding criteria for **1) Annual Evaluation** and **2) Cumulative Reviews**. These templates are to include specific criteria appropriate for each rank according to each evaluative review time period.


All probationary and tenured faculty, PACs, and department heads are expected to collaborate together in order to create clear, consistent department-level standards and criteria for the purposes of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Departments should consult with adjuncts, term, and renewable term faculty regarding standards for their performance.


All criteria are to be reviewed annually in the spring semester by all departmental faculty members and department heads and submitted to the dean for approval. The Dean will consult with the College Review Committee (CRC) and Associate Provost for Faculty (in consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee during initial development and the Faculty Handbook Committee thereafter as needed). Upon approval of the document, it is to be distributed by department heads to the faculty of each department.


UNI recognizes, values, and prioritizes teaching as a faculty member's primary responsibility. The university also values and rewards scholarship and service when such activities are part of the faculty member's assigned workload.


Departments shall list criteria specifying any materials to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in addition to the required components in scholarship/research/creative activity and service. Tenured faculty may engage in Discovery, Integration, or Application research within their field of expertise. Additionally, the templates must specify which if any Integration or Application scholarship is to be recognized for promotion and tenure for probationary faculty. Discovery, Integration and Application components must be included in scholarly/research/creative activity criteria developed.


Criteria should specify departmental expectations for meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, and needing improvement for annual review, which align with expectations for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. All criteria must be consistent with the

**University Guiding Standards and Criteria (<ins>Section 3.11 University Guiding Standards</ins>).**

Criteria should specify departmental expectations for <ins>Meets Expectations</ins>, <ins>Exceeds Expectations</ins>, and <ins>Needs Improvement</ins> for *<ins>continuation</ins>, <ins>promotion</ins>, <ins>tenure</ins>, and <ins>post-tenure review</ins>* by *<ins>rank</ins>* and work *<ins>portfolio</ins>*.

Below are important definitions and sections included in the Faculty Handbook which inform the development of specific criteria:

## Teaching

Faculty members' primary role is to provide high quality teaching to students. Because excellence in teaching is the top priority of UNI, teaching is evaluated first and foremost. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching or librarianship effectiveness has been made can serious consideration by given to an evaluation of research/scholarship/creative achievement and service. UNI expects faculty to foster critical thinking and knowledge in the content area of study, as well as to tailor course content and rigor to the course level, curricular needs, program learning goals and outcomes, and UNI's student body. Faculty teaching should evolve over time as faculty members continue to refine and develop their teaching skills across their career. UNI encourages faculty to consider new pedagogical approaches when appropriate for their discipline. Teaching should be informed by the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or one's research.

## Definition of Teaching (FH, Section 4.1)
## <ins>Section 3.5</ins> Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Teaching

> ### <ins>Subdivision 3.5a</ins> Required versus Optional Teaching Components
> ### <ins>Subdivision 3.5b</ins> Required Component: Self-Assessment
> ### <ins>Subdivision 3.5c</ins> Required Component: Observations for Probationary Faculty and Action Cases
> > #### Paragraph 3.5c.1 Training
> > #### Paragraph 3.5c.2 Observations by Pedagogy Expert
> > #### Paragraph 3.5c.3 Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education Courses
> > #### Paragraph 3.5c.4 Example Forms for Peer Observation
> > #### Subdivision 3.5d Required Component: Student Assessments
> > #### Paragraph 3.5d.1 Frequency and Access
> > #### Subparagraph 3.5d.1a Probationary Faculty and Instructors
> > #### Subparagraph 3.65.1b Tenured Faculty, Associate Instructors, Senior Instructors
> > #### Paragraph 3.5d.2 Faculty Reflection

## Paragraph 3.5d.3 Interpretation
## Definition of Librarianship (FH, Section 4.2)
## Definition of Scholarship/Creative Activity (FH, Section 4.3)
## Discovery (FH, Subdivision 4.31)
## Integration (FH, Subdivision 4.32)
## Application (FH, Subdivision 4.33)

