

Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation
Second Edition

College of Liberal Arts
University of Southern Indiana

Approved by the Liberal Arts Council (October 2005)

Liberal Arts Mission
University of Southern Indiana

The College of Liberal Arts seeks to develop the individual, providing the essential skills of critical and creative thinking and expression that prepare students for an active life, both public and private, as well as civic and professional.

We strive to ignite intellectual curiosity and a passion for lifelong learning.

We aim for the understanding of self, society and ethics necessary for responsible and engaged citizenship, for integrity balanced with social awareness.

We foster both cultural enrichment and an appreciation of the human condition in all of its diversity.

We cultivate an awareness that truth is usually complex, multifaceted, and unlikely to be found in one place.

To reach our goals, the College of Liberal Arts offers comprehensive and multi-disciplinary programs, as well as extracurricular activities. We encourage and support faculty excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, creative production, and service. Challenging our students to address the historical, philosophical, cultural, and analytical foundations of their disciplines, we teach them to act with ethical and aesthetic awareness as leaders in their disciplines, their university, and their communities; and to communicate effectively in the free exchange of ideas.

Adopted 4/2004

Introduction to the Second Edition

This document is proposed as a revision of the 1998 Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation (hereafter C&C.) An ad-hoc College of Liberal Arts Committee appointed and chaired by then-Dean Iain Crawford met during spring 2003 to discuss faculty evaluation. (Committee members were Darrel Bigham, Maggie Felton, Teresa Huerta, Bob Jeffers, Michael Kearns, Elliot Wasserman, Rebecca Whisnant, and Steve Zehr.) This committee determined that such a revision was needed and that a draft should be prepared during summer 2003; Felton and Kearns undertook this task. Materials consulted by the committee include C&C; the USI University Handbook (hereafter Handbook); policy and procedures documents of the Colleges of Nursing, Business, and Science and Engineering Technology; and publications on faculty evaluation.

The revision is intended to build on the excellent work done by the authors of the 1998 edition while clarifying the process of evaluation, resolving some inconsistencies, expanding the definition of faculty work, and recognizing the point of view of contract faculty.

The present revision incorporates quite a bit of material from the 1998 edition. Like that edition, the revision is intended to be consistent with but to elaborate on the Handbook statements regarding academic appointment, promotion, and tenure (section III of the Handbook) with excerpts reprinted as Appendix A in this document.

The committee generating this revision agreed on the following general points. (1) Department evaluation committees, department chairs, and the dean of the College must work together to ensure that each faculty member receives a clear and coherent evaluation. (2) Given the disciplinary breadth of the College of Liberal Arts, it may be difficult if not impossible to establish a highly specific, College-wide set of criteria by which faculty can be evaluated, after the fashion, for instance, of the College of Business.

The introduction to the first (1998) edition of this document is located at the end.

Intended Audience

Because it addresses the evaluation of faculty members within the College of Liberal Arts, this document is intended for use by faculty members, evaluation committees, department chairs, the dean, the University Promotions Committee, and other administrators involved in decision-making regarding roles and responsibilities of persons within the College. It should also be of interest to persons seeking employment in the College.

Mission Statements

Evaluation within the College of Liberal Arts should be informed by the College's

mission statement, which was approved in April 2004. The following sentences from the University Mission statement also address issues important to the College of Liberal Arts.

A liberal arts and science curriculum provides the foundation of knowledge for all programs and complements undergraduate programs leading to careers....
(paragraph two)

Excellence in teaching will continue to be the most important criterion in faculty recruitment. At the same time, the ability to do research, to engage in continuous scholarly and creative work, and to provide service, primarily to the region and the state, will be important additional qualifications. (paragraph six)

A major emphasis of the University of Southern Indiana is the delivery of credit programs....The University [also] provides comprehensive outreach and public service programs of short duration—including workshops, conferences, seminars, and instructional courses. These programs will increase as the University continues to address economic, social, and cultural needs in Region 13 as well as in the state. (paragraph seven)

The University works in cooperation with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources to manage historic properties and tourism programs in New Harmony, Indiana, a community with a rich intellectual and cultural inheritance. The community provides opportunities for research and laboratory learning experiences which benefit both the town and the University. (paragraph nine)

Most comprehensively:

Therefore, as the University of Southern Indiana seeks to support education, social and economic growth, and civic and cultural awareness, it will be devoted primarily to preparing students to live wisely. (paragraph one)

Faculty Evaluation at USI

The following tables summarize the types of evaluation and reviews that take place at USI based on different academic contracts and faculty status.

Table One: Annual Review for Renewable Full-Time Contract Faculty

Faculty Affected	Type of Evaluation	Materials the Faculty Member Must Provide	Evaluators and Flow of Reporting
Full-time renewable contract faculty	Annual Performance Evaluation Re-appointment	1. CLA Faculty Annual Report form. 2. Other materials as required by department policy.	<p>1. Department evaluation committee^a, if applicable to department policy, reviews the FAR and other materials required by the department. The evaluation committee chair submits the FAR and other materials required by the department to the department chair. The evaluation committee chair is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.</p> <p>2. The department chair reviews the FAR and other materials required by the department and submits the FAR to the dean. The chair is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.</p> <p>3. The dean reviews the FAR and reports her/his evaluation and recommendation to the Provost. The dean is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.</p>

^aDepartment evaluation committees will have a minimum of three members. One member may be from outside the department.

Table Two: Annual Review for Tenure-Track Faculty During Years 1 – 6^a

Faculty Affected	Type of Evaluation	Materials the Faculty Member Must Provide	Evaluators and Flow of Reporting
Tenure-track faculty	Annual Performance Evaluation Re-appointment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CLA Faculty Annual Report form. 2. Portfolio, including the candidate's personal, evaluative essay as well as cumulative information about teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The candidate's department may have specific requirements for the portfolio.^b 3. Appropriate University tracking form. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A department evaluation committee^c reports the results of its evaluation to the department chairperson. The evaluation committee chair is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member. 2. The chairperson submits her/his evaluation, along with that of the department evaluation committee to the dean. The department chair is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member. 3. The dean reports her/his evaluation and submits recommendation to the Provost. The dean is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.

^aTenure-track faculty in their second year will need to submit their materials for two reviews, one in fall and the other in spring. The CLA Faculty Annual Report form will not be required for inclusion during the fall review.

^bImportant information on portfolio preparation is provided in Appendix B of this document.

^cA departmental evaluation committee is to have three to five members (including at least one from outside the department and possibly from outside USI). This committee is to be appointed by the departmental chairperson or program director. When department chairs are evaluated for promotion, tenure, or reappointment, an evaluation committee shall be appointed by the dean in consultation with the department. At least one member of the committee will be a current chair in Liberal Arts from outside of the department.

Table Three: Annual Review for Tenured Faculty and Tenure-Track Faculty Who Have Been Approved for Tenure

Faculty Affected	Type of Evaluation	Materials the Faculty Member Must Provide	Evaluators and Flow of Reporting
Tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty in their 7 th year	Annual Performance Evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CLA Faculty Annual Report form. 2. Other materials as required by department policy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The chairperson submits the FAR to the dean. The chairperson is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member. 2. The dean submits the FAR and her/his evaluation to the Provost. The dean is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.

Table Four: Tenure Review

Faculty Affected	Type of Evaluation	Materials the Faculty Member Must Provide	Evaluators and Flow of Reporting
Tenure-track faculty who are eligible to apply for tenure ^a	Tenure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Portfolio, including the candidate's personal, evaluative essay as well as cumulative information about teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The candidate's department may have specific requirements for the portfolio.^b 2. Appropriate University tracking form. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A department tenure and promotion committee^c reports the results of its evaluation to the department chairperson. 2. The chairperson submits her/his evaluation, along with that of the department evaluation committee, to the dean. The chairperson is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member. 3. The dean reports her/his evaluation to the provost. 4. The provost makes his/her recommendation to the president. 5. The president and the Board of Trustees have the final word on awarding tenure.

(Table updated 2/29/2008)

^aOn appointment to the rank of assistant professor or higher rank, and after completing seven years of full-time service in accredited educational institutions, four years of which must have been served at the University of Southern Indiana, the faculty member shall become eligible for continuous appointment (Handbook).

^b Important information on portfolio preparation is provided in Appendix B of this document.

^cA department tenure and promotion committee is to have three to five members (including at least one from outside the department and possibly from outside USI). This committee is made up of tenured faculty to be appointed by the department chairperson or program director. When department chairs are evaluated for promotion, tenure, or reappointment, an evaluation committee shall be appointed by the dean in consultation with the department. At least one member of the committee will be a current chair in Liberal Arts from outside of the department.

Table Five: Promotion Review

Faculty Affected	Type of Evaluation	Materials the Faculty Member Must Provide	Evaluators and Flow of Reporting
<p>Tenured and tenure-track faculty who are eligible and have selected to apply for promotion^a</p>	<p>Promotion</p>	<p>1. Portfolio, including the candidate’s personal, evaluative essay as well as cumulative information about teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The candidate’s department may have specific requirements for the portfolio.^b</p> <p>2. Appropriate University tracking form.</p>	<p>1. A department tenure and promotion committee^{c,d} reports the results of its evaluation to the department chairperson.</p> <p>2. The chairperson submits her/his evaluation, along with that of the department evaluation committee, to the dean. The chairperson is obligated to explain the recommendation to the faculty member.</p> <p>3. The dean reports her/his evaluation to the provost.</p> <p>4. The provost makes the materials available to the University Promotions Committee.</p> <p>5. The University Promotions Committee makes its recommendation to the provost.</p> <p>6. The provost makes his/her recommendation to the university president</p> <p>7. The university president and the Board of Trustees have the final word on awarding promotion.</p>

^aEligibility requirements for promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and Associate Professor to Professor are discussed in the Handbook.

^bImportant information on portfolio preparation is provided in Appendix B of this document.

^cA department tenure and promotion committee is to have three to five members (including at least one from outside the department and possibly from outside USI). This committee is made up of tenured faculty to be appointed by the department chairperson or program director. When department chairs are evaluated for promotion, tenure, or reappointment, an evaluation committee shall be appointed by the dean in consultation with the department. At least one

member of the committee will be a current chair in Liberal Arts from outside of the department.

^dIn the case of promotion to full professor, committee membership is limited to faculty of associate professor and full professor rank.

The Academic Affairs Office publishes a Calendar for Personnel Decisions at the beginning of each academic year. Faculty should consult the calendar annually.

Contract Faculty and the Evaluation Process

According to the Handbook, contract faculty are “[m]embers of the teaching faculty appointed to serve in specified temporary assignments. These may be for one semester or an academic year and may be either on a part-time or full- time basis.” The Handbook further notes that contract faculty are

1. Eligible to receive, but not entitled to expect, renewal of appointments following the expiration of their current appointments;
2. Given assignments which are recommended by department chairs or supervisors and which are in accordance with policies found in the Handbook.

These Handbook statements suggest that contract faculty are to be evaluated primarily on the basis of their teaching performance. While a specific department may expect contract faculty to engage in service and in scholarly or creative work, these expectations should not be as high as those for tenure-eligible faculty. The expectations should be made a matter of record at the beginning of each contract cycle and should be referenced during each annual evaluation. Although teaching is the primary responsibility of contract faculty, the College of Liberal Arts supports contract faculty in their scholarly and creative endeavors.

Standards and Criteria

The Handbook requires that faculty members engage in teaching, scholarship, and service and provide evidence of expertise in each of these three areas as their careers develop, especially as they approach important milestones like tenure and promotion. Most professionals agree that each of the three areas of professional competence relies on the other two and that none can be omitted if true excellence is to be achieved. Nonetheless, it is also clear from the Handbook and the Mission Statement that at USI teaching is our first priority. The Handbook addresses all these matters in some detail. Candidates and reviewers should refer to appropriate areas in the Handbook (especially Section III, Faculty and Academic Policies) when developing the materials for evaluation.

To meet expectations provided for in the Mission Statement and Handbook all faculty members must not only be knowledgeable and proficient but also engaged in continual self-improvement. Re-appointment, tenure, and promotion are privileges to be earned rather than expected, and no one should receive tenure who has not demonstrated

effective performance in the fulfillment of his or her duties. To assess an individual's progress in these matters, the College and the individual departments undertake both annual and longer-term evaluations

Since no one can predict the particular twists and turns an individual faculty member's career may take, both short and long term evaluations require a high degree of give and take in understanding the "value-added" nature of an activity as it is planned and executed by the person under review. Nonetheless, as academicians we can expect that the process will be a rational one and that we will know and be able to demonstrate when the faculty member being evaluated has made a serious attempt at establishing worthwhile goals, pursuing them, and measuring the results. In this sense, evaluation for promotion or tenure is simply a special case in a larger pattern of assessment which may include annual evaluations for merit pay considerations, decisions about leaves of absences, and decisions about administrative assignments or other long term commitments that may take place periodically throughout a faculty member's career.

It is also essential that no evaluation be burdensome but at the same time each evaluation should be comprehensive enough to benefit both individuals and the institution they serve. All such assessments should be sensibly integrated with annual evaluations, "reports," and long-term goals.

An individual faculty member may find it helpful to prepare a plan of personal academic development; a department chairperson may require the preparation of such plans, especially for new faculty and faculty who are hoping to be recommended for tenure or promotion. Academic plans would identify goals for the period specified as well as what constitutes success in meeting them. Evaluation of academic plans should allow for the serendipitous character of faculty work (for example, an unexpected call for papers or manuscripts that is germane to the faculty member's scholarly, creative, or teaching agenda) and for new duties that a faculty member may be called upon to fulfill.

A carefully written personal academic plan can help a faculty member identify and focus on strengths as well as chart new directions. The plan may also help a faculty member establish the best possible "fit" between her or his strengths and the needs and expectations of the department, the College, and the university. It may, for instance, help a faculty member (or a chairperson, dean, or colleagues) determine that an emphasis for a given year on one or two of the three areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service) is beneficial both for the faculty member and for the university, College, or department.

At the same time, however, the expectations set forth in the Handbook for appointment, promotion, and tenure must be respected. Key statements are the following.

Regarding teaching, the Handbook states that "teaching occupies a central position among academic duties," that "Quality teaching . . . is the most important element in evaluation of teaching faculty," and that "effective teaching assumes intellectual competence and integrity, creative pedagogical

techniques that stimulate and direct student learning, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant revision of courses and curricula consistent with new knowledge. It is further understood that teaching includes effective academic advising.”

The Handbook specifies the following, regarding teaching:

In addition to continued growth in knowledge of subject matter, by rank the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of development in pedagogical techniques, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry.
- 2. Associate professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of continuing development of pedagogical techniques, cooperation with students and colleagues, and independent scholarly inquiry as reflected in the revision of course content.
- 3. Professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of continuing development of creative pedagogical techniques and significant cooperation with students and colleagues, supported by continuing scholarly inquiry through which new knowledge affects course and curricular revision.