## Department Standards and Criteria Document Template

Name of Department _____

Academic Year:  20xx-20xx

Date of Revision _____

## TEACHING CRITERIA* (annual)

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors | Associate Professors | Professors | Tenured Faculty (all ranks) |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improvement** | | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

### Summary of Teaching Criteria*: Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for Promotion and Tenure; Promotion, and Post-tenure Review:

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors** | **Associate Professors** | **Professors** | **Tenured Faculty (all ranks)** |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

### SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY CRITERIA* (annual)

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors** | **Associate Professors** | **Professors** | **Tenured Faculty (all ranks)** |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

66

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

## Summary of Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity Criteria* - Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for promotion and tenure; promotion, and post-tenure review:

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors** | **Associate Professors** | **Professors** | **Tenured Faculty (all ranks)** |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

67

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

### SERVICE CRITERIA* (annual)

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors** | **Associate Professors** | **Professors** | **Tenured Faculty (all ranks)** |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

**Summary of Service Criteria\*:  Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for Promotion and Tenure; Promotion, and Post-tenure Review:**

| | *RANKS:* | *STANDARD PORTFOLIO:* | | *EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors** | **Associate Professors** | **Professors** | **Tenured Faculty (all ranks)** |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

69

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*

### TEACHING (Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity/Service – if present) CRITERIA (annual)

| | *RANKS:* | *TEACHING PORTFOLIO:* | | *RESEARCH/SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES (if present)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors** | **Instructors** | **Senior Instructors** | Criteria to be defined in offer or annual evaluation letters according to individualized portfolio assignments |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

70

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Needs Improvement** | | | |

**TEACHING (Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity/Service – if present) CRITERIA - Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years)**

| | *RANKS:* | *TEACHING PORTFOLIO:* | | *RESEARCH/SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES (if present)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *RATINGS:* | **Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors** | **Instructors** | **Senior Instructors** | Criteria to be defined in offer or annual evaluation letters according to individualized portfolio assignments |
| **Meets Expectations** | | | | |
| **Exceeds Expectations** | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| **Needs Improvement** | | | | |

**APPENDIX B: Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Template**


**Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures**
**(Instructions for Development)**


The **Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures Document** (Subdivision 3.1g) defines how each Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) organizes, functions, schedules and complete its work.

The document is to be created separately but in conjunction with the **Department Standards and Criteria Document,** which is utilized by individual departments as their guiding resource for faculty evaluation (see Subdivision 3.1f). Any PAC procedures developed must be consistent with the Faculty Handbook and are to be approved annually by the department head, dean (in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)), and Associate Provost for Faculty (in consultation initially upon development with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and then the Faculty Handbook Committee as needed in the future). The procedures are then distributed to the faculty of each department. The procedures must adhere to the **Calendar** (Section 3.12).

If the department head, dean, or Provost designee reject the department's document, they shall provide clear direction and feedback for revising the document to meet the **University Guiding Standards** (Section 3.11) and other general university policies and procedures**.** Departments which fail to create or document specific approved department-level standards and criteria for evaluating faculty shall default to the **University Guiding Standards** documented in this Handbook.

Faculty Handbook provisions related to roles, responsibilities, deliberations, parliamentary authority, scheduling of meetings and PAC reports is documented in the Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 3.2b.

**Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures Document**

Name of Department _____

Academic Year:  20xx-20xx

Date of Revision _____

PAC Chair (signature)

_____

Department Head (signature)

_____

Dean (signature)

_____

Associate Provost for Faculty (signature)

_____

**APPENDIX C: Syllabi**

**ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS/BEST PRACTICES FOR COURSE SYLLABI**

Syllabi with the following information meet expectations within the UNI Faculty Handbook and UNI Policies and Procedures, and for meeting Higher Learning Commission's accreditation review standards for the university. Providing this information in course syllabi is one way instructors communicate expectations to their students.