Scholarship, according to the Handbook, is “the foundation for teaching and professional activity . . . the pursuit of a definite, continuous program of studies, investigations, or creative works is essential.” Professional activity other than scholarship is also expected. The Handbook elaborates thus:

- 1. Assistant professor:** Academic preparation should be sufficient for progress in teaching, independent scholarship, and creative work.
- 2. Associate professor:** The production of scholarly or creative works should be of sufficient merit to gain local, state, or regional recognition.
- 3. Professor:** The production of scholarly or creative works should be of sufficient merit to gain state, regional, or national recognition.

Professional Activity. Active participation in organizations that stimulate and propagate knowledge in professional disciplines is an essential ingredient to professional growth and development. Therefore, evidence of membership; committee service; offices held in professional organizations; and experience in organizing and assisting in conferences, workshops, and seminars are principal criteria to be considered for faculty promotion. Professional consultation; travel related to teaching and research; and

recognition by one's peers through professional honors, grants, and awards should also be given serious consideration. Voluntary and philanthropic activities related to the faculty member's discipline or area of expertise should be considered where appropriate.

By rank, the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** A foundation of professional activity should be in evidence.
- 2. Associate professor:** Significant involvement in advancing knowledge through participation in professional organizations and other professional activity at the local, state, or regional level should be apparent.
- 3. Professor:** Leadership in advancing knowledge through participation in professional organizations and other professional activity at the local, state, regional, or national level should be clear.

The Handbook discusses both university and community service. "Faculty members are expected to be available for service to University faculty, students, and administration. They must show willingness to serve and to demonstrate efficient performance in such capacities as faculty governance, department/College and University-level committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities." "Service to groups, agencies, and institutions external to the University is a legitimate responsibility of faculty and is consistent with the mission statement of the University. In general, community service should result from carefully developed plans of activity. Persons who desire recognition for their service must document their work's effectiveness."

University Service. Faculty members are expected to be available for service to University faculty, students, and administration. They must show willingness to serve and to demonstrate efficient performance in such capacities as faculty governance, department/College and University-level committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities.

By rank, the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** University service should be in evidence at least at the College level.
- 2. Associate professor:** Effective University service at various levels should be in evidence.

- 3. Professor:** Effective leadership in University service at various levels should be in evidence.

Community Service. Service to groups, agencies, and institutions external to the University is a legitimate responsibility of faculty and is consistent with the mission statement of the University. In general, community service should result from carefully developed plans of activity. Persons who desire recognition for their service must document their work's effectiveness.

By rank, the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** The candidate should demonstrate activity within the University's continuing education area or membership and activity in local community and public service agencies, groups, and other organizations.
- 2. Associate professor:** The candidate should demonstrate effective community service at various levels.
- 3. Professor:** Leadership within local and regional groups should be in evidence.

Although teaching, service, and scholarship are all required of USI faculty members, under normal circumstances differences in emphasis will occur. For faculty seeking tenure, promotion, or both, the collective weight of the candidate's total contribution to the department, the university, the profession, and the community must be significant enough to warrant a positive recommendation. Where significant imbalance among teaching, scholarship/creative work, and service occurs, the candidate's contributions should reflect the concerns and objectives of the department, College, and university. For this reason, it is essential that the candidate's contributions be documented, that the connection between those contributions and an area's concerns and objectives also be documented (by the appropriate chairperson, director, dean, etc.), and that all such documentation be made available to all parties involved in a decision regarding tenure or promotion (committees, chairperson, dean, provost, etc.).

It is incumbent on the reviewers explicitly to communicate and document the extent to which the candidate meets criteria as set down by the Handbook and by this document. Should the candidate require assistance in some area, the reviewer(s) and candidate together will generate and document a plan for remediation.

Note about Terminal Degrees

The terminal degree in most disciplines in the College of Liberal Arts is the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.). In studio arts, creative writing, and performing arts, either a Ph.D. or

a Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) is generally considered the appropriate terminal degree.

Materials for Evaluation

In an evaluation system which emphasizes the candidate's self assessment, general agreement at the outset about what should be assessed, the materials appropriate to the assessment, and the process for conducting the assessment may have much benefit. Following, therefore, are recommendations regarding how each area might be interpreted and approached. In outline, these recommendations borrow heavily from Diamond's two books, *Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review: A Faculty Guide* and *Serving on Promotion and Tenure Committees: A Faculty Guide* (copies of which are available in the College office). Although Diamond's books provide a convenient starting place for both candidates and reviewers, he is not the only educator to address such matters; individuals and committees may wish to consult other materials.

Candidates for re-appointment, tenure, and promotion have traditionally submitted documentary evidence in support of their assessment by faculty evaluation committees and the administration. Indeed, over the years the volume of these materials has, in some cases, grown to the point that they defy intelligent use and organization. Since a valuable criterion in establishing a candidate's strengths is his or her ability to distinguish what is merely incidental from what is truly important, candidates should be aware that outside their immediate peers, evaluation—both self evaluation and that of appropriate reviewers—is preferable to extensive documentation. For tenure and promotion, a personal essay, no more than 12,000 words, is recommended. The personal essay is followed by appendices with supporting materials divided according to teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. With the guidance of the department chairperson, the dean, and other faculty as appropriate, each candidate should strive to present a readable, representative sample of her or his career achievements. (Note that the page limit is a recommendation, not a requirement.) For reappointment, a shorter personal essay is appropriate.

Evaluators should caution themselves that neither the "heft" of a portfolio nor the quantity of documentation are the true test of its worth. Nor, except in the immediate department, should they expect to act as critics of work that lies outside their own field of expertise. Their primary role lies in discovering whether plans have been established and fulfilled.

The following pages offer criteria and examples to be used in evaluating the three main categories (teaching, scholarship and professional activity, university and community service). The examples are intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive. Some activities may belong in several categories but may only be represented in one, and, obviously, it would not be possible to list every activity that a faculty might appropriately engage in. It is up to the faculty member being evaluated to make the case for placing a particular activity within one or more categories.

Teaching & Advising

It is true that legitimately-held but broadly-divergent opinions exist about what constitute the goals and the appropriate outcomes of good teaching. Is one's duty, for example, to "teach the subject" or to "teach the student"? When is a lecture approach valuable, and when is it not? To what degree does an awareness of learning styles shape what should go on in a classroom? To what degree is academic freedom concerned with these matters? These and other questions legitimately concern, and occasionally divide, faculty members and are the subjects of lively and often productive debates about the nature of the classroom experience. They may also provide the basis for disagreements among reviewers themselves and those under review.

In spite of the possibility of legitimate disagreements, faculty should be able to present, in the personal essay that accompanies the portfolio, a clear understanding of what they wish to achieve as teachers, the assumptions which undergird their approach, and the means to evaluate success in teaching. It is similarly incumbent on reviewers to be explicit with themselves and with the candidate in response—particularly if there is any disagreement among them.

The College also believes that good teaching requires participation with colleagues in the development of courses and curricula within the department (and between departments, when faculty are engaged in interdisciplinary teaching), willingness to participate in program assessment, and advising of students.

Examples

In light of such considerations, the following list should help provide a basis for identifying qualities desirable in a teacher. The candidate should use them as he or she builds a case for positive evaluation. Important omissions should be noted by reviewers. This list is intended to be suggestive, not comprehensive.

- Advising
 - Accessibility
 - Communication skills
 - Knowledge of University policies and procedures
- Appropriate student learning outcomes
- Attendance at workshops and conferences on teaching and learning
- Completion of in-service training and application of the training to courses
- Conducting seminars for the education of interns, graduating seniors, or professionals within the faculty member's area of expertise

- Creativity and flexibility in teaching methods and technologies
- Development of new courses and revision of existing courses
- Effective communication with students
- Enthusiasm for teaching
- Fairness and rigor in assessing student work
- Guiding and monitoring interns, assisting in the transition of students to employment
- Interaction with colleagues in development of curriculum
- Interaction with students—both inside and outside the classroom
- Knowledge of subject matter and familiarity with pedagogy in the field
- Organization of subject matter as reflected in such documents as syllabi and assignment sheets
- Participation in and knowledge of course and curricular assessment

Assessment Materials

- Advising survey
- Alumni surveys
- Classroom observation by colleague(s) and/or department chair
- Course syllabi, lecture outlines, assignments, exams, or other course materials
- Evidence of student achievement
- Evidence of success of alumni
- Informal or unsolicited testimony of students should not be considered
- Other documentation by people appropriate to the evaluation process (students, faculty, alumni, etc.)

- Other observations by colleague(s) and/or department chair
- Results of student evaluations of USI courses using the currently approved university-wide form (see Appendix C for discussion on student evaluations)
- Self- or departmentally-designed evaluation form

Research, Creative Work, and Professional Activity

The Handbook is clear that research or creative activity is required for tenure and promotion and that it should contribute in an on-going way both to a faculty member's teaching and to the advancement of knowledge in her or his field. This activity may include what Boyer and his associates term the "scholarship of application" and "scholarship of pedagogy" as well as the more traditional scholarship of "discovery" and "integration."

Portfolio descriptions and listings on the curriculum vitae of research and creative work should clearly state and/or categorize whether and how this work has been evaluated by the relevant professional community. (For example, has it been reviewed by peers? Juried? Invited by a curator? Cited in other work?) There will be individual and departmental variations in the form of these products and in the types of appropriate professional review. Departments are encouraged to set their own standards, consistent with Handbook guidelines and approved by the dean, for quality and quantity of scholarship and creative work, and to define those professional communities relevant to the discipline.

The Handbook is also clear that faculty are to be involved "in organizations that stimulate and propagate knowledge in professional disciplines."

Following are examples of appropriate scholarly and professional activities, some of which are gathered from statements by professional organizations and elsewhere that may or may not fall within traditional guidelines. (This list is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive). It is understood, however, that all such activities should fall clearly within the areas of the faculty member's academic training and professional expertise. The faculty member who offers any activity as counting toward the scholarship/creative activity requirement should provide in the personal essay an explanation of the activity and how it meets the criteria, taking special care to present the activity as part of a rational and on-going plan. This is not to discount the value of activities that occur as a result of serendipity, but the Handbook clearly calls for "a definite, continuous program of studies, investigations, or creative works."

- Attending/Presenting a paper/chairing a panel at an academic conference
- Creating a body of art work for a one-person or group exhibition

- Conducting a workshop/symposium on a regional/national/international level
- Curating/Serving as a Juror for an art exhibition
- Demonstrating research or creative activity carried out over an extended period of time
- Designing and conducting a musical production or concert
- Giving a public lecture at another university/museum/performing arts center
- Holding office or serving on committees in a professional organization
- Illustrating and writing a catalogue for an exhibition
- Participation in a juried show or other juried forum for creative work
- Presenting a teaching portfolio that emphasizes the scholarship of teaching the particular discipline. Under some circumstances, a teaching portfolio may be offered as peer-reviewed work.
- Presenting web-based materials (scholarly, creative, or teaching) designed for a professional audience. Under some circumstances, this material may be offered as peer-reviewed work or as professional service.
- Producing/directing a documentary film or video
- Professional consultation
- Providing direction/design/technical design or construction/performance in a theatrical production
- Publication of a book or monograph (compilation of essays, novel, poetry, play, biography, etc. and also textbooks, workbooks)
- Publication of articles in peer-reviewed, scholarly journals
- Publication of reviews (literary, theatrical, art, music, etc.) in scholarly and professional journals
- Recognition by peers as signified by professional honors, grants, and awards
- Translation or edition of a text, previously published or unpublished
- Travel related to teaching and research
- Writing or producing materials for the mass media

Assessment

Boyer suggests the following general guidelines (here slightly amended) for evaluating both traditional and innovative scholarship and creative work. These general criteria obviously need to be supplemented by more specific criteria as they pertain to each discipline. When no specific criteria exist, reviewers will have to inform themselves and rely on their own study and judgment in providing an estimate of value.

- Does the individual have clear goals?

For example, to what extent does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Identify important questions in the field? Have an adequate understanding of the time, cost, and materials for stated plans?

- Does he or she exhibit adequate preparation?

For example, to what extent does he or she show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward? Define the extent of research realistically? Have a grasp of time, costs, travel, and technology necessary to accomplish proposed work?

- Does he or she use appropriate methods?

For example, to what extent does he or she use methods appropriate to the goals? Apply effectively the methods selected? Modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

- Does he or she achieve significant results?

For example, to what extent does he or she achieve the goals? Does the work add consequentially to the field? Add a new dimension or represent “creative” development? Does it add to the quality apparent in USI publications, studios, and public forums? To student growth at USI and after graduation? Does it open additional areas for further exploration?

- Does he or she provide an effective presentation?

For example, to what extent does he or she use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Present his or her message with clarity and integrity? Present the work in a suitable setting or venue as to size, aesthetic appeal, etc.

- Is the project followed by the faculty member's reflective critique?

For example, to what extent does he or she critically evaluate his or her own work? Bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

Service

The Handbook includes two types of service faculty members perform: University Service which includes such things as “departmental/College and University-level

committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities”; and Community (or Public) Service which includes service to “groups, agencies, and institution external to the University,” which must be consistent with the Mission Statement, and which must be documented as to the work’s “effectiveness.”

University Service

Of the two, University Service is defined by the Handbook as mandatory: “Faculty members are expected to be available for service to University faculty, students, and administration. They must show willingness to serve and to demonstrate efficient performance in such capacities as faculty governance, department/College and University-level committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities.” Departmental service may be the best opportunity for new faculty members to display their commitment while service on University-wide committees may most effectively be accomplished by persons with tenure and/or in the middle to later years of their careers at USI. In any case, knowing that service plays a role in evaluation, candidates are urged to plan from the beginning to document service activities. In the case of University Service, this may require the collecting of materials from committee work or administrative assignments and describing their importance as well as the success of the outcome of the activity. Letters of reference or solicited observations and commentary by colleagues and/or department chairs or by other persons who are in a position to notice and evaluate the candidate’s work may also be important.

Community Service

Both Boyer and Diamond stress the importance of community service as central to the changes going on in “applied” scholarship nationwide. USI is not a “research” university, nor is it desirable that all universities aspire to that designation. It is, however, desirable that some institutions turn their efforts to service in support of the public good. Given USI’s unique history and its relationship with Evansville, Region 13, and the state, this view of service should be acknowledged (and is through the Mission Statement) and suitably rewarded here.

The evaluation of service is an emerging field, and in developing our thinking we have borrowed heavily from a publication by the University of Illinois, *A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process*.

Although the forms can be diverse, community service activities share the following four distinguishing characteristics.

- They contribute to the public welfare or the common good.
- They call upon faculty members' academic and/or professional expertise

- They address or respond to real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.
- They are capable of being documented and evaluated.

Examples of Community Service Activities

The diversity of external needs as well as faculty training and experience leads to many different forms of service. To the extent that they are in keeping with all four of the previously stated characteristics, the following activities are examples of how faculty members, through their academic or professional expertise, can contribute to the public good while directly addressing real-world problems, issues, interests, or concerns.