1. **Course Information**
   a. Course name and course number
   b. Meeting times and location (or indicate if online)
   c. Faculty Name, Contact Information, Office Location and Office Hours
   d. Credit Hours with the following note: "This course meets the Course Credit Hour Expectation outlined in the Course Catalog. Students should expect to work approximately 2 hours per week outside of class for every course credit hour."

Note: If teaching an asynchronous online course, an independent study, an internship or practicum or other non face-to-face course, the syllabus must include a description of the work involved that meets the definition above. For example, an internship could require that students spend at least 40 hours of work per credit hour at their internship, plus an additional five hours working on papers to meet the internship's requirements. This would be equivalent to the 45 hours of work per credit hour in a face-to-face course.

2. **Course learning outcomes –** Course learning outcomes are statements about the knowledge and skills that students are expected to know, be able to do, or value by the end of the course. Learning outcomes must be common across all sections and all modes of delivery for the same course.  Additionally, learning outcomes for undergraduate courses should be distinguished from learning outcomes for graduate courses, which must be more rigorous. Finally, outcomes should be distinguished for variable credit (i.e., if some students are taking a 3 hour internship and others a 6 hour internship, the learning outcomes are likely different).

3. **Course Description** - add catalog description.

4. **Description of how student performance will be evaluated**
   a. Listing and Description of Assignments
   b. Weighting of Assignments
   c. Grading Scale

5. **Approved Statements for Non-discrimination and Accessibility**

   a. Office of Compliance and Equity Management
   "The University of Northern Iowa does not discriminate in employment or education. Visit 13.03 Equal Opportunity & Non-Discrimination Statement (https://policies.uni.edu/1303) for additional information."

   b. Student Accessibility Services
   Non-discrimination based on Disabilities

      "The University of Northern Iowa (UNI) complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act of 2008 (ADAAA), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Fair Housing Act, and other applicable federal and state laws and regulations that prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability. To request accommodations please contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS), located at ITTC 007, for more information either at (319) 273-2677 or Email accessibility services@uni.edu. Visit Student Accessibility Services (https://sas.uni.edu/) for additional information."

6. **Recommendations from the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning**

   ● Materials required and recommended, and where they are available
   ● A course calendar with due dates for assignments/projects/exams or a statement about how these dates are determined.
   ● Attendance policy (see Class Attendance and Makeup Work, https://policies.uni.edu/306)
   ● Policies on turning in course work, late work, make-up work
   ● Statement on classroom civility
   ● Diversity and inclusion statement
   ● Resources for student success

**APPENDIX D: Instruction Modes/Definition of Credit Hour**

In general, it is assumed that courses will be taught face-to-face ("in person") unless an alternative approach is approved in advance by the academic department head. Faculty members should discuss their interest in blended or online course delivery with their department head prior to schedule development to ensure the approach is consistent with departmental goals and that students are informed about course instruction mode as they register. All courses scheduled to be taught online are expected to meet university standards, such as Quality Matters (QM) standards.

Changes to instruction mode after registration begins should be made only in extraordinary circumstances and with the approval of the academic department head and dean. Enrolled students must be promptly informed of any changes.

UNI adheres to the federal definition of the credit hour in all courses, regardless of instruction mode, meeting pattern, or course format. A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that reasonably approximates not less than:

> one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester; or, the equivalent amount of work in item (1) over a different amount of time; or, at least an equivalent amount of work in item (1) for other activities, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading toward to the award of credit hours/units of credit.