- Act as expert witnesses.
- Assist neighborhood organizations.
- Conduct studies on specific problems brought to one's attention by individuals, agencies, or businesses.
- Consult with town, city, or county governments; schools, museums, parks, and other Public institutions; companies; groups; or individuals.
- Engage in economic and community development activities.
- Engage in informational activities (seminars, conferences, and institutes) that address public-interest problems, issues, and concerns and that are aimed at either general or specialized audiences such as practitioner or occupational groups.
- Evaluate programs, policies, or personnel for agencies.
- Give presentations or performances for the public.
- Make research understandable and usable in specific professional and applied settings.
- Participate in collaborative endeavors with Colleges, industry, or civic agencies.
- Participate in governmental meetings or on federal review panels.
- Provide continuing education.
- Provide expertise to the media.

- Provide public policy analysis for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies.
- Publication of articles for the popular press or other media (magazines, newspapers, television/radio, editorials, advertisements, public service announcements).
- Test concepts and processes in real-world situations.
- Testify before legislative or congressional committees.
- Write for popular and nonacademic publications, including newsletters and magazines directed to agencies, professionals, or other specialized audiences.

Evaluating Community Service

The following questions and observations pertain to how community service activities relate to a faculty member's professional life.

- Do the service efforts draw upon the faculty member's disciplinary or professional expertise?
- To what extent do the activities represent potential new interpretations and applications of knowledge for use in specific settings?
- Is there potential for the activities to generate new research questions or make more understandable the current body of knowledge?
- Does the outreach activity make an impact on public policy or on the improvement of practice among professionals?
- Documentation of the impact of service activities and their contributions to professional improvement may be the most potent single manner in which comments by professionals can support the case in the review process.
- Faculty members from other institutions or professionals in other fields may represent a valuable source of evidence regarding the excellence of faculty members' community service efforts and related scholarly endeavors.
- The qualifications of persons asked to comment upon leadership in the field or contributions to theory through community service efforts should be made explicit in reviewers' comments on public service activities.

Note On Grants

For purposes of evaluation, the writing of grants should be considered in relation to the activity (teaching, service, or research, creative activity, or professional activity) for which the grant was written.

Introduction to the First (1998) Edition

The College of Liberal Arts is a large and diverse academic enterprise whose faculty engages productively in a wide range of scholarly and professional activities, not all of them as fully understood or accepted as they should be by traditional academic standards. To respond to this situation, acting at the request of the Faculty Senate, the College has undertaken to clarify and extend its thinking with regard to evaluation of full-time faculty members particularly for re-appointment, tenure, and promotion.

A variety of materials were consulted in the preparation of this document [first edition]: the USI Handbook, The Mission Statement of the University, statements provided by departments as well as materials developed nationally by individual disciplines, their professional organizations, and accrediting agencies. The committee has especially sought to consider and respond to publications by Boyer and others in publications of the Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement of Teaching and by Robert Diamond and others (and brought to campus by Diamond during his visit in Fall, 1997). The thrust of these publications has been to redefine scholarship and professional activity in ways that take into account the broader roles that professionals engage in today, the changes that may occur in faculty members' careers over time, and the broader range of institutions—USI included—in which such activities take place. Because USI is not only a new institution but also, in many ways, a new *type* of institution with a different mission and a changing mix of faculty, it is important that we consider these discussions if we are to be inclusive, practical, and fair.

APPENDIX A

III. FACULTY AND ACADEMIC POLICIES

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS

In this section of the faculty handbook the designation "faculty member" should be interpreted to include members of the teaching faculty, academic administrators, their staff having teaching responsibilities, and individuals classified as librarians. The term "teaching faculty" specifies only faculty members whose primary duties include teaching.

Each faculty member of the University of Southern Indiana is considered to be an officer of a public educational institution, a member of a learned profession, and a citizen of the community. As an officer in the University, the faculty member is expected to abide by the established policies, rules, and regulations for the operation of the University and the conduct of its instructional programs; to participate in and contribute to the development and improvement of educational services within the scope of the accepted purposes of the University (See Mission Section for Mission Statement of the University); to perform assigned duties to the best of one's ability; and to be concerned about the educational welfare and achievement of the students. As a member of a learned profession, the faculty member should continuously endeavor to improve scholarly attainments; should participate in appropriate organized professional activities; and should contribute, through research, teaching, and service, to the expansion of knowledge and the advancement of learning. As a citizen, the faculty member will accept and uphold the principles and ideals of American democracy and will assume the duties and obligations of all citizens in promoting the general welfare in the community, state, and nation. Personal conduct and relationships with students and colleagues should conform to the accepted ethics of the academic profession and will be judged by the highest standards of personal integrity and moral behavior.

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

I. Teaching Faculty

A strong faculty possesses a diversity of skills, academic preparation, and experience. In general, however, when making judgments about initial appointments, tenure recommendations, and promotions, members of the teaching faculty, chairs, and administrators should consider achievements in the following basic areas: 1) teaching, 2) scholarship and professional activity, and 3) service.

A. Teaching

Teaching occupies a central position among academic duties. Generally, teaching responsibilities consume the greatest amount of faculty energies and provide the primary arena to display faculty scholarship. Quality teaching, therefore, is the most important element in evaluation of teaching faculty. In order for candidates to be considered for promotion, their teaching performance must be viewed as satisfactory by students, colleagues, and administrators with respect to preparation, relevance to subject matter, and organization of material. Applicants for promotion to associate professor and professor must provide evidence that efforts beyond caretaker administration occur in those courses for which he has primary responsibility. Moreover, effective teaching assumes intellectual competence and integrity, creative pedagogical techniques that stimulate and direct student learning, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant revision of courses and curricula consistent with new knowledge. It is further understood that teaching includes effective academic advising.

As evidence of accomplishment in teaching, faculty members should present such items as pedagogical materials including course syllabi and lecture outlines; summaries of anonymous student evaluations taken in class; letters of citation from colleagues or supervisors who visited their classes, observed their teaching in other ways, or taught the same students in subsequent courses; and the record of success of former students in graduate and professional schools and in subject-related careers.

In addition to continued growth in knowledge of subject matter, by rank the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of development in pedagogical techniques, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry.
- 2. Associate professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of continuing development of pedagogical techniques, cooperation with students and colleagues, and independent scholarly inquiry as reflected in the revision of course content.
- 3. Professor:** Teaching performance should be supported by demonstrable evidence of continuing development of creative pedagogical techniques and significant cooperation with students and colleagues, supported by continuing scholarly inquiry through which new knowledge affects course and curricular revision.

B. Scholarship and Professional Activity

Scholarship. Scholarship is the foundation for teaching and professional activity. Completing graduate programs, independent research, and creative works not only contribute to faculty members' knowledge within their teaching fields, but also permit them to become productive scholars among their peers in learned and professional societies. Therefore, the pursuit of a definite, continuous program of studies, investigations, or creative works is essential.

Remembering that quality of scholarly production is considered more important than mere quantity, candidates should demonstrate such evidence as completed graduate or post-doctoral programs; research activities leading to participation in and papers presented to professional meetings and the publication of articles and books; creative works of literature, art or invention which result in publications, exhibits, and patents; and the receipt of professional honors, grants, and awards.

In addition to continued growth in knowledge of subject matter by rank the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** Academic preparation should be sufficient for progress in teaching, independent scholarship, and creative work.
- 2. Associate professor:** The production of scholarly or creative works should be of sufficient merit to gain local, state, or regional recognition.
- 3. Professor:** The production of scholarly or creative works should be of sufficient merit to gain state, regional, or national recognition.

Professional Activity. Active participation in organizations that stimulate and propagate knowledge in professional disciplines is an essential ingredient to professional growth and development. Therefore, evidence of membership; committee service; offices held in professional organizations; and experience in organizing and assisting in conferences, workshops, and seminars are principal criteria to be considered for faculty promotion. Professional consultation; travel related to teaching and research; and recognition by one's peers through professional honors, grants, and awards should also be given serious consideration. Voluntary and philanthropic activities related to the faculty member's discipline or area of expertise should be considered where appropriate.

By rank, the following are expected:

- 1. Assistant professor:** A foundation of professional activity should be in evidence.

2. **Associate professor:** Significant involvement in advancing knowledge through participation in professional organizations and other professional activity at the local, state, or regional level should be apparent.
3. **Professor:** Leadership in advancing knowledge through participation in professional organizations and other professional activity at the local, state, regional, or national level should be clear.

C. Service

University Service. Faculty members are expected to be available for service to University faculty, students, and administration. They must show willingness to serve and to demonstrate efficient performance in such capacities as faculty governance, department/College and University-level committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities.

By rank, the following are expected:

1. **Assistant professor:** University service should be in evidence at least at the College level.
2. **Associate professor:** Effective University service at various levels should be in evidence.
3. **Professor:** Effective leadership in University service at various levels should be in evidence.

Community Service. Service to groups, agencies, and institutions external to the University is a legitimate responsibility of faculty and is consistent with the mission statement of the University. In general, community service should result from carefully developed plans of activity. Persons who desire recognition for their service must document their work's effectiveness.

By rank, the following are expected:

1. **Assistant professor:** The candidate should demonstrate activity within the University's continuing education area or membership and activity in local community and public service agencies, groups, and other organizations.
2. **Associate professor:** The candidate should demonstrate effective community service at various levels.
3. **Professor:** Leadership within local and regional groups should be in evidence.

D. Promotion Criteria

Criteria and requirements listed below should guide all concerned with academic promotions. Mere attainment of these conditions does not, in itself, automatically justify promotion.

To be eligible for promotion to a higher rank, at the time of application, one must ordinarily meet minimum requirements described below. Except under extraordinary circumstances, the following criteria should be fulfilled before eligibility for promotion is considered. (Eligibility suggests when candidates may be considered for promotion.)

Ordinarily faculty members serving a probationary period may not submit applications for promotion until the final year of probation.

1. Instructor to Assistant Professor

a. Quantitative Criteria

- i. Should attain three years of teaching experience in rank.
- ii. Should complete 30 semester hours of graduate work beyond the master's degree, or the equivalent, in an area relevant to the teaching assignment.
- iii. Should have at least five years of teaching experience or equivalent professional experience.
- iv. Should have taught at the University of Southern Indiana at least three years.
- v. Shall be eligible for promotion the academic year following completion of the doctorate or terminal degree.
- vi. Faculty members serving without tenure may not apply for promotion until the final year of non-tenure.

b. Qualitative Criteria

- i. Should meet criteria for Assistant Professor in teaching, scholarship/professional activity, and service.
- ii. Should have positive recommendations for promotion from the appropriate department and/or College committees, department chair, and dean.

2. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

a. Quantitative Criteria

- i. Should have attained an earned doctorate or terminal degree.
- ii. Should have attained four years in rank.

- iii. Should have attained ten years in rank and completed 60 semester hours of graduate work beyond the master's degree, or equivalent, in areas relevant to the teaching field if the doctorate or terminal degree has not yet been earned.
- iv. Should have at least five years of teaching experience or equivalent professional experience.
- v. Should have taught at the University of Southern Indiana at least three years.
- vi. Should have received or be eligible to receive tenure.

b. Qualitative Criteria

- i. Should meet criteria for Associate Professor in teaching, scholarship/professional activity, and service.
- ii. Should have positive recommendations for promotion from the appropriate department and/or College committees, department chair, and dean.

3. Associate Professor to Professor

a. Quantitative Criteria

- i. Should have attained an earned doctorate or terminal degree.
- ii. Should have attained four years in rank.
- iii. Should have at least ten years of teaching experience or equivalent professional experience.
- iv. Should have taught at the University of Southern Indiana at least three years.
- v. Should have held the doctorate or other terminal degree at least six years.
- vi. Should have received or be eligible to receive tenure.

b. Qualitative Criteria

- i. Should meet criteria for Professor in teaching, scholarship/professional activity, and service.
- ii. Should have positive recommendations for promotion from the appropriate department and/or College committees, department chair, and dean.

TYPES OF APPOINTMENT AND TENURE POLICY

Appointments

Classification of full-time teaching faculty appointments. Faculty members may be appointed as either regular or contract faculty.

I. Regular Full-time Teaching Faculty

A. Regular full-time members of the teaching faculty appointed to serve in regular full-time assignments are:

1. Tenured or eligible for tenure upon the completion of all general requirements as stated in approved departmental, College, and University policies and all specific requirements as stated in the initial letter of appointment;
2. Eligible for all privileges extended by the University to regular full-time faculty, including employee benefit programs as described in the letter of appointment;
3. Eligible for full participation in the affairs of the total University, of its component institutions (e.g., Faculty Senate and its councils and committees), and of its departments and administrative units in accordance with University policy;
4. Eligible for academic promotion in accordance with departmental, College, and University policies; and
5. Given assignments which are recommended by departmental chairs or supervisors and which are in accordance with policies found in the *University Handbook*.

B. Ranks which may be assigned include the following:

Instructor. The instructor normally holds at least the master's degree. Faculty members who hold the rank of instructor shall not be eligible for consideration for continuous appointment until they are changed to a regular faculty appointment and complete three years of probationary service at the rank of assistant professor. They shall, however, be eligible for annual term appointments.

Assistant Professor. Persons with an earned doctor's degree but little or no professional experience are usually appointed to the rank of assistant professor. The assistant professor who does not hold the doctorate must have completed at least one full academic year of graduate work toward a doctor's degree and must have had significant professional experience. In very exceptional cases, clearly distinguished achievement may be accepted as a substitute for the additional year of graduate work.

Associate Professor. The associate professor holds an earned doctor's degree and has had significant professional experience. In very exceptional cases, associate professorship may be granted to one without the doctorate.

Professor. The professor holds an earned doctor's degree and has had extensive professional experience. In very exceptional cases, full professorship may be granted to one without the doctorate.

1. Contract Teaching Faculty

A. Members of the teaching faculty appointed to serve in specified temporary assignments. These may be for one semester or an academic year and may be either on a part-time or full-time basis contract teaching faculty are:

1. Eligible to receive, but not entitled to expect, renewal of appointments following the expiration of their current appointments;
2. Given assignments which are recommended by department chairs or supervisors and which are in accordance with policies found in the *University Handbook*;
3. Eligible, if contract full-time teaching faculty, to participate with voting rights in the departmental or area governance system by invitation of a majority of the regular members of the unit; and
4. Persons appointed on contract as part-time, lecturers, visiting appointees, and adjunct appointees are not considered members of the voting faculty as defined in Article I of the Faculty Constitution.

B. Contract faculty are accorded the following privileges:

1. Full-time contract faculty, may participate in the staff benefit programs of the University as stated in Section C of the *University Handbook*.
2. Part-time contract faculty assigned to teach seven or more semester hours in each semester on an academic year appointment, may participate in the staff benefit programs of the University as stated in Section C of the *University Handbook*.
3. Part-time contract faculty employed on a semester by semester basis or academic-year faculty who are less than half-time (seven semester hours or less) are not eligible to participate in the staff benefit programs.