In addition, distance/online courses and independent studies are expected to reflect equivalencies in the amount of instructional time and student work leading to equivalent learning outcomes as reflected in the same courses offered face-to-face.

| Instruction Mode Code In SIS | Description | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| P | In Person | Instruction takes place face-to-face. May incorporate online elements to supplement what is an in-person course. |
| PO | In Person/Online | Instruction takes place face-to-face and online, with a specified proportion of the instruction taking place online. The time spent meeting face-to-face is reduced accordingly. Any change to the specified percentage of online instruction compared to face-to-face meetings after the course has started should be discussed with the department head. Sometimes referred to as blended or hybrid instruction. |
| O | Online Semester Based | Most or all of the instruction takes place online. No on-campus attendance is required. Instruction begins and ends within standard fall and spring semesters and at various times during summer terms. In general, these courses are "paced" in that a group of students moves through the material together in the same time frame with assignments that are due at prescribed times. Online courses may be fully synchronous or a blend of asynchronous (e.g., discussion forums) and synchronous (video conferencing tools). |

| OG | Online Guided Independent Study | Most or all of the instruction takes place online. No on-campus attendance is required. These courses are "open" in that students may enroll at any time, work at their own pace, and take up to one year to complete. |
|----|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## SIS Instruction Modes and Definitions Common Tools Used in Online Courses

| Zoom | A video conferencing tool that is used for synchronous instruction. |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Adobe Connect | A video conferencing tool that is used for synchronous instruction. |
| eLearning | A learning management system that facilitates online components of instruction. Currently, UNI uses *Blackboard.* |

## Key Definitions

| Blended/Hybrid | See "In Person/Online" Instruction that includes a combination of face-to-face and specified online learning with a corresponding reduction of face-to-face meeting time. |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Flipped | A flipped classroom does NOT mean that a course does not meet face to face. The term refers to the way a particular professor may ask students to cover content outside of class either through eLearning (or not, as the case may be). Typically, students would be asked to review lectures or other content online and then when students come to class, they participate in collaborative activities which are based on the content that was delivered outside of class. |
| Synchronous | Interaction takes place in real time |
| Asynchronous | No requirement for all students to be available at the same time. |

**APPENDIX E: Grandfathering Plan for Post Tenure-Review and Promotion for Adjunct (50% or more appointments) and Renewable Term Faculty**

The university recognizes the challenges that come with implementing a new evaluation system with new standards and criteria. This appendix documents the plan for grandfathering individuals into the new system.

**Grandfathering Schedule: Start Dates**

| | Annual Review Standards and Criteria | Tenure and/or Promotion Standards and Criteria | Eligibility for Promotion | Post-tenure Review Standards and Criteria | Eligibility for Post-tenure Review |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **All faculty hired for 2019 or after** | Fall 2019 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Fall 2025 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Year six after tenure |
| **Probationary faculty starting prior to 2019** | Fall 2019 | Choice of New or Old Departmental Standards and Criteria | Year 6 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Year six after tenure |
| **Faculty tenured in 2013 or prior** | Fall 2019 | Choice of New or Old Departmental Standards and Criteria through fall 2022. | Year 6 or later after tenure | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | 2022, 2023, or 2024 (randomly assigned) |
| **Faculty tenured in 2014-2016** | Fall 2019 | Choice of New or Old Departmental Standards and Criteria through fall 2023. | Year 6 or later after tenure | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Tenured in 2014 = Post-Tenure Review (PTR) in 2022<br><br>Tenured in 2015 = PTR in 2023<br><br>Tenured in 2016 = PTR in 2024 |

| Faculty tenured in 2017 or after | Fall 2019 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Year 6 or later after tenure | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | 6 years after tenure or promotion, or after 3 needs improvements |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty hired prior to fall 2013 | Fall 2019 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Most senior faculty first starting in 2022 | NA | NA |
| Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty hired fall 2013 or after | Fall 2019 | New Departmental Standards and Criteria | Year 6 starting in 2022 | NA | NA |

## Annual Review

All faculty are subject to the University Guiding Standards and the Departmental Standards and Criteria for the purposes of annual review and merit pay beginning in fall 2019.