C. Ranks which may be assigned include the following:

1. **Instructor:** The instructor normally holds at least the master's degree. Faculty members who hold the rank of instructor shall not be eligible for consideration for continuous appointment (tenure). They shall, however, be eligible for annual term appointments.
2. **Assistant, Associate, or Professor, Full or Part-time:** Changes from contract appointments to regular faculty or librarian status should follow the customary procedures of the University. Persons holding contract appointments are not eligible for tenure.
3. **Lecturer:** The title "Lecturer" may be used for persons employed as contract full-time or part-time faculty who are uniquely qualified to serve the University. The person recommended to be a lecturer must be approved by the academic department and recommended through the usual channels. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. This title should not be used for persons who qualify for employment as regular faculty personnel.
4. **Visiting Appointees:** The title "Visiting" may be used for persons holding rank in another institution who are temporarily employed at this University. The person recommended to be a visiting professor must be approved by the academic department and recommended through the usual channels. Visiting professors are not eligible for tenure.
5. **Adjunct Appointees:** The title "Adjunct" is used for persons who by their professional cooperation significantly assist the University in its academic programs, regardless of the fraction of load assigned and, in most cases, without remuneration. The person recommended to be an adjunct professor must be approved by the academic department and recommended through the usual channels. Adjunct faculty are not eligible for tenure.

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

I. Librarians

Applications for promotion are available in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and procedures conform to the deadlines and other guidelines observed at the department and College level. When the promotion application is properly forwarded to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs, he will appoint a five-member Library Promotions Committee with a designated chair. Among the committee's members shall be a representative of the University Promotions Committee, a representative of the Faculty and Academic Affairs Committee, and members of the professional library staff. This committee will carry out the actions of the

University Promotions Committee, applying the criteria for the promotion of librarians.

II. Teaching Faculty

A. University Promotions Committee

The Promotions Committee is defined in Faculty Handbook Section II Article V: Standing Committees.

B. Applications for Promotion: Procedures

Procedures may vary among the Colleges and academic units with respect to promotion evaluations. However, all Colleges are to utilize at least one evaluation of each applicant by a committee of faculty peers at the department or College level plus an evaluation by the dean. Evaluations at both the departmental and College levels may be appropriate and necessary in some areas. Evaluation procedures shall be written and distributed to all faculty within the College or academic unit. The procedures and deadline dates listed in this section of the *University Handbook* apply to all Colleges regardless of additional evaluations that may be performed.

Applications for promotion are available in the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and can be initiated as follows:

1. An individual member of the teaching faculty who meets the minimum criteria and requirements for promotion may submit an application form to the department chair or dean as appropriate for evaluation and action.
2. Faculty members who are not under the direct jurisdiction of a dean may submit promotion applications to their immediate supervisor or director, who should follow the procedures outlined for deans.
3. A faculty member's completed application for promotion must be transmitted to the appropriate dean or director by the first Monday in November.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE PROMOTIONS PROCESS

A. Application for Promotion

An applicant for promotion must assume the following responsibilities:

1. To prepare a completed promotion application which provides well-organized evidence to document his achievements in the area of evaluation specified in the *University Handbook*.
2. To transmit the completed application to the dean or director by the first Monday November or to transmit it to the department chair at an earlier prescribed date if a departmental evaluation is to be used.
3. To provide additional pertinent information upon request by an appropriate administrator or Promotions Committee evaluating the applicant.
4. An applicant may withdraw the promotion application at any time prior to its being transmitted to the Board of Trustees.

B. College or Academic Unit Promotions Committee

This Committee will assume these responsibilities:

1. To receive the applicant's promotion application from the dean or director.
2. To evaluate pertinent information concerning an applicant's qualifications for promotion.
3. To grant or request an interview with the applicant prior to making the committee's recommendation.
4. To inform the dean or director in writing of the committee's recommendation by the first Monday in December.
5. To provide the dean or director with a written evaluation of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses.

C. Dean or Director

The dean or director will assume these responsibilities:

1. To make a continuing study of those faculty members who are eligible for promotion.
2. To suggest that any faculty members in the College or academic unit deemed worthy of consideration submit an application for promotion; such suggestions must be made by an announced date of each year.

3. To create annually a College or Academic Unit Promotions Committee(s) whose membership(s) is (are) established in agreement with the College faculty.
4. To complete a recommendation form for each faculty member applying for promotion.
5. To inform the applicant of the dean's or director's recommendation.
6. To forward the applicant's promotion form and any other pertinent information to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs by the first Monday of classes of the spring semester.
7. Upon request, to confer with an applicant regarding his strengths and weaknesses.

D. University Promotions Committee

The University Promotions Committee will assume the following responsibilities:

1. To acknowledge in writing to the individual under consideration the receipt of the promotion application.
2. To review pertinent information concerning any applicant's qualifications.
3. To inform each applicant in writing, by way of the committee chair, of the committee's recommendation.
4. To make recommendations to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs concerning those for whom promotion should be recommended and those for whom promotion should not be recommended by the Monday of the sixth week of classes of the spring semester.

E. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

The provost and vice president for Academic Affairs will assume these responsibilities:

1. To make applications for promotion available to any faculty member who requests one.
2. To suggest that any faculty member whom the vice president deems worthy of consideration submit an application for promotion to the dean or director.

3. To receive the recommendations for promotion transmitted by the chair of the University Promotions Committee.
4. To analyze such recommendations and to seek additional data deemed necessary.
5. To make recommendations on each applicant.
6. To confer, upon request, with any faculty member whose application for promotion did not receive final favorable action.
7. To provide, upon the applicant's request, a written evaluation of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses.

F. President for the University

The president for the University will assume these responsibilities:

1. To suggest that any faculty member whom the president deems worthy of consideration submit an application for promotion to the College dean or appropriate administrator.
2. To receive from the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs all the completed applications, all recommendations, and all evaluations.
3. To submit to the Board of Trustees in time for consideration at its May meeting the names of those faculty members the president recommends for promotion.
4. To confer, upon request, regarding strengths and weaknesses with applicants who received conflicting recommendations from the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs and the University Promotions Committee.

OPPORTUNITY TO WITHDRAW AN APPLICATION

Once submitted to the dean, an application for promotion is automatically routed through the various faculty committees and administrative offices on the university campus regardless of specific recommendations that may be made regarding it until and unless the individual faculty member requests that the application be withdrawn. This process constitutes an automatic review procedure for recommendations formulated within the University. The process of automatic review does not extend beyond the Office of the President.

APPENDIX B: FACULTY PORTFOLIOS

Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty seeking promotion are required to submit portfolios that serve to explain and document their professional activities. Tenure-track faculty submit their updated portfolios annually whereas tenured faculty seeking promotion only do so in the semester that they submit their promotion application.

Variation in portfolios is expected within the College of Liberal Arts due to the diversity of our disciplines and uniqueness of the professional interests and specializations of our individual faculty. The liberal arts' Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation was developed to assist in providing examples of material that may be included in the portfolio for describing professional activity in the teaching, scholarship, and service components. The examples are intended to be suggestive, not comprehensive, and each example is not expected to be relevant to all faculty.

The following list represents documents that are **required** for inclusion in faculty portfolios in the College of Liberal Arts submitted to the dean.

- I. Evaluation Report of Tenure and Promotion Committee (Evaluation Committee will add this to the portfolio following their review.)
- II. Evaluation Report of Chair (Chair will add this to the portfolio following her/his review.)
- III. Reflective narrative by faculty member that includes discussion of each of the following:
 - A. Teaching
 - B. Scholarship and Professional Activity
 1. Scholarship
 2. Professional Activity
 - C. Service
 1. University Service
 2. Community Service
- IV. Current Curriculum Vitae
- V. FAR for current year only (except for fall review of 2nd year where no FAR is required)
- VI. Required Teaching Documents¹
 1. Peer-review reports of classroom visitations prepared by chair and/or colleagues. These reports should be dated and signed.
 2. Most current course syllabus for all classes taught.