## Faculty Hired for Fall 2019 or Beyond

Faculty starting in fall 2019 and after are subject to the new University Guiding Standards and Departmental Standards and Criteria for the purposes of annual review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

## Probationary Faculty Starting Prior to Fall 2019

Faculty who started prior to fall 2019 shall have the choice of seeking promotion and/or tenure under the standards and criteria of the old or new system. Faculty shall declare in writing which system of standards they wish to be assessed by April 15 of the prior spring in their request to seek promotion and/or tenure.

## Adjunct (50% or More Appointment) and Renewable Term Faculty

Faculty who are not on the tenure-track are eligible for promotion starting in year six. Faculty with more than six years of service at UNI (i.e., those who started prior to fall 2013) are eligible to seek promotion on an expedited timeline after three years of annual reviews, starting in 2022.  Faculty who wish to seek promotion starting in fall 2022 may request promotion by April 15 of the prior spring semester. In the event that more faculty are seeking promotion than can be reasonably accommodated by the department head or PAC, then faculty shall be broken evenly into 2 or 3 groups based on seniority (i.e., faculty with the most years of service at UNI first) to be evaluated for promotion over 2022 and 2023 (with an extension to 2024 as an option in very large departments).

**Tenured Faculty**

Faculty who were tenured prior to the implementation of the new system shall have the choice of seeking promotion to Professor under the standards and criteria of the old or new system through fall 2022. Faculty shall declare in writing which system of Departmental Standards and Criteria  they wish to be assessed on by April 15 of the prior spring in their request to seek promotion and/or tenure.

Tenured Faculty with more than six years of service to the university (tenured in 2013 or prior) are subject to post-tenure review starting in fall 2022, after three consecutive years of annual review. Each of those faculty members shall be randomly assigned to one of three equally distributed groups to undergo post-tenure review in the years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

For tenured faculty with under six years post-tenure (tenured after 2013), faculty are encouraged to seek promotion in year six following tenure. Faculty who are six years post-tenure in 2022, 2023, and 2024 (tenured in 2016, 2017, 2018) shall undergo post-tenure review in the appropriate year. Faculty who are six years post-tenure in 2019 will undergo post-tenure review in 2022; those six years post-tenure in 2020 shall undergo post-tenure review in 2023; and those six years post-tenure in 2021 shall undergo post-tenure review in 2024.

## Section 9.3 Post-Tenure Rewards

The University shall make every effort to reward tenured full professors for consistently outstanding performance as assessed in the post-tenure review process. This reward shall take the form of a monetary award the size of which is determined annually by the provost in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty. The award is not a salary adjustment; it a one-time cash bonus. Tenured associate professors are rewarded for professional excellence via the salary adjustment that accompanies successful promotion to full professor.

### Subdivision 9.31 Eligibility
Tenured full professors who have spent at least three years at UNI are eligible for post-tenure monetary awards. In addition, eligible faculty must meet expectations or exceed expectations in teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service in all annual reviews during the post-tenure review period.

### Subdivision 9.32 Awards
Tenured full professors are eligible to receive three post-tenure awards based on their Summary Review (utilizing the cumulative criteria in the Department Standards and Criteria Document).

### Paragraph 9.32a Excellent Post-Tenure Performance Award
Eligible faculty who complete a Summary Review (utilizing the cumulative criteria) and have ratings of Exceeds Expectations in teaching/librarianship and

Meets Expectations in the other two areas (scholarship and service) during the post-tenure review period shall receive a monetary award of $250.
Paragraph 9.32b Outstanding Post-Tenure Performance Award
Eligible faculty who complete a Summary Review (utilizing the cumulative criteria) and have ratings of Exceeds Expectations in teaching/librarianship; plus Exceeds Expectations in one other evaluation area and Meets Expectations in the third area (scholarship or service) respectively) during the post-tenure review period shall receive a monetary award of $500.

**Paragraph 9.32c Superior Post-Tenure Performance Award**
Eligible faculty who complete a Summary Review (utilizing the cumulative criteria) and have ratings of Exceeds Expectations in all three evaluation areas (Teaching, Scholarship and Service) during the post-tenure review period shall receive a monetary award of $1,000.