3. Sample of course exams, course assignments, or other measures that you use to evaluate students in each of your classes.
4. Results of student evaluations of all courses using the currently approved university-wide form.

VII. Required Scholarship and Professional Activity Materials^{2,3}

1. Copies of all published books and textbooks listed on the c.v.
2. Copies of all published journal articles and book chapters listed on the c.v. (Xerox copies or reprints are acceptable and there is no need to include the entire journal or book that the article or book chapter appeared.)
3. Copies of all published reviews (literary, theatrical, art, music, etc.) in scholarly and professional journals listed on the c.v.
4. Annotated images, video, or audio of current creative work in slide, CD or DVD format (for faculty members of art, theatre and music).
5. Program listings (photocopy of cover page or title page and page that lists your presentation) of presented papers at professional conferences and copies of the papers, if written.
6. Program listings of all art exhibitions and/or musical and theatre productions (for faculty members of art, theatre and music).

VIII. Required Service Activity Materials⁴

1. Listing of all department, college, and university committees served on as a member or chair.
2. Listing of all community service activities.

¹A listing of other materials that may be included with the portfolio related to teaching effectiveness is provided in the Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation on pp 16-17.

²If a publication is indicated as *in press*, *accepted*, or *forthcoming*, a supporting letter of the journal or publication outlet must be included in the scholarship area of the portfolio.

³A listing of other materials that may be documented and included with the portfolio related to scholarship and professional activity is provided in the Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation on p. 18

⁴A listing of other materials that may be documented and included with the portfolio related to service activity is provided in the Contexts and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation on pp. 21-22.

Appendix C: Uses of the Cafeteria Form

Administration of student-generated evaluations of all university teachers demonstrates that USI values quality instruction. Actively seeking students' response to their instruction sends a strong message that USI honors both the teaching and the learning process. Involving both teachers and learners in the monitoring of instruction is the best way we can demonstrate that commitment.

Within the College of Liberal Arts, evaluation of teaching effectiveness by students serves two primary purposes. First and most critical, constructive student critique provides individual instructors with important feedback from the "consumer's" point-of-view. This feedback should reflect how he/she is perceived as a teacher, and more importantly, how he/she might become more effective by making adjustments in his/her teaching techniques. Secondly, student-generated teaching evaluation data are of value to administrators and senior faculty members in assessing the perceived effectiveness of instructors. This information forms part of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness relative to tenure and promotion considerations for junior faculty and can serve to monitor trends for every instructor's perceived effectiveness over time. Thus, student-generated teaching effectiveness evaluations should serve primarily the instructor, and secondarily the university (department, college/).

However, student evaluations such as the one created by Purdue should be used with extreme caution for two reasons. First, student ratings provide only one dimension of teacher effectiveness. Second, ratings are usually collected at the end of the term when students are anxious about final grades and the unhappy/failing students are no longer attending class. Therefore, the Purdue and/or other student evaluation results should *never* be the sole determiner of teaching effectiveness when making tenure/promotion decisions. At minimum, evidence from other tools for assessment (as stated in the main text of this document) should be given *equal* weight in decisions.

Student evaluations work most effectively in demonstrating that (1) an instructor has consciously worked to become a better teacher, and (2) the instructor has collected evidence to show improvement (Diamond, 1995). Therefore, comparisons of the *same items* for the *same* course across time work effectively in documenting improvement in teaching.

The Purdue form works well along these lines. The Cafeteria form was invented for self-evaluation by instructors interested in improving teaching performance. It is a menu of 200 items phrased as fact or opinion statements with which students are asked to agree/disagree on a 5 point scale. Instructors chose up to forty items for specific assessment of a particular class. The menu is large and imaginative enough to meet the particular needs of almost any course and/or instructor (see note). The instructor should select voluntary items based on following:

- (1) Select items that reflect strengths *and* weaknesses in a particular course.
- (2) Select the same items each time the same course is taught in order to show improvement in teaching over time.

(3) Select items that will measure attempted areas of improvement of a different teaching style/method which will reflect the effectiveness of that change.

(4) Select items that reflect strengths *and* weaknesses of your particular teaching style.

Student evaluations also work, although less effectively, as a tool for demonstrating students' perceived quality of teaching. For ratings to work in this manner, *meaningful* comparisons should be made on the same items with the *medians* (not percentiles) of other faculty teaching similar courses in the same department and/or College. Diamond (1995) recommends a simple histogram/bar chart to present the information. Unfortunately, the current Purdue forms do not allow for these type of comparisons. Information about other instructors' courses can be extremely difficult to obtain. Therefore, it is not required nor expected that the candidate presents this information in his/her teaching portfolio. If a candidate is able to produce this information, it should be viewed as "icing on the cake."

Given the lack of utility inherent in the Purdue forms, it is tempting instead to use normed percentiles. However, institutional normed percentiles, such as those given on Purdue results, are poor indicators of relative teaching effectiveness for several reasons and should not be given any weight in personnel decisions. First, teaching methods differ across departments and schools within an institution. Therefore, ratings will vary. Second, several variables such as class size, class level, grading standards and teaching methods have been consistently shown to affect student ratings (McKeachie & Kaplan, 1996; Felder, 1992; McGee, 1995). Small differences in median ratings due to these factors appear much more significant when presented as a percentile ranking. Third, the Purdue form was not written to make comparisons among faculty. The normed percentile rankings were included over the protest of the authors (McGee, 1995). The percentiles compare current courses with all courses taught at USI since 1975. As course enrollment continues to increase at USI, it is fallacious to compare current larger classes (which research consistently shows have a depressant effect on ratings) with small classes taught over two decades ago. It is simply incorrect to interpret a 50 percentile ranking as "low," in that apples and oranges are being compared.

In that institution wide norms are so frequently misinterpreted and misused by committees and administrators in making personnel decisions (McKeachie & Kaplan, 1996; McGee, 1995), it is the policy of the College of Liberal Arts to not provide committee members and administrators with the Purdue results prior to the evaluation process. Therefore, no prior opinion of teaching effectiveness has been formed. Candidates must present the results of their cafeteria results as a part of the yearly evaluation, and for tenure/promotion evaluation. *It is up to the instructor to present the results within a context which allows for a valid interpretation.* The numbers do not simply speak for themselves. Instructors should make note of improvements over time in a particular course, as well as overall improvement across a variety of courses during one's career.

Note: The Purdue form was developed in the early 1970s and some of the items are dated. Additionally, instructors who take advantage of modern technology in their courses will be hard pressed to find a valid measurement item in the Purdue. In these situations, it is recommended that the instructor create his/her own evaluation form that is a valid measurement of course design and methods. The results from a self-designed rating system should be presented along with the Purdue in the evaluation portfolio.

Selected References

- A Faculty Guide for Relating Public Service to the Promotion and Tenure Review Process*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Office of Continuing Education and Public Service, 1993.
- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Diamond, R.M. *Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review: A Faculty Guide*. Boston: Anker, 1995.
- _____. *Serving on Promotion and Tenure Committees: A Faculty Guide*. Boston: Anker, 1995.
- Felder, Richard. (1992). "What do they know, anyway?" *Chemical Engineering Education*. v.26(3):134-135.
- Glassick, C.E. and others. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. An Ernest L. Boyer Project of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Jossey-Bass, 1997.
- McGee, Reece. (1995). "Using and interpreting CAFETERIA scores." *Teaching Matters*. v.2(3):3-4.
- McKeachie, W. J. & Kaplan, Mathew. (1996). "Persistent problems in evaluating college teaching." *AAHE Bulletin*. Feb.:5-8